

was paid \$4, and that the bill was \$18 for the use of the armor. There is no return of the \$8, and Mr. Demare must have paid that money to himself, because there is nothing said about it. This man Smilie must have given truthful evidence, because the counsel for the canal officials did not ask him one single question in the cross-examination. Why? Because he was afraid to ask him. He said he would call him some other day. I did not quite get through with Mr. Smilie, but Mr. Rykert thought he was not a good witness for his side, so he was not recalled. At page 667 Smilie says that he was receiving pay from the Government and from outside parties at the same time—at least, when he was working for outside parties and receiving pay from them he was getting pay from the Government also. At page 677 he says he worked on the schooner "J. P. Beals," and that Mr. Demare paid him. Mr. Demare, he says, ordered him to do this work and was always his boss or foreman. He says, on page 678, that he worked on the barge "Tecumseh." Mr. Demare, at page 2221, says he collected no money from the schooners "J. P. Beals," "Haskell," "Leadville," "Norwood," "Tecumseh," "F. J. King" or "James R. Benson." In none of these cases did the country get any money for the use of the diving armor, and Mr. Demare swears that he collected nothing. Can you credit the evidence of Mr. Demare after what he swore about the farming land? Can you believe his evidence and refuse to credit other witnesses who swore to the contrary? This man Demare was, I think, twelve or fifteen times on the witness stand, and I refer to the fact in order that you may judge of his credibility. If you find one man contradicted by three others who are his own friends you would be inclined to believe the majority of the witnesses. As far as the Superintendent of the canal is concerned, he was discredited by documentary evidence that he cannot get over, as well as by his own testimony. In the case of the farming lands, Mr. Demare denied that he got any share of the crops grown on the canal lands, but he is contradicted by McGrath, Moriarty and Brownlee, who swore that they gave him a share of the crop. In this House last year, in speaking of this Demare, I ventured the assertion that

he was getting pickings. Well, it appears from the evidence that my charge was well founded. If I had been a prophet I could not have come nearer it.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)—What do you mean by pickings?

HON. MR. McCALLUM—Anything that you can catch—anything that you can get, honestly if possibly, or get anyhow. I now come to the evidence of William Mossop, a man that I shall have occasion to say a good deal about before I get through, and who is dealt with in a very harsh manner in the pamphlet circulated by Mr. Rykert. A determined effort has been made to destroy his character—and why? Because I wrote a letter to Mr. Ellis asking him to give Mossop continuous employment, and now they blame Mossop for having brought about this canal investigation. They say I have a spite against them because they refused to give Mossop employment. Mossop is no more to me than any other poor man who is trying to earn a living for his family. I hope I shall always be ready to assist any poor man to get employment; when I wrote that letter that was the only object I had in view. My only feeling in this matter is that the country should have full value for the money that it expends on the Welland Canal and that the canal should be managed properly. At page 965 William Mossop says that the steam pump was at the rubber factory four or five days. He took the scow "Sir John" to Thorold for a load of stone for the rubber factory. The stone went through the canal as Government stone and there was no let pass. He says Mr. Demare ordered him to do this, and that Mr. Ridgeway paid him for his work on the scow "Sir John." He says also that he worked on the pontoon, to which I have already referred, for Mr. Miller four or five days and got his pay as if he had been working for the Government. Mossop further swears, at page 975, that he brought the scow "Mud Hen" from Battle's quarry, with a load of stone for Richard Hutton, lock tender; that the scow was occupied for about three days on this job and that he got orders from Demare to do so. I did not offer any evidence on this point as to who paid for the stone and cement. I think it was the duty of the men who defended the canal officials to show that the Government did