

that should you desire a change from the sketch and that change clearly adds to the cost, then I should be allowed the difference in cost of work. I am prepared to commence the work at once, and will complete it as promptly as is possible, consistent with first-class work.

"I remain,  
Respectfully yours,  
"ROGER MILLER.

"The above tender for the work as described in the specifications is hereby accepted.

"WILLIAM ELLIS,  
"Superintendent.

"WELLAND CANAL OFFICE,  
"20th June, 1886."

The cost of that work is \$1,035. Of course, the document is rather long, but it deals with the whole thing. Evidence was taken which showed that they did all of this work, and dug a ditch to the harbor, and the commissioner puts that down at \$500 in order to minimize the importance of the work. The report shows like that all the way through. He tells us about the damage, a year ago last January, to the Welland Canal, by the superintendent's neglect to close the gates at Port Colborne; but he tells us that Mr. Ellis did not do it on purpose, and because he did not do it on purpose he should not be punished for it. Of course, one could overlook neglect of that kind if he was all right otherwise, but this money for the seventeen men that worked for him, which the country paid, and which he put in his pocket, that is a thing which the people of this Dominion cannot stand. Sir John A. Macdonald says that the report speaks for itself, and I am referring you to these facts to show how the commissioner arrived at the conclusion that, taking into consideration all the facts, if the men were not paid by Mr. Ellis it was an oversight. I alleged that men were paid for work on the Welland Canal that they did not do at all. What does the commissioner say? "I find no evidence to sustain this charge besides the Assell case." You will see an effort all the way through this report to try and cover up this sink of iniquity. Now, what is the Assell case? Mr. Ellis tells his clerk in the office to put Mr. Assell's name on the pay-list though he was not working at all, and he keeps his name on that list, returns him 654 days work and tells the paymaster to pay him, until this man received \$817.50 out of the public treasury for which he never did one day's work during the whole of this time. Yet Sir John Macdonald says that the integrity of this official is maintained

by the report. Very good. That will be for the people of this country to judge. The Commissioner admits that charge No. 7 has been clearly proved, and I have nothing to more say about it. He reports that a scow was used by Hutchison for a short time, and Ellis did not think it worth while charging for it. The Commissioner says there was a charge of cement belonging to the Government having been used in the rubber factory. By Mossip's evidence this was a mistake. The Commissioner makes everything a charge—particularly if it was not proven—to magnify the number of charges against Mr. Ellis, and then misquotes the evidence, and ignores things of importance to cover up this man's misdeeds, that were proven, as much as he can. Of course, it was proved clearly that the scow went through the Welland Canal with a load of stone and cement; that the cement and stone went through the canal as Government stone and cement, and the inference is, from the evidence, that it was Government property. You cannot take it otherwise, but he tries to cover that fact up in the report. That stone and cement were used in what is called the rubber factory, a hole into which a lot of the money of the people of this country was sunk. He says that that was a mistake; I say it was not a mistake; and that Sutton, a lock-tender, who built the foundation of the rubber factory, says that he used the cement. Mossip's evidence does not say it was used, but carried by the scow. The Commissioner says that there was no cement used. He could not have read the evidence, or must have been wilfully blind, when he says there was no cement used in the bottom of that rubber factory:

"It was proven that James Dell, overseer, took plank belonging to the Government. Dell appears to be a faithful officer, and I attach no particular value to plank taken by him."

No; of course not. There is an evident intent throughout the whole report to cover up matters, and it looks to me as if this gentleman was sent up on that commission for a certain purpose. The more I read the report the more it confirms my impression that the Commissioner is endeavoring to excuse wrong-doing and not to expose it.

Now, as to moneys received and not returned at the proper time: That is one of the charges I made in this House, and the