

Mr. SPEAKER. If the expressions of the Minister of Finance were unparliamentary, he should have been called to order at the time.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not the point.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question of order is before the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to speak to the question of order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No one denies that the hon. gentleman has a right, as the leader of the Opposition has said, to defend himself, and to deny and refute any insinuation made against him in strong terms, but he must keep within parliamentary language. He has just admitted that he said that the Minister of Finance made a scandalous imputation which is false, and that he knew to be false.

Mr. MULOCK. As I understand the point upon which your ruling is asked, it is this: The Minister of Finance made a statement reflecting upon the character of my hon. friend from East Grey—

Mr. LANDERKIN. South Grey, if you please.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from South Grey. He denies that, and says that the imputation was false and scandalous. If an imputation is made against a member of this House, surely he has a right to say that it is untrue.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think, Mr. Speaker—

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Chair has not yet decided the question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We are discussing the question of order. I think the well understood rule is that you may characterize a statement as being untrue and false, but you cannot charge the member who made it personally with being a liar, or say that he is stating what he knows to be untrue. You can characterize the statement as untrue, but you must not accuse the person of stating what he knew to be untrue.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. member said both. He said that the statement was untrue and scandalous, and that the Minister of Finance knew it was so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In order to stop any further discussion on that point, I will bow to the wish of the Speaker and withdraw the statement, and I suppose that is all that is necessary. I do not know that it is necessary, but, if the Minister of Finance will see that he has done me an injustice and will have the manhood to get up and say so, the discussion will end, and I will give him the opportunity of doing so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman has finished, I desire to make a few remarks on the subject now before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have the floor still. I only asked whether the Minister of Finance had the manhood to withdraw that statement or not?

Some hon. MEMBERS. What is the statement?

Mr. LANDERKIN. He knows very well the statement he made.

Mr. FOSTER. I really do not know what all this is about. If the hon. gentleman or any hon. member on that side will mention the state-

ment I used against the hon. gentleman which was false and scandalous, I will withdraw it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I heard the statement.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister of Justice cannot have the floor the whole time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) would have the right to refer to what the Minister of Finance may have said in respect to him, but it is rather late to call the Minister of Finance to order for what he may have said, and to which attention should have been called at the time, if it were necessary.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I bow to that decision, as I do to all the decisions of the Speaker.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has risen to give the information asked for by the Minister of Finance from any member on this side.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has asked any hon. member on this side of the House to state the words used by the Minister of Finance in reference to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). I was here at the time, and the words he used were: "the hon. gentleman is not in a condition to be quiet." I would like to know what the hon. the Finance Minister meant by that?

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say that this question is exceeding all bounds. If the expression used by the Finance Minister was an unparliamentary one, the attention of the Chair should have been called to it at the time. We cannot discuss it now, whether it were unparliamentary or otherwise. I did not hear the expression used by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), but if, as stated by the Minister of Justice, it was that the statement of the Minister was false, and he knew it to be false, it certainly was unparliamentary, but I suppose I am to understand that the member for South Grey withdraws that expression.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That question having been solved and the Minister of Finance having screened himself behind the ruling of the Chair and allowed an imputation like that to rest against me, I will conclude that he has taken another of his weak fits, has got one of his parliamentary fits—if it were in order I would say something else; and the Speaker, and the Minister of Justice, and some other members on that side of the House might come to his rescue. Now, I could carry this case further, I could reason it out with him in its entirety, I could go along his career since he entered the House, and I could consider his position, his variety of positions on this question, ever since he came to this House and some time before; I could follow him up and down the lines when he went around with his carpet bag and when he was lecturing on this subject. I will not do that, I am not going to do anything of that kind, nor do I impute any fault to him for that. But when he makes a specialty of this subject, gets into the House on this subject, gets into the Government on this subject, and just as soon as he gets into the Government, then he shelves this subject, and puts his prohibition into the pigeon holes of the department, and never mentions it again in the House, then, I have a right, as a public man, and he being in the