

HON. MR. McCALLUM—I do not know; I guess he charges pretty high.

“An active qualified clerk, directly responsible to the superintendent (and whose duty it should be to look after him) would be far more efficient.”

Not one in whose books the red figures are in mourning to cover up railway fares for which the people of this country pay \$205, while the actual cost was only \$32:

“A better system of checks for ‘time’ and ‘supplies’ is necessary, and should extend to ‘livery service,’ railroad fares—in fact, to every branch of the canal service, and there should be some person responsible to see that it is properly performed.

“As the present system is carried out, the superintendent has undertaken at various times expensive works, such as the post office, Custom house and dock at Port Colborne, and large bridges, such as ‘Dishers’ and ‘Shiners’ without authority from the Department, and without consulting the Chief Engineer. I am satisfied from enquiry that it was never intended to put the superintendent of the Welland canal in the position of an administrative officer. Clearly his duties are executive, and should be confined to them.

“The present system seems to have grown up from the necessity of an increased force during the construction of the new canal—repairs and construction running close together, and not since reduced.”

I do not see why it should. It did not grow from that at all, because the construction of the canal was carried on under contract, independent of the management of the canal altogether. The commissioner is wrong there, as he is in a good many instances. He is mistaken more than half of the time:

“In brief, I think the superintendent should resume the duties appertaining to that office, coming personally in contact two or three times per week with the men and work, at least (for which he has an allowance now of \$300), and confine himself strictly to the duties of that office.

“Reduce the number of overseers to three on the new canal and one on the old canal. If necessary, make a deputy of one of the three on the new canal to assist (not to take the place of) the superintendent. Have the overseer at each end of the canal discharge the duties of harbor-masters, whose office should be abolished.”

Mark the contrast! He said before that one superintendent is enough for the canal, but here he recommends a deputy. There are plenty of lock-tenders on the canal that know more than Mr. Ellis does, though he is managing the canal, and this man took advantage of it. He was “skilful and energetic” for his own interest, and, of course, assumed more than he should in the management of the work. The commissioner comes to this conclusion, how I do not know, except that he had a pleasure trip through the Welland

Canal, and had this man Demare to be his guide and attendant. The report continues:

“Reduce the staff of foremen; have only active and efficient men in such positions. Abolish the storekeeper’s office; introduce a better system of checks and extend it to the whole service. In fact, have a live system of internal management, embracing the spirit of the changes I have indicated, and I am prepared to say there will be, not only a direct saving of from \$8,000 to \$10,000 annually, and an indirect saving equally as large, but the service will be more effective in the public interest.”

Now, what did I say the other day? I said that with proper management on the Welland Canal the country could save \$12,000 a year in expenditure, and could save as much more that is now lost through mismanagement, making in all \$24,000. The commissioner and I almost agree on that. He says that the saving would be from \$16,000 to \$20,000; I say it would be from \$20,000 to \$24,000; and I claim that I know as much as the commissioner does about the Welland Canal:

“An unnecessary multiplicity of offices always has a tendency to weaken any service, and on the Welland Canal such is the result beyond a doubt.

“A superintendent, to be effective, must feel the pulse of the work over which he is an overseer, by continually coming in contact with the men and work. On the Welland Canal there will be plenty to occupy his time and attention if he discharges his duties faithfully, without meddling with what belongs to another branch of the service.

“While the present general management meets, as I have before stated, the demands of shippers and commercial men so far as the transit of goods and vessels are concerned, at the same time there can be no doubt in my opinion but that it is accomplished at too much expense and unnecessary waste of time and labor.

“The Chief Engineer and Deputy Minister of Canals are men of large experience, and I respectfully submit these suggestions for re-organization for your consideration, with a proper deference to their judgment, but fully impressed with the importance of changes in the present management.”

It is true that Mr. Wood has not signed this report, but how does it come to get to the press before being submitted to this House? Who gave it to the *Empire*? Was it Mr. Wood or the Department? I do not want to quarrel with the newspapers, but they appear to have a knowledge about these things sooner than Parliament. On the occasion of the first report, in fact the day that the commissioner gave it in, the *Empire* contained the following:—

“Mr. A. F. Wood, M.P.P., was here to-day, handing in his report on the recent Welland Canal investigation. It is understood that the result of the enquiry exonerates Mr. Ellis from the charges preferred against him.”