

not furnish the stone and cement for the use of private individuals. The presumption is strong that the public furnished the stone and cement that went into the bottom of the rubber factory, and it is no small amount. Mr. Rykert in defending Mr. Ellis was either trying to mislead the commissioner or arguing dishonestly when he said that no cement went into the foundation of the rubber factory. What does the evidence prove? It shows that two lock tenders were farmed out by Mr. Demare to do that work and one of them swears that there was cement used in the bottom of the rubber factory. Mr. Demare says that there are no returns of the money paid for the use of the scow "Sir John" to bring stone from Thorold to the rubber factory. The scow paid no toll going through the canal, and so it was their duty to prove that the stone was not public property. Richard Hutton, at page 1032, states that he got the Government scow free of charge to take stone from Battle's quarry to Port Dalhousie, and had her for about three days. That the stone passed through the canal as Government property and there was no let pass. He says he got the scow from Demare. Whether we furnished the stone in that case or not we found the scow to freight it. George W. Reid, at page 1839, says he got screws and tackle and blocks to use at the rubber factory—that they were furnished by Mr. Demare and he paid nothing for the use of them. Remember these are hydraulic jacks which cost \$100 or \$200 apiece and are very easily injured. He also swears that they had the Government steam pump because they found a leak. It was the easiest thing in the world to find a leak on that canal wherever they wanted to cover up a job. They found a leak in the bottom of the rubber factory, they say, and that was the excuse they offered for working the pump there for four or five days. Before I close, I can show you that they found a leak somewhere else, in order to cover up another dirty transaction. You will find, before I get through, that the bottom of that rubber factory was a sink hole for the money of this country. The scow, "Sir John" carried forty cords of stone and twenty barrels of cement that went into that hole in the rubber factory, and I don't know how much more besides. We will come now to the eighth charge: moneys received and not returned at the proper

time, and some moneys retained and not credited. This is money collected for the use of diving armor and steam pumps, and moneys collected as fines from vessels going through the canal. I must refer to these printed pay-lists in the Sessional Papers, pages 42 to 82. The following are the amounts collected:—

RECEIPTS for Hire or Use of Steam Wrecking Pump
from the Parties mentioned below.

18th August, 1884, Graham, Horne & Co.—			
2 days, steam wrecking pump,			
at \$45.....	\$90	00	
Plank and lard oil.....	4	25	
			\$94 25
1st October, 1884, Sylvester Neelon—			
2½ days, steam wrecking pump,			
at \$45.....	\$112	50	
2½ days, wrecker, at \$3.....	7	50	
2½ days, engineer, at \$1.75.....	4	38	
			124 38
Total.....	\$218	63	

They kept that money one year and ten months, before they paid it into the Government. Here is the book to prove it. No further evidence is necessary; whether that money was taken to pay Mr. Ellis' debts, like the money borrowed from the canal employes, I cannot say, but he had the use of the money. R. D. Dunn, at page 1456, says that Mr. Ellis had the use of all such money. The money was not returned at the proper time, as is shown by comparison with Mr. Collier's books. I examined them on the first day of the investigation. That was the time when the canal officials and their counsel made their boast that they would run me—the "old woman" as they called me—out of St. Catharines in less than two days, but the "old woman" did not go. I knew what I was about, and I commenced slowly and exercised all the faculties that I had. I worked very hard and you will see by the time I get through, that I worked against great odds: I was handicapped from the start. Charles Smilie, ship carpenter, says, at page 1022, that he paid \$38 for the use of the pontoon to take the engine out of a propeller, the money being stopped by Mr. Murray, by order of the canal office. This money was not accounted for; where has it gone? I never could find an account of it in the public accounts. It never was paid. I may surmise where it went, but I cannot tell.

It being near six o'clock, Mr. McCallum asked that the question be adjourned until