

indulging towards two hon. members of this House are out of order.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Do I understand the Speaker to rule me out of order?

THE SPEAKER—I tell the hon. gentleman he has been out of order from the beginning of his remarks up to the present time.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Then I may say that if I am debarred in the Parliament of the country from endeavoring to unfold a serious wrong done to the orphans and widows and other innocent shareholders of the Bank of Upper Canada, then my only recourse must be to the Press, and I must send my remarks to the Press of the country.

THE SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman will remember that he has the privilege of every other member of this House within the rules of Parliament.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—Then if I am prevented from going on to explain further I move the resolution of which I have given notice.

THE SPEAKER—It is moved by Mr. Alexander seconded by—There is no seconder.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Although the hon. gentleman has not found a seconder to his motion, I yet think it is desirable that I should give some explanation with reference to the transaction to which he has called attention. I was exceedingly glad that the hon. gentleman was called to order by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. I did not like to appeal to the House in the way the hon. gentleman has done, though I was perfectly sensible all the time that the hon. gentleman was speaking, of the irregular course he was pursuing, and that it was completely out of order, but as his accusation was levelled partly against my hon. colleague near me, I thought I would submit and hear all he had to say. We have heard most of what he had to say, because I presume from his own language that he was very near the end of his

remarks before he was interrupted by my hon. friend from Barrie. I desire only to offer a few remarks explanatory of the £100,000 bill of which he has spoken, remarks which will make as clear as daylight everything which occurred with reference to that bill from its inception to the time of its payment. The hon. gentleman says now, for the first time so far as I know, that there were two bills each of £100,000, and amounting to \$1,000,000. I agree that the whole amount of the debt due by the Grand Trunk to the bank was upwards of \$1,000,000; but there was one bill and not two. We have the history of that bill very much in the public papers and in the returns which were brought down to Parliament some years ago. We see there that there was a dispute between the Bank of Upper Canada and the Government as to who was liable for this £100,000. We see the inception of the dispute; we see its termination; we see its settlement. The settlement consisted in the dispute having been abandoned by the bank, and the £100,000 sterling assumed by them, and the admission made that they and not the Government were liable for its payment. These transactions were not altogether during the time of the present Government or altogether during the time of the Mackenzie administration. They originated long before that, and the £100,000 I find first mentioned by Mr. Holton in 1863, when he was Minister of Finance. Mr. Street and Mr. Walbridge, two directors of the Bank of Upper Canada, and Mr. Cassels, cashier of the bank, waited upon Mr. Holton for some settlement of the amount which they owed the Government. Mr. Holton tells them that the total amount of indebtedness must be reduced by the 1st of January next to \$1,486,000, including the G. T. R. bill for £100,000. They assent to those terms, and those terms are embodied in an Order-in-Council on the report of Mr. Holton, and the first paragraph of the report adopted by the Governor-General in Council at the instance of Mr. Holton (who was not a member of any Government of which Sir John Macdonald and myself were members, but was a member of the Government of the late Sandfield Macdonald who was a reformer), the first paragraph of the report which the