

I said then to be correct. Mr. Demare goes to a lock-tender, James Bradley, and requests him to make a false report against a brother lock-tender, George Millward, on the same lock, and gives as a reason that he wants to put him, Millward, off the canal—that he wants to get rid of him. Lock-tender Bradley's evidence stands unimpeached in every respect. Mr. Demare swears that he did not do so, but his evidence is discredited, and I consider cannot have any force. What do we find to have taken place shortly afterwards. We find that this Lock-tender Bradley was dismissed on some trifling charge which he refuted, but he did not get placed back on the lock, so Mr. Bradley got dismissed because he refused to make a false report about Lock-tender Millward. Bradley warned Millward and put him on his guard. This man Demare pays money to himself that should be paid to the credit of the country—from the schooner "Leighton" \$10, from the barge "Hall" \$10, and money collected from Smilie and Kelly for use of the pontoon by Capt. Murray, \$38. According to C. Smilie's evidence, the men at Port Dalhousie must get well paid for anything in the shape of work. Did this money, the \$38 collected from Smilie and Kelly, go to pay for the cement and stone for the band hall at Port Dalhousie? The \$38 is not accounted for. Messrs. Murray and Cleveland collected the money, and the evidence shows that Mr. Demare got the material for the band hall from them. The evidence taken at the investigation proves much more than I charged last Session, and shows a state of affairs that should not exist in the management of a great public work. I wish hon. gentlemen to read the evidence and deal out the punishment by the dismissal of these men from the Government employment—what I expected to be done under the circumstances. We cannot expect to get the money back that has been wasted by those managing the Welland Canal, but we can dismiss from the service those found and proven guilty by the evidence. Last Session the leader of the House, Mr. Abbott, promised that there should be an immediate and searching investigation. An investigation has taken place; but, as I have shown, it was not searching or thorough; but enough has been proved to justify the Government in promptly dis-

missing from the public service the men who have been mismanaging the Welland Canal. I beg to inquire, therefore, what action the Government intend to take on the evidence taken before A. F. Wood, Esq., Commissioner, as to the conduct of the officials on the Welland Canal in the management of that important work.

HON. MR. LACOSTE—In answer to the inquiry made by the hon. gentleman, I have the honor to state that Mr. Wood's report has been received but recently, and has not yet reached the Privy Council.

SAULT STE. MARIE RAILWAY CO'S BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. MR. READ moved the second reading of Bill (27) "An Act to incorporate the Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company." He said: This Bill asks for authority to build a railway from Sault Ste. Marie to Hudson's Bay, with power also to issue debentures or bonds to a certain amount.

HON. MR. POWER—I am surprised to hear my hon. friend from Quinté asking the House to endorse the principle of this Bill. Do I understand that this railway is to run to Hudson's Bay or to James' Bay?

HON. MR. READ—It says Hudson's Bay in the title, but it says James' Bay in the Bill.

HON. MR. POWER—That makes the matter rather worse.

HON. MR. READ—It is called the Sault Ste. Marie and Hudson's Bay Railway; but it is to construct a railway from Sault Ste. Marie to Moose Factory, on James' Bay.

HON. MR. POWER—Every one who knows anything about that part of the country is aware of the fact that James' Bay is not navigable for vessels of any size, and that it freezes over in the winter, and I really do not think it is right for this House to endorse the principle of such a Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.