

supposed to be, when it was open to the whole world. No advantage could have been gained by any one individual, and we have the absolute testimony of Mr. Mackenzie that he never communicated the information to any individual soul. Is the Premier going to be contrasted with a couple of land jobbers? Clark says Savigny was present at the alleged conversation with Davidson; Savigny swears he was alone and got it confidentially—that Clark was not present at all—so I practically broke down those two witnesses. The whole gist of the charge is that Oliver, Davidson & Co., were friends of the Government, and that the Government located the terminus at Fort William for their benefit. What is the fact? Oliver, Davidson & Co. invested \$100,000 in a mill at the mouth of the Kamistiquia River in 1872. I believe Mr. Brown's law partner is a Conservative and Chairman of the Conservative Club in London. He had an equal interest with Mr. Brown in his share. Oliver, Davidson & Co. invested money as any other firm would have a right to do. Mr. Brown swears they had a larger interest at Prince Arthur's Landing than at Fort William. They invested \$13,000 at Sault Ste Marie and bought a large quantity of land at Nipegon under the impression the terminus would be there, showing that, to their minds, at all events, that was the proper place for it. They had also bought largely on the south shore of Lake Manitoba, believing, as the hon. Senator (Mr. Girard) does, that to be the true route for the railway. They were mistaken in two or three places. I venture to say their speculation of \$13,000 at the Sault is worth very little, from what I know of it. But we have testimony which, I think, should be considered conclusive—the statement of the Premier that he did not know the owner of a single lot at Fort William. I suppose I knew as much as any member of the Government was likely to know on that point, having been Commissioner of Crown Lands, and I could not tell who was interested in land at Fort William.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—The report does not say to the contrary.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It insinuates that the Government had put the terminus

Hon. Mr. Scott.

there to serve their friends. That is what was directly charged against the Government by the hon. Senator from Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD—I said it gave them a chance.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—The hon. gentleman said the friends of the Government had benefited by the location of the terminus at Fort William.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I deny emphatically that only the friends of the Government were benefited. I do not think that we could have bought lands in any part of the country where friends of the Government would not have been benefited, because the friends of the Government are very numerous.

Hon. Gentlemen—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—At the same time friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite were benefited, but they are kept in the background, because the word "job" would not apply otherwise.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—Where the hon. Secretary of State does injustice to my hon. friend from Manitoba is in saying he charged the Government with conniving at it. He did nothing of the kind.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I ask if the Queen's English could be tortured in such a way as to point to any other conclusion? You say the terminus was located in the wrong place, and you say the friends of the Government benefited by it. The only inference that can be drawn from that is that the object in locating the terminus there was to benefit their friends. I confess, when I read that report first I was shocked, and expressed myself in a way that caused changes to be made in it, and it is not so objectionable now as when it was first presented to the Committee. I shall simply say, in conclusion, that the Premier, as the evidence shows, was practically forced to select this piece of land for the terminus. He protested against the site, in the first place, and afterwards against the amount of land that was taken. He was overruled by