

before the House when the member for Cardwell (Mr. Ferguson) after a fashion which was peculiar to him, carried on a running commentary on the debate in a very loud and disorderly tone, and in the course of that running commentary a controversy had arisen between the hon. member for South Brant, which considerably disturbed the propriety of debate, without, however, the Speaker calling the hon. gentleman to order. There was certainly some conversation between the two hon. members; but it could not be said that the hon. gentleman's remarks were observations made in the course of debate. He (Hon. Mr. Blake) did not know what the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Ferguson) had said, nor had he knowledge of the language used by the hon. member for Brant (Hon. Mr. Wood) with reference to the piece of paper which the hon. gentleman had produced.

Mr. FERGUSON: Here it is if you want to see it (handing it towards Hon. Mr. Blake).

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said he did not want to see it, inasmuch as he was quite aware of the general imputations that were made in regard to it. (*Laughter.*) He perfectly well recollected having written that paper. He understood that, after it had passed into the possession of the hon. member for Brant (Hon. Mr. Wood) it had been torn in two, and that the pieces having been pasted together, it appeared in the rehabilitated shape in which it was now presented before the world. He (Hon. Mr. Blake) supposed that the hon. member for Brant, after receiving and reading it, had torn it, thrown it upon the floor, and that subsequently the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Ferguson) or some other person had picked it up, joined the fragments together, and kept it until the opportunity presented itself for using it in this House. He (Hon. Mr. Blake) had some papers on the floor around him, which he had torn up to-day, and he trusted that the Speaker would issue instructions that they should be carefully removed and destroyed, so that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Ferguson) would not have access to them in order to make use of them to the prejudice of others. That was all he (Hon. Mr. Blake) had to say in reference to that. Now, with regard to the debate, in respect to which a controversy had arisen between the hon. member for Cardwell, and the hon. member for Brant, that debate had been upon a motion of the hon. member for West Middlesex in that House, and for Lambton in this. That debate had been going on Friday and during the course of the debate the hon. member for South Brant had resigned. The debate terminated late on Friday by the carrying of an address in the sense of a vote of want of confidence. On Monday following the Government had come down with an answer to the address which answer was deemed unsatisfactory to himself (Hon. Mr. Blake) and his friends, and they proposed on the Monday following—the hon. member for South Brant having resigned on Friday—another address to His Excellency representing the unsatisfactory character of the preceding address. In the course of the debate which followed, he (Hon. Mr. Blake) had met the hon. member for South Brant in the lobby. The hon. member had told him that certain imputations had been cast upon him in the interval between the Friday and Monday for having resigned his office in the Government, and that he intended to speak in the course of the debate in reply to those imputations. The hon. member had asked him (Hon. Mr. Blake) how long it was probable the debate would last, and he had told him that it would be late that evening

before a division would be taken, and that it was even doubtful whether it would not continue till the following day. Later in the evening he (Hon. Mr. Blake) had observed signs that the debate was lagging, and that there was a probability of its coming to a close, and having erroneously informed the hon. member for South Brant that it would continue till late at night, and probably till next day, he (Hon. Mr. Blake) had committed the heinous crime of sending a line across the House to the hon. member for South Brant (Hon. Mr. Wood) to correct the error, and give him an intimation that now was the time to speak if he intended to speak at all in reply to the imputation to which he had previously referred. Shortly afterwards the hon. member for South Brant had told him that he had met Mr. Sandfield Macdonald in the lobby and that the latter had asked him not to take any notice of the imputations, and that at his instance he (Hon. Mr. Wood) had determined not to speak. That was the history of this piece of paper. (*Hear, hear.*)

Mr. BOWELL said he knew nothing of the piece of paper, and had no desire to interfere in the discussion in regard to it; but in justice to hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Ferguson) he felt bound to say that the hon. member for Durham West (Hon. Mr. Blake) was not strictly correct with regard to what had occurred in this House between the hon. member for Cardwell and the hon. member for South Brant. The hon. member for Durham West had stated that the hon. member for Cardwell had made a running commentary on the remarks of some other hon. member who was speaking. Now the fact was that the interruption of the hon. member for South Brant had taken place while the hon. member for Cardwell was addressing the House.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON called attention to the fact that there was no question before the House and that, therefore, the discussion was out of order.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the gentleman was quite in order, and there was a question of fact before the House, and it was certainly strange if the House would refuse to do justice to an hon. member, whose statement had been impugned without sufficient cause.

Mr. BOWELL desired to state distinctly that the interruption had taken place while the hon. member for Cardwell was speaking. The hon. member for Durham West had also accused the hon. member for Cardwell with having chosen a time to bring this matter up when the honourable member for South Brant was absent. Now he (Mr. Bowell) knew that the hon. member for Cardwell had, on two different occasions, given notice to the hon. member for South Brant that he intended to refer to this matter in the House, and yet the hon. member for South Brant had not chosen to attend to give him an opportunity.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN could not see what this House had to do with a matter that had occurred in another House at Toronto.

The SPEAKER stated that he had allowed the hon. member for Cardwell to make a personal explanation, but that debates upon an explanation were not in order.

The subject then dropped.