

strongly upon my hon. friend from Monk, and if any man that I know should be brought to the bar of the House, it is Mr. Wood himself. I am satisfied, from all the information I can obtain, that the hon. gentleman from Monk was justified in making the charges that he made in this House. I am satisfied that Mr. Wood is not a fit and proper person to hold Her Majesty's commission for anything whatever. I know, and I believe the Minister of Customs knows, that there are other things against the gentleman, which, if brought to light, would not make him look very well in the eyes of the public. He should never have been appointed, and I believe he is just the sort of man, if a good sum had been held out to him, who would make a false report or would so manage it as to cover up, as far as possible, the sins of those whose conduct he was sent to investigate. He may be fit for such work on the principle of setting a rogue to catch a rogue. My object in including the last two investigations is this: perhaps a portion of the 190 days was spent on the Trent and Murray Canals, and, if so, it should be separated from the other. It is evident that he is fattening at the public expense. It is no more than right that the Government should endeavor to employ good, faithful and true men and pay them liberally, but \$15.67 a day is a little too much for this country to be paying a commissioner. He has put down even 25 cents for stationery in one of his reports. While we are willing to do everything in our power to advance the material interests of the country by constructing railways and canals, we should be careful not to incur needless expense in connection with those who are appointed to look after them. I believe in giving them a fair allowance but not an extravagant sum. We must economize, if we are to become a great country: we must be careful of our expenditure. I would rather see \$100,000 spent on canals and railroads than \$100 spent in the way it has been done on Mr. Wood.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I have no objection to the motion.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—I will not occupy the time of the House very long about this matter.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Is it the old story?

HON. MR. McCALLUM—No, I am not going over the old story; and I will remind the hon. gentleman that I do not trouble the House with as many old stories as he does. My hon. friend from Trent gives a very bad account of Mr. Wood's conduct. I do not know that I can give a bad account of him; I was with him for some time, and except that I considered he did not admit proper evidence, I cannot say that he failed to conduct the investigation properly. The hon. gentleman gives him credit for making two reports, and says that he only saw the first one. I understood the leader of the House to say that he did not know whether the second document was a report at all. He said further that the second report was sent to the Department after the other was laid on the Table. I did not like to contradict him then, and I would not like to say that he stated what he believed was not correct at the time, but I would say to the House that that second report, from the best information that I can get, has been in the hands of the Government since the 30th January last, and the first report was laid on the Table of the House on the 3rd or 4th of March, so my hon. friend was not correctly informed on that point. The second report has not been laid on the Table of this House yet. The public have paid for it and it ought to be submitted to Parliament. My hon. friend, the leader of the House, said some time ago, "I hope my hon. friend will dismiss from his own mind, and will also assist me in removing the impression from the minds of hon. gentlemen that the Government is acting or feels in any way different from what he says it ought to feel. The Government has nothing to conceal in the matter." I stated in this House two or three different times that I could not see that the Government had anything to conceal in the matter, but if they withhold from the public certain public documents that should be laid on the Table, I must begin to suspect there is something to conceal. Why is not this second report laid on the Table? My hon. friend said the other day that this matter was under the consideration of the Government and that he would inform me what the decision was as soon as it was arrived at. It had then been under the consideration of the Government for two months and it has not been laid on the Table yet. I hope