

HON. MR. READ—That is a good recommendation.

HON. MR. MCKAY (C.B.)—Why did he dismiss him?

HON. MR. MCCALLUM—He did not dismiss Mr. McDonagh, because he was not employed on the canal, but he treated Mr. McDonagh rudely. Mr. Ellis, as the evidence shows, is a very nice, civil man when he is paid for his civility, but Mr. McDonagh did not bleed: he would not lend Mr. Ellis the money. But Mr. McDonagh's principal offence was that he did not copy and send this celebrated letter for Mr. Ellis to Sir Charles Tupper:—

*"Please copy and forward."*

THOROLD, 30th April, 1880.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER.

"DEAR SIR,—I have only recently heard Mr. Ellis, our new Canal Superintendent, is only receiving \$2,000 a year salary, \$900 a year less than Mr. Bodwell, his predecessor—and I feel it only an act of justice to him to say that Mr. Ellis has worked very hard and done more judicious well-done and much-needed work along the canal already than has been done for years—and the improvements he has made are so important, and so much appreciated by all the captains, vessel owners and citizens generally, that everybody is sounding his praises in the highest terms, and it will afford the greatest satisfaction, I am sure, to everybody, irrespective of politics, to hear that the salary of so deserving and efficient an officer is at least raised to the full amount received by his incompetent predecessor.

"Yours respectfully,

JOHN McDONAGH.

"P. S.—Of course, I intend to ask Mr. Rykert, McCallum and Bunting to try and help me before they leave Ottawa."

I have got the original of this letter, and I think it ought to be lithographed and put in a frame. Although this letter is signed with John McDonagh's name he never wrote it or signed it—it is in Mr. Ellis' handwriting. I have stood a great deal of the expense, so far, in connection with this investigation, and I think for the benefit of posterity this letter ought to be lithographed at the expense of the country. Was there ever such a letter written? The object was to deceive the Government in this instance, as he has been doing in other directions. If ever there was a case of a man blowing his own horn I think you will say it is this. I repeat, Mr. Ellis is always civil when there is anything to be gained for himself by his civility, but he is violent and rude when people refuse his requests. Mr. Ellis says that he ordered Mr. McDonagh out of his office and threa-

tened to kick him out; but if he had attempted to do so he would have had the biggest contract on hand that he ever undertook. He knew better than that. When he had the protection of the court as a witness he was not afraid to say that he threatened to kick Mr. McDonagh, but he would take good care not to say it elsewhere in Mr. McDonagh's presence. The fact is, when he ordered Mr. McDonagh out of his office the reply was: "Yes; I am always ready to go out of a gentleman's office when I am told to do so, but come outside with me." Mr. Ellis did not follow him. Mr. Ellis gets free gas on the Welland Canal from the gas company of St. Catharines, who have a bulk sum contract with the Government to supply gas on the Welland Canal for \$10,000 a year. We find that the company made a present to Mr. Ellis—that by a resolution of the board they gave him free gas for light and fuel. What do they give it to him for? Is it for his good looks? He is a pretty good looking man, but I do not think they give him free gas light and free fuel because of his attractive appearance. I have already read to you section 31 of the canal regulations, which forbids any man employed on the canal receiving directly or indirectly anything more than his salary. The intention of the Parliament of Canada is that every man employed on that great work should be honest, and should depend upon his salary alone for a living. If any man does not get salary enough the proper course is to raise the salary, and not have him looking around for testimonials and bonuses and favors from the people who want special advantages on the canal. We commenced to take evidence on this gas question early in the investigation. I had a good deal of trouble to get evidence on the subject, and had some difficulty in getting the commissioner to admit the letter that I have just read. We got it in one day, and the next day the commissioner wanted to take it out, and I, on behalf of the people, protested. He said he would expunge it out of the evidence. I asked him how he could do that? I said: "I have a copy of the evidence; are you going to take me by the throat and force me to give it up? I should like to see the man that would undertake to do that." He said he would expunge it from the copy he sent to the Government. I said: "You can expunge the whole evidence if you like,