

such a poverty stricken condition that it could not pay \$175 if that was due? At the present time I am told by the gentleman who is administering it that there are thousands of dollars still outstanding that can be collected at any time. I will not refer to the insulting tone the hon. gentleman has adopted; but I can assure him that the people of the North-west know him, and when this thing comes to be fairly sifted, they will find that a member of parliament, and a friend of a government for seventeen years in power, one who had the confidence of the political leaders and their personal friendship, in regard to him it cannot be found that he ever benefited himself in one iota. I am able to say here and to defy contradiction that during all those years I never spoke to a minister or a deputy minister of my own motion, and never but once, at the instance of another, and that about the veriest trifle of any matter in which I was personally interested. And now, one of these clever fellows finds that for the sake of \$175 I boodled; they have taken the language of a man that I will not characterize, but it will be shown by and by what kind of a word he has. They have taken his ribald utterances, which he withdrew and apologized for when he was about to be placed on his trial; they have taken the ribald misstatements of that man as statements of fact, and an hon. gentleman gets up in this House and moves to have a reference to the Public Accounts Committee to make inquiry of that sort, in face of the opinion of Mr. Rimmer, the law officer, that the money was not due Mr. Scott. I will not refer to what has taken place in the committee at the present time; but I have done here what I did in the committee, I have taken the first opportunity of letting the public know what the facts are. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has quoted a statement, which of course is a misstatement, that the lieutenant-governor denied that he sent for me. The lieutenant-governor said frankly that he did not remember, and he said he might have sent for me. It was very necessary that I should take the first opportunity of bringing all the amount of fact that I can bring without infringing on the rules of the House.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman has taken exception to the language that I used in discussing this question. I do not think I said anything that is not parliamentary. The hon. gentleman takes exception to my making a statement on the word of Mr. Walter Scott. I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that Mr. Walter Scott last winter published a letter in his newspaper that was scattered all over the North-west Territories and the Dominion of Canada, an open letter to the hon. gentleman. I have it here under my hand, and it is very nice reading. Now, when a letter of that kind is scattered all over this country

Mr. DAVIS.

accusing a member of this House of boodling, and when the member takes no steps to contradict this party who signs his name to this letter, and to drag him over the coals before a court of law, I think any gentleman in this House is justified in taking Mr. Scott's statement. Here is the letter, several columns long, published on the 9th of November, 1899, and from that time to the present the hon. gentleman never took occasion to contradict that letter. Now he complains that I have moved a resolution to have this account referred to the Public Accounts Committee. I think I have a perfect right to do so as a member for the North-west Territories when a letter of that kind is published. I do not want to inflict the reading of this long letter on the committee, but it sets forth the agreements between the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, as managing director of that company, and Mr. Scott. The hon. gentleman cannot deny that he is openly accused of boodling.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the hon. gentleman read that?

Mr. DAVIS. Do you want me to read the whole letter?

Mr. DAVIS. Read where he says that he accused me of boodling.

Mr. DAVIS. I will just read the paragraph in which he uses this strong language:

I am, therefore, driven to the necessity of repeating former tactics, and to again allege against you that in or about the month of April, 1895, you did, as managing director of the 'Leader' Company (Limited), obtain payment of the sum of \$400 of public money of Canada to the said company for alleged advertising for immigration purposes in connection with the Territorial Exhibition, which said advertising had not been done nor such service rendered; and you further allege that on the 12th day of September, 1894, you did, as managing director of above-named company, by representing that the work was done, procure payment to the company of \$175 of public money of Canada, for alleged printing of the law reports of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories, when, in truth, the work was not done. I allege further that you nor your company never did the work, and unless you have recouped the public treasury within recent months, which I doubt, you still retain that \$175 of the public money of Canada. Common people might think that these payments savored of boodling. I myself have to admit that they bear a suspicious approximateness to that offensive term. Yet I would not go the length of calling you a boodler—it is a very indelicate appellation.

That is pretty strong language, I think. Now, when a letter of that kind has been scattered all over this country and the hon. gentleman accused takes no steps to contradict it from the 9th of November last down to the 1st of March, I think I was perfectly justified in bringing this account before the Public Accounts Committee. Here is a member of this House accused by a newspaper editor, over his signature, of having taken \$175 in one instance of the