

HON. MR. PERLEY—And we hope he will lead it many more years.

HON. MR. McCALLUM— I hope that his conduct will be such in the management of the affairs of this country, that I shall be able to follow him. The right hon. gentleman made a reply the other day to a question in reference to this report, and I cannot do better than to read it to the House. I find the following in the Commons *Hansard*:—

“MR. MULOCK—There is another matter in regard to canals to which I wish to call attention. During last summer, the public were greatly shocked by an investigation going on with regard to certain matters connected with the management of the Welland Canal, and we have learned in our part of the country, with very great pain, the report of a strife between an hon. member of the Senate, and, I think, to some extent, the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert, in regard to the management of the canal. The Senator in question charged some of the officials, if I remember the evidence aright, with profiting with their position, with using some of the public servants for their own advantage, with obtaining material for their own benefit, and so on. I think the Government should lay the report of the Commission on the Table, that we may have an opportunity of seeing if there is anything in these accusations.

“SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD—There were some charges brought against the superintendent of the Welland Canal, Mr. Ellis, by an hon. gentleman of the other House. These charges were made in his place in the Senate, and he gave specific statements as to certain shortcomings of the local superintendent, and the Government granted a Commission to investigate that. A gentleman was appointed for the purpose, whose report, I think, has been laid on the Table of the House.

“MR. FERGUSON (Welland)—Yes; weeks ago.

“SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD—The report speaks for itself. There have been some irregularities, but the integrity of the officers has been maintained by the report of the Commission.”

Did the right hon. gentleman read the report? He says that it speaks for itself. Let us see what it says and what sustains the integrity of the officials on the Welland Canal. He does not say himself that the integrity of the officials has been sustained, but that it has been sustained by the report. Now the commissioner's report is before Parliament, and you have heard from the hon. gentleman from Belleville (Mr. Flint) the sort of man the commissioner is. I have no reason to doubt—on the contrary, I believe implicitly every word that the hon. gentleman said on that subject. I may go a little further and say that if the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and the Minister of Customs, knew the character of Mr. Wood, they could only have sent him on such a mission on the theory suggested by my hon. friend from Belle-

ville—of sending a rogue to catch a rogue. Now let us look at the report and see whether it sustains the integrity of those who are managing the Welland Canal. If it does, I am satisfied, because I have no feeling in the matter except a desire to see this great public work properly managed. The report says that twenty—even employés on the Welland Canal were working for Mr. Ellis, the superintendent; that, of these, Mr. Ellis paid ten—now, who paid the other seventeen? The evidence will show that the Government of this country paid the other seventeen. The commissioner admits that the officials did wrong, but he says that they did not mean to do it. Now, if in taking money out of a man's pocket I get caught, it is a poor excuse for my conduct to say: “Oh, I did not mean to do it.” The rest of the report is a good deal of that character. The services that Mr. Ellis had from these people, for which the Government had to pay, cost the country various sums, from one dollar to one thousand dollars each. How, therefore, can my leader say that the integrity of the officials was maintained, when, as I have shown, the money of this country has been taken by Mr. Ellis for his own use and squandered? I have, on another occasion, referred to the manner in which the public money was paid to Mr. Miller for work done by Government employés. One of these cases was that of the work done on Mr. Demare's house. Mr. Wood was so anxious to cover up the shortcomings of Mr. Ellis that he says that this is all explained by the evidence. Let us see how far it is explained. The commissioner says that Mr. Miller put in a certificate from the Government showing that he charged himself \$89.50, and he makes that do duty to try to cover up this corrupt job, though the item refers to another work altogether which was done two years afterwards—work done on John Reid's house, which was occupied by Roger Miller himself. He sent the Government men to work on it, whether it was a judicious thing to do or not, but he allowed the Government so much for that work, because the Auditor General's Report shows that. The commissioner must certainly have thought that the people of this country were asleep, if he supposed that he could cover up the shortcomings of these people in that way. Now, here