

Commissioner says so himself, and the evidence will show that every statement I made on this matter was perfectly true. When the Government were pressing him for explanations for the extra expenditure of money, and where it was expended, he wrote an explanatory letter, which I quoted in my remarks on the 10th February last, in which he said nothing about Shiner's Pond bridge, but goes over a whole year's business trying to cover this up with others. In his report the Commissioner refers to the repairs on Demare's house, which he says, "were done without instructions, by verbal contract with Roger Miller, for \$500." The Commissioner says this was explained satisfactorily by Miller, Demare and others, and adds: "I am of the opinion that the work was necessary. It was well done, and only the proper parties paid for the work performed." The Commissioner refers to Alexander Muir's evidence as giving Ellis a good character, but what does Alexander Muir say? He says that his vessels were detained on three different occasions by Mr. Ellis. Two vessels were detained in the canal with 28 men on board—detained all night, when a gallon of oil for light would have put him through. The Commissioner says nothing about that. The Commissioner further says that Cloy's evidence is "favorable to the management of the canal," though that witness swore that boats were fined for towing in the canal, when, by the circular put in by Ellis, he had no right to do it. He says: "The evidence discloses great irregularities in the return of moneys as fines and other moneys collected," and reports "the extenuating feature is an account kept of the canal. While the accounts were irregular, the Government received the full amount of sums collected." That is a mistake. The evidence shows that the Government did not receive the full amount collected—\$10 from the barge "Hall;" \$10.00 Demare paid to himself from the schooner "Leighton," \$38 for the use of pontoon and \$8 kept from the barge "Manitowoc." Referring to the Assel case he says: "I consider it not only blameable, but entirely unwarranted, but not purposely dishonest." Of course not—not purposely dishonest. This man could not do anything dishonest—not "purposely dishonest." The Commissioner's object seems to have been to cover up and cloak Ellis' dishonesty or shortcomings, from the

evidence quoted by him and his report; therefore, he could not find him purposely dishonest. Even when he was taking thousands of dollars worth of labor, for which the people paid, for his own private use, he was not acting dishonestly according to the Commissioner. He considers that when Mr. Ellis got free gas and received testimonials it was most unfortunate. He says: "Mr. Ellis cannot fairly be charged with dishonesty of intention in his management, but such a transaction throws a grave suspicion on him." Then the Commissioner points out that "Mr. Ellis clearly exceeded his duty and assumed powers never contemplated by the Department of Railways and Canals when he constructed, without authority, the Custom house, docks and bridges along the canal." The Commissioner further says that: "In doing all this, Mr. Ellis did not act for the purpose of concealment, and thought he was doing good service." If he did not do it for the purpose of concealment, why did he conceal the work done on Shiner's and Disher's bridges? And when the Government asked him to explain why he was spending so much money, he did not give them the information.

The Commissioner says, with respect to the bridges and chutes claimed to be done by private parties, and work at Riorden's pond: "It is difficult to decide how far Mr. Ellis was right or wrong in permitting such work to be done." I cannot see what difficulty there was in defining what part should be done by the Government, because the leases distinctly defined that they should be done by the lessees. But there is the same desire shown by the Commissioner to cover up all their wrongdoing. He says that, "There is a responsibility for damages caused by the storm of January, 1889," and he adds: "The evidence proves that Mr. Ellis neglected his duty, not wilfully but from a want of appreciation of its importance in this particular case." He admits Mr. Ellis neglected his duty. Whoever supposes that a man who is receiving a salary of \$2,900 a year for his services, and \$300 a year for horse-hire to take charge of an important work, would wilfully destroy that work? It simply shows how this Commissioner was put to his wits end to cover up this sink of iniquity on the Welland Canal. The Commissioner says: "It does not appear that the damage will be as large as estimated,