

in reference to the management and expenses of the Welland Canal, the number of days employed, the number of adjournments, the amount allowed per day as salary, also for board, travelling and other expenses. Also for any amounts for time and expenses in connection with the Murray and Trent Valley Canals, since the last report was furnished to this House last Session.

He said: It will be recollected, I think, by all those who were in the House last Session and the Session before, that each Session I moved for a statement of the expenses incurred by the Government in reference to A. F. Wood Esq., in connection with the Murray and Trent Canals. The first return came down so late that I was not able to see it; the second return came down in time. I made my comments on it then, and showed as far as I could show that there was too much paid for the services professed to be given by Mr. Wood, especially in reference to board—that in the places where this gentleman went to attend to this business, the public houses charged from \$1 to \$1.50 a day; and none charged more than \$2.00, but it seems to have had no effect, and my object is to see if something cannot be done to lessen the expense, as well as to show that Mr. Wood is not a fit and proper man for the position which he held. In reference to that I will say nothing further, but I was led, after he was appointed commissioner for the investigation of the matters connected with the Welland Canal on the charges made by the hon. gentleman from Monk, and after hearing the hon. gentleman's remarks upon it, and seeing no report, except the one that was in the *Empire*, and which was not signed and which was never, I believe, laid upon the table of this House, to again ask the privilege of allowing the House to have a statement of the amount of the expenses in connection with that investigation. That commissioner should never have been appointed. I am surprised at my hon. friend, the leader of the Government, as well as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, knowing that gentleman's actions heretofore, having consented to placing him in such a responsible position. Some years ago—I am obliged to make this statement to show the reason for the course I am taking—Mr. Wood was removed, from some cause or other, from the post office at Madoc, and, at the same time, he had been guilty of issuing marriage certificates and taking

pay for those marriage certificates, without license. The fee at that time was \$6 for the license, \$4 of which went to the Government and \$2 to the issuer of the license. It was stated that 42 of these certificates were given, all of which were illegal and which would, of course, leave upon the children, the issue of those marriages, the stamp of illegitimacy. It was brought to public notice at last by Mr. and Mrs. Walbridge of Belleville and they were bound to prosecute Mr. Wood. Sitting on this Chair alongside of me in this Chamber Mr. Wood asked my advice as to what he had better do in view of the prosecution. He did not admit that 42 certificates had been issued, but he admitted that he had issued certificates without license and that marriages had taken place under them, which were no marriages at all, and he wanted to know what he would do. He told me he thought that the best thing he could do was to go home and throw up his wardenship and reeveship and leave the country. I advised him not to do so, because I thought it was a political persecution—not because I agreed with Mr. Wood politically, but because I believed he was persecuted. These facts were known to the Premier of the country. They were well known to the Minister of Customs, and it did strike me that after what I stated last Session and the Session before, it was time that those gentlemen should be stopped from giving this man such a position as he has held. What has he done? I see from the *Belleville Intelligencer* that a certain member of the House of Commons has stated that Mr. Wood was paid for 190 days at \$10 a day, besides expenses, amounting in all to \$3,056.36, or at the rate of \$15.67 per day.

Now, if this is true—I do not say it is true—that that gentleman took 190 days pay for attending to that matter, it strikes me there is something wrong about it. At all events, after hearing the first report of Mr. Wood, and comparing it with what was published in the papers as a second report, I am satisfied that he was not the proper person to send to make that investigation. I am satisfied that every attempt was made on his part to cover up the faults of those whose conduct was being investigated. It is evident that if Mr. Moylan, in his report, reflected upon the hon. member for New Westminster, Mr. Wood has, in his report reflected more