

of different ones who have been employed upon the canal, and those who have been called by Mr. McCallum, some twelve of them have sworn, beyond all question, that he is a man totally unfit to be associated with, and a man using such violent language that it was utterly impossible for a person to work satisfactorily with him. The first person who spoke strongly upon that point was Mr. Duggetty, who, at page 309, says: "I have worked with pleasant men. He was not a very pleasant man to work with. And at page 310 he said, "I mean by his rough language, cursing and swearing where there was no necessity for it." Then again, at page 311, he says, "he saunts a great deal at times."

That, sir, is one of a few samples of the evidence which we have before us. So I have no hesitation in saying that you must come to the conclusion from the evidence that Mr. Mossip was a man totally unworthy of the confidence of Mr. Ellis and his deputy superintendents, and a man whom it was not safe to have working with other employees, that he was continually breeding discord among the men, continually trying to effect strikes, inducing men to believe they were not sufficiently remunerated by the Government, and, therefore, causing insubordination against the management, which you, as a man employing labor, will know is the most dangerous thing it is possible to have. You may take the evidence of old Mr. Muir, Alexander Muir, a gentleman well known in this constituency, living in Port Dillonsie for 40 or 50 years, an employer of labor, he says he would not have any such man at all. Then you may take Mr. Harvey Neelon, a gentleman also employing labor: he says "I do not want to employ such a man." You may follow it on, and take the different men who have been called, and who have employed him: they all say, and bear testimony universally to the fact, that he is not a proper man to be employed on the canal. Then we have Captain Larkin, a gentleman also well-known in this county: he says he is a man he would not have at all.

Now, there was one thing which struck me, which I thought was very unfair on the part of Mr. McCallum: that was an attempt upon his part to fasten upon Mr. Demare the stigma that he had been guilty of using language about Sir John Macdonald, which, if he were guilty of using, was totally unworthy of him. But when we come to examine what are the words used upon that occasion, as alleged to have been used by Mr. Demare, according to Mr. Mossip's story, that he was a dirty son of a bitch: we have the universal testimony of every witness that that is his common expression: every man that has been sworn, who has given testimony with regard to him, says that is his common expression, "you are a dirty son of a bitch." Now, Mr. Demare has met it fairly and squarely; he denies it positively; says it is no such thing. He says, "I have never taken part in an election," and I can personally bear testimony to that myself. He has always tried to act impartially, and to serve his employers to the best of his judgment, and I think you will come to that conclusion when you make your report. But that this Mossip was deliberately telling what is not true in that statement admits of no doubt. We do not rely alone upon Demare; we have George W. Read, a gentleman well-known in the community, of established reputation, a man of honesty and integrity. He says Mossip told him distinctly he never heard Demare make that observation, but that he had heard that Demare had said so.

Now, there is a witness, who voluntarily wrote me a letter as soon as he heard Mr. Mossip's testimony, and I also questioned Mr. Mossip upon the point. So that

you
and
unw
sta
able
confi
delib
creat
who
Gove
matte
case,
out of
a man
his c
Mossi
Daly,
emplo
great
of thi
if eve
fact th
Mr. D
which
of tha
little
"drun
"discl
"not c
"that
a little
who ha
the ma
work,
testimo
state th
the res
other n
good cl
thing a
efficient
never s
Demare
that he
think y
is conce
in comp