

the transaction. They asked him in the office how long he had worked; he said three days, which was the time he had worked. Miller went to Johnson for the money; Johnson told him the boy collected the money and did not get it; he told Johnson to go and get the money, and tell them he had done the work, or it would get him into a scrape, which he did. Miller not being on hand when he got the money he handed it to Demare. All this I explained to Mr. Rykert at the time. The answer I got from Mr. Rykert was that he was no informer. Demare wanted to know from Johnson what he would do with the money. He said, give it to Miller. Those gentlemen have got their own clerk whom Miller fetched from the West. I think we have plenty good men in our own county to fill the position.

"Yours respectfully,
"HUMPHREY JULIAN."

It only shows that the question was brought before the gentleman that was defending the canal officials before this, and that he did not take any notice of it—that he was no informer. I will now read a letter from Mr. Julian, who is an honest, respectable man, that was published in the *St. Catharines Star* while the investigation was going on:

"To the Editor of the *Star* :

"I see by your paper that Mr. Rykert has a good deal to say respecting a conversation that took place between himself, Johnson and myself. He says no such conversation took place "in his office or on the street." I agree with him there; but a certain conversation did take place in his back yard respecting Miller, not Demare. Before Mr. Rykert accuses me of saying anything that is not true he should have waited to hear my evidence, which they did not take. Neither did I expect them to take it. I told Mr. McCallum so, before being called, that my evidence would not be taken. I am prepared to swear what did take place between us, also Mr. Rykert's reply, before any magistrate.

"Yours truly,
"HUMPHREY JULIAN."

"PORT DALHOUSIE, Oct. 5, 1889."

Charge 6 is a very serious one, and you will see by the time I get through that I have proved it beyond the slightest doubt. When I first made this charge I said that the amount might be small. That letter shows that it was only \$20, but even that amount of money should not be paid without the public getting some value for it. But when I came to examine the pay-lists of the Welland Canal I found that \$817.50 had been paid to a man who never did anything for it. Thomas O'Neil, whose evidence commences at page 1131, says that Wm. Assell never worked a day with him. My statement on this case will be confirmed by the evidence of R. D. Dunn, the paymaster, and James Laurence, the clerk. The one put his name on the list as working, and the other paid him. Mr. Dunn's evidence will be found on pages 1447 to

1455, inclusive. You will see by the pay-lists that Wm. Assell is put down as working under different foremen, although for over three years and a-half he was doing no work. He was put down during this time as working under Thomas O'Neil, James Edgar, Benjamin Johnson, Wm. Cook, Nathan Morey and Cornelius Reid. Why does he appear in the pay-lists as working under all these foremen? No doubt, to hide the transaction from the Government. Mr. Ellis was paying out the public money to this man, and he was the guilty party, but he made the paymaster and the clerk by his actions parties to the fraud. Jas. Laurence, the canal clerk, says, at page 1466 of the evidence, that Wm. Assell has been paid for three years and seven months' time (or half time), and that he, Laurence, knew that he was not working at all. Mr. Laurence swears that Mr. Ellis ordered him to put Assell's name on the pay-list. You can see therefore that this man Assell has been paid at the rate of \$1.25 a day for 654 days' work that he never performed. Wm. Ellis, himself, was examined on this point. He was put on the witness stand by Mr. Rykert to try and swear himself through. He was called no less than seventeen times; and what does he say? At pages 2187 to 2193 he says that the only mistake that he made in this case was that he did not put Assell on the sick list. I pushed him further on the matter; I wanted to know who established this sick list rule on the canal, but he could not tell me. Just fancy, the manager of a great work like the Welland Canal putting a man's name on the sick list when there was no sick fund to pay him, and keeping him on the pay-lists for three years and seven months to deceive the Government. I know, as a matter of fact, having lived for many years on the Welland Canal, that there is no such thing as a sick fund recognized by the Government of this country. If there was, there should be a medical examination before a man could be appointed to office, or receive pay out of it. My opinion is that the Government of Canada has lost thousands of dollars through this putting men on the sick list. Lock-tenders and bridge-tenders have from time to time been put on what is called the "sick rule." That came out in the evidence. Some of them have been on the sick list for months—one of them, in 1887, I was told was