

was not consulted about the repairs made to the canal office at St. Catharines. Mr. Ellis says, at page 2318 of the report of the evidence, that he consulted Mr. Carter and Mr. Secord, but did not consult Mr. Page, the Chief Engineer, about the building of the dock at Port Colborne; he consulted his subordinates, but did not think it worth while to consult his chief. Now that dock is of no value to shipping as the evidence clearly shows. It was a pure waste of the public money. I saw the dock last year, and knew all about it, and knew that it was worthless, owing to the place where it was constructed. Charles Carter, the harbor master, in his evidence at page 1291, says he does not know what the dock at Port Colborne was built for, that Mr. Ellis ordered him to have the tugs lay there, and that he made them go there for ten or twelve days until they knocked their wales off, and then they would not remain there any longer. That dock was built at a point where it was exposed to storms on Lake Erie, and when a breeze comes down the lake no craft can lie there. When the dock was built the harbor master wanted to show that it was of some value, and he tried to compel the tugs to remain there, but when they found they were knocking their wales off they had to leave. At page 1292 Mr. Carter says that all parties at Port Colborne interested in tugs remonstrated about it. At page 1293 he says that he carried out Mr. Ellis' orders until the tugs began to knock themselves to pieces. Some of the vessels had to be towed away to save them from destruction. At page 1316 Edward Armstrong stated that if he did not get redress he would go to Ottawa about it.

George Ross, in his evidence at page 1318, also comments on the absurdity of building a dock in such a place for tugs to lie in. I would refer you also to the evidence of Sperry Carter, Daniel McGrath, Edward Armstrong and Henry Mawdsley, all to the same effect, all pointing to the fact that the building of that dock was a pure waste of money. I do not care to go into all the details of this evidence, but I have a copy of it here which was furnished to me by the commissioner and paid for by the country. I have read it over three times to get at the facts, and I have no further use for it. The evidence about the dock at Port Colborne

is conclusive that it is of no value whatever to the public.

I come now to the fourth charge, and I turn to the evidence of Mr. Page, which will be found at page 1397 of the report. I put the question to him: "Did Mr. Ellis ever consult you about building a Custom house and post office at Port Colborne out of the canal appropriations?" He answered: "No; if I had been consulted I would not have sanctioned it." Mr. Ellis was not satisfied with trying to control the Department of Railway and Canals, but he must control the Department of Public Works also. If he knew anything at all he must have known that the construction of such a building was within the province of the Department of Public Works.

Now, what was the result of his unauthorized action? Nobody owned the building when it was completed, and the Government had to pass an Order in Council to give it to the Department of Public Works. I have mentioned how the Department of Railways and Canals tried to control this gentleman. I had no evidence taken on this point, but I have documents here to prove what I say. I shall now read some letters from the Department to Mr. Ellis in regard to the expenditure on the Welland Canal in April last, and Mr. Ellis' replies, showing that the Government has been after him with a sharp stick since I last moved in Parliament. The first letter is as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 11th May, 1889.

"SIR,—The pay-lists for the Welland Canal staff and repairs for the past month have been submitted to the Chief Engineer, and for his information I am directed to say that an explanatory letter should accompany pay-list, stating at what work the carpenters and masons named on the list were engaged; where, and at what the laborers were employed; what so many machinists were doing—in fact, full details of the service on which the respective men were engaged; the reason in each case why the men are expected to be paid for more than twenty-six days in a month, and why it was necessary to do the different works undertaken. More details and information should also be given for the supplies furnished, and where used.

"Nothing can be done towards sending the money for April pay-lists until the information asked for is furnished and proved satisfactory.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. P. BRADLEY,

"Secretary.

"W. ELLIS, Esq.,

"Supt. Welland Canal,

"St. Catharines."

The Government ought to be applauded for this attempt to control Mr. Ellis since I brought his conduct under their notice. I