

their best judgment,
the very convenience,
regularly and especially
the management
of many of them by
you, sir, have nothing
nothing to do, many
passed over in perfect
it was the drift of the

enquiry was to know all
out noticed, from the
part of the person
the management of the
t Mr. Page, the very
opinion about such
or not the canal was
It was within his
experience, of whom we
ers, who could have

Not one of them
out, on the contrary,
ed, from persons who
not at all conversant
entry had a right to
obscure; you had a
like Mr. Shady and
not called upon, nor
of a purely personal

investigation—that all
character, dating back
a single enquiry has
the enquiry has been
our years; but, I say,
the management of
the Senator were here
ish to say anything
any person, if I could
bottom of this matter,
which was referred
instructions—

mission for investi-
ter, that, underlying
st Mr. Denare partic-

I shall run through these charges as hurriedly as I can. I propose to strike at
the very foundation of this charge, and show you how little Mr. McCallum was
justified in making the accusations he made against Mr. Ellis in the Senate. In his
speech in the Senate, referring to the object of this enquiry, Mr. McCallum says:

"What has led me to make this enquiry at all is this: a year ago last January a
young man named William Mossip, an acquaintance, came to my house, and I
asked him what he was doing. He said that he was out of employment just then
that he was living on section number one, on the Welland Canal. I wrote a
friendly letter to Mr. Ellis, Superintendent of the Canal, asking him if he would
give this man continuous employment, as he had a large family to support. I
have not got a copy of that letter. Mr. Ellis wrote me, in reply, the following
letter, dated 14th January, 1888, giving me the reasons why he could not employ
this man." And the letter was put in, and will appear in the speech Mr.
McCallum made, published in the Senate reports of that date. Mr. Ellis then gives
his reasons why he could not employ him, and, among the rest, he says, "It is
simply that his ill-temper and general bearing towards his boss has been so
vicious that at last it became unbearable and intolerable. He has been trained,
and become thoroughly acquainted with the work, and we are anxious to keep
him; and although he has received several warnings of dismissal, they have proved
unavailing."

I say the whole foundation of this enquiry arises from the fact that Mr. Ellis
would not employ, and keep in his employment, a man named Mossip, whom Mr.
Mr. McCallum says is a young man of good reputation and character, and such a
person as should be employed. It does seem to me that Mr. McCallum must have
been satisfied, if any person could be satisfied, before he closed his enquiry, that Mr.
Mossip was not a man of such a character and reputation as any government could
employ. Just let me point out here that there have been called upon Mr. McCallum's
behalf twenty witnesses, to testify as to the character of Mr. Mossip. There are
eight of these who have sworn that he was an agreeable man to work with, but five
out of the eight have sworn that his reputation for being of a quarrelsome disposi-
tion was well-known throughout the village of Port Dalhousie, where he resided.
The other twelve witnesses have unhesitatingly sworn that he was of a quarrelsome
disposition, that he used obscene, violent and profane language, and several of them
would not work with him under any circumstances; but the general consensus of
opinion expressed by these persons is that Mr. Mossip was a disagreeable and quar-
relsome man. That is all referred to in the different pages of the evidence, to which
it is hardly necessary for me to direct your attention; but you will find them com-
mencing at page 68, and extending away down to page 1900, and so on. So that
you will have observed that, during the conduct of this enquiry, a large number of
witnesses called by Mr. McCallum himself have, not only upon the examination-in-
chief, but upon cross examination, admitted that he was a man totally unworthy
of being associated with, particularly as a working man. The few people who speak
in his favor only speak from their knowledge of him gained by working with him
from two to three weeks in the course of three or four years; the longest time any
witness said he worked with him was something like two or three weeks in the
course of three or four years. As far as the prosecution is concerned, they have
entirely failed to make out any proof that Mr. Mossip was a man worthy, either of
credibility, or a man worthy of being employed upon the canal. Take the evidence