

out which they got quite improperly as profits by the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, and we have \$16,303,891. Even then the roads did not serve their purpose. The idea of these roads was to open up the Saskatchewan valley. Hon. gentlemen opposite suggest the same idea with regard to northern Ontario. They say it will serve the purpose better if lines of railway should run from the south to the north, on the same principle as in this case. The result was that the Saskatchewan valley was only tapped in two places, and there has been practically no development, and will not be until a lateral line is built from east to west in that country. Before the Prince Albert line was built, I am informed, the town of Prince Albert went to the expense of sending three delegates to Ottawa to protest against action which was bound to result in blocking the extension of the Manitoba and North-western, which was projected from Portage la Prairie, in a north-westerly direction to the town of Prince Albert. Their prayer was not listened to. The government spoke the word to the then Conservative member for Saskatchewan, and he informed the delegates that their mission was useless, and they went back home. The result was that the lines were built from Regina to Prince Albert and from Calgary to Edmonton for the purpose of opening up the Saskatchewan valley, and the Manitoba and the North-western was hung up for years, and was never extended until this year. It was built to Yorkton at that time, and it has remained at Yorkton until last year.

Mr. CLANCY. What has all this to do with the merits of the two propositions now before the House?

Mr. SCOTT. Is it not perfectly fair, Mr. Speaker, that in considering this proposition we should compare it with the legislation placed upon the Statute-books of this country in years gone by by the Conservative government? Now, as I pointed out, on these two little deals, these two little railways, comprising about 550 miles, somebody was allowed to get away improperly with \$16,303,891. I am reminded that my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), one evening since the commencement of this session, expressed some curiosity to see that individual who is frequently termed a grafter. My hon. friend from West Elgin will remember that one evening here he read a letter from some one in Vancouver, I think, and said he would like to see one of these individuals spoken of as grafters. It seems to me that if we could put our finger on the gentleman who got away with these \$16,000,000 we would find a grafter under our finger. Now, I would advise my hon. friend from West Elgin to cast his eye down to the seat just four rows in front of him, to the seat of the hon. junior member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and he will see -- or he would see, because the seat is vacant

at the present moment—he would see, if the seat was filled by its member, one of these grafters who, by himself and his associates, got away with this sum of \$16,000,000 odd dollars.

Mr. KEMP. I rise to a point of order. Is it in order for an hon. gentleman to call another hon. gentleman in this House a grafter?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, before you give your ruling, I make haste to withdraw the appellation, and I leave it to my hon. friend to apply the term that he thinks will best suit any man who, with his associates in the railway business, manages to get away with a matter of \$16,000,000.

Mr. BARKER. Quite apart from the rules of the House, it strikes me that, instead of insinuating charges that are very grave indeed if true, the hon. member should come out straight and fair and charge my hon. friend from West Toronto with what he insinuates.

Mr. SCOTT. I cannot imagine that there is any ambiguity in my words. I have stated here that somebody, some persons in this country, got into their pockets, through Conservative railway legislation, a matter of \$16,303,891, which would not have got into their pockets under proper legislation.

Mr. BARKER. What has that to do with the particular gentleman he picked out? He might as well refer to me or any other gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. I will make a further statement, and make it upon my responsibility, that the hon. member for West Toronto—I do not want to make any mistake, I will name him—Mr. Osler, is one of the gentlemen who is implicated in this matter. I do not blame him at all. Individuals in this country are not expected to work for their health. When they go into railway enterprises they are going to make all the money they can out of them. I am not throwing any aspersion upon the hon. member for West Toronto; but I am calling to the attention of this parliament and the people of this country the kind of legislation that the Conservative party put through when they were in power, and the kind of legislation which enabled their friends to get away with an amount of money like this. They were perfectly right to take the money when they got the opportunity. But I am pleased to say that in the legislation brought down by the Liberal government no person is going to have an opportunity to make away illegally or improperly with any amount of money, or legally and properly with any illegitimate amounts of money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I am exceeding the time which I had allotted myself. But these are two notorious deals that I have mentioned, and I venture to say