

work: but he did not discharge Daly, because Demare said that the band boys wanted him to keep him on. He said he wanted Daly because the band boys wanted him. He says: "I went down on the scow, and this man dared me to discharge him. I did not discharge him, on account of what Mr. Demare had said to me." When Demare is called, he says (page 1618), that he had not the slightest recollection of saying "the band boys," but he spoke of the "boys;" but nobody should place much reliance on anything that Mr. Demare would say, who knows how his evidence as to farming lands on shares was contradicted.

To show that Mr. Demare is a pet of Ellis', Mr. Ellis recommended that the Government should pay him, Demare, \$100 extra, and he returned it in pay-lists, March, 1887. (See p. 132, Sessional Papers, 43 to 82, last Session). Mr. Ellis wishes to pay his pet on repairs, although working under Mr. Page on construction, and getting a salary of \$1,200 per year. The Government refused to pay him that. (See letter from Department, 14th April, 1887, requesting Mr. Ellis to report the facts, and instructing Mr. R. D. Dunn not to pay the \$100). He receives \$1,200, \$150 horse hire, rent free, and land farmed on shares for his benefit.

This \$300 increase he got in March, 1886; I see it in the pay-lists. There is no authority for paying him this money. I am of opinion that he is receiving it illegally to this day. If there is an Order in Council authorizing the payment I should like to see it; and if the Government have got it let them produce it. Here is this man on the Welland Canal who raises a subordinate's salary by \$300 a year, while the Prime Minister of this country cannot increase the salary of one of his clerks \$50 a year without going to Parliament for authority to do so. But Mr. Ellis says that he and he alone is responsible to the people of Canada for the management of the Welland Canal. He is like Alexander Selkirk: he is monarch of all he surveys; his right there is none to dispute, and all along the Welland Canal he thinks he can do just as he pleases. I will pass charge 14 and come now to the 15th charge. This is a very serious matter. The facts that I am about to dwell upon have been proved by the report of the

Chief Engineer, Mr. Page, which was submitted to this House last Session and can be found in the Senate *Debates* of last year. I refer particularly to the fact that the Welland Canal sustained damage to the extent of \$25,000 a year ago last January from a storm. Mr. Ellis had plenty of men and means at his disposal to prevent that loss. The Government had *prima facie* evidence of this man's incapacity and negligence. Why did they not suspend him during the investigation? I asked the Government to do so, but they thought it would be unjust to Mr. Ellis and contrary to British fair play to suspend a man with such a grave charge hanging over him. But I had made my statement publicly in Parliament, and I was responsible for it. They might have known that I would not have taken such a step without having abundant evidence to sustain me. The Government said, in their kindness of heart: "We will not suspend these men, we will give them a fair trial." Well, they have had more than a fair trial, and by the time I get through you will agree with me that sufficient evidence has been elicited to justify the Government in dismissing them from their positions on the Welland Canal. It is unnecessary to refer to the evidence on the 15th charge, you have all seen or can see the report of the Chief Engineer in the Senate *Debates* of last Session. I would refer you to Mr. Page's evidence on pages 1400 to 1427. The country has lost \$25,000 through the negligence of Mr. Ellis, who, according to Mr. Page's statement, had plenty of men and means at his disposal to prevent it.

I come now to the last charge in this list. It refers to William Mossop. This is the gentleman who is represented as being a very bad man. He has been guilty of the greatest sin he could commit in their estimation: they accuse him of giving me the information that led to the investigation. Now let us see what the men who worked with Mossop have to say as to his character. Of course Mr. Rykert brought any number of witnesses to swear away Mossop's character. They thought if they could only blacken his reputation that it would save themselves. They were under the impression that I was prosecuting the case on behalf of this man Mossop; but Mr. Mossop is nothing to me more than any