

to matters that even upon the simple ground of expense it would be preposterous for any government to consent to enquire into, and that enquiry I believe—and I speak for a large number of people, my own connections and others—would be utterly distasteful to them, and they would regard it as wholly unnecessary. I beg to be excused intruding a word upon this House. It is not at all necessary that I should say anything. I would not be presumptuous enough to say one word in respect to the standing and high character of the hon. gentlemen who have been assailed, but there was one little point that struck me as—I can scarcely select language sufficiently strong to characterize it—it struck me as utterly uncalled for. My hon. friend from Toronto was sneered at because he was president of a Bible society. Well that hon. gentleman is in a position to distribute books, blessed books, that teach much that I think the hon. gentleman from Woodstock would improve by studying; it would amongst other things teach him that charity that thinketh no evil, that vaunteth not itself, neither is puffed up.

HON. MR. ALLAN—I had not intended to say anything on this occasion at all, because I should best consult the dignity of this House and my own self-respect by refraining from making any remarks in reply to the hon. gentleman behind me, but towards the end of his speech he intimated that if he could not make those slanderous charges here he would make them through the press of the country, and I presume he will also have his speech published in the official reports of the Debates of this House, and I should regret if my silence, my not replying to him, should be construed as an admission of any of the charges and insinuations he has uttered to-day. I take this opportunity for that reason, to give them the fullest contradiction, in order that my contradiction may be recorded in the official report. The hon. gentleman has referred in still more gross language to-day than that which he used on a previous occasion to my connection with the bank. I hold in my hand a copy of the *Globe* of June 1865, containing a report of the annual meeting of the shareholders, at which there was an unusually large attendance and at which the

hon. gentleman, who was then a director, was present, when a very full and exhaustive statement of the affairs of the bank was given by the then cashier, Mr. Robert Cassels. In the course of that statement Mr. Cassels said, although it was contrary to the bank charter to make public, or to tell anything about any man's private account, yet he had my permission, and I had requested him to state how my account at that time stood. He said that that account had been reduced \$15,500 since I had been president, and that it was continuing to be reduced by payments every three months with interest, until the time the bank stopped: that it was at that time reduced to \$25,000, and it was upon that amount the trustees offered to settle for \$12,500. I wish to say with regard to those trustees that while I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that it is unnecessary to defend the character of one gentleman who was referred to here to-day, Mr. Charles Campbell, because I think that they will see that he has been attacked simply because he happens to be the brother of the Minister of Justice, at the same time I cannot help protesting against the insinuations which have been thrown out as to the integrity of two men well known in Toronto, now passed away, the late Mr. Peleg Howland and the late Mr. Peter Patterson. They were both known in Toronto as men of perfect uprightness and integrity, and therefore I desire to take this opportunity of protesting against the insinuations which have been thrown out against them, as if they were in collusion with me for a settlement of the debt. I also desire to say further that Mr. Clarke Gamble, who was solicitor for the Bank of Upper Canada, under whose charge the hon. gentleman says the books were, had nothing to do with them. Those books were in the hands of trustees. I myself never saw, and never had anything to do with them from the time the bank failed down to the present moment. I may say also, so far as Mr. Gamble himself is concerned, that he had nothing whatever to do with the settlement of my debt. I make those statements because I should be sorry if any wrong impression should be created by the hon. gentleman's reckless insinuations.