

that question, I caused enquiries to be made in Toronto of a gentleman named Morton, who was one of the book-keepers of the Bank of Upper Canada at the time. A telegram was sent to make the enquiry, and this is the reply: "Morton has explained the whole circumstances in connection with the draft for £100,000, drawn by the Grand Trunk Railway through the Bank of Upper Canada. This bill, principal and interest, was paid, not by the Government, but by the Grand Trunk Railway themselves. Mr. Morton is prepared to substantiate this." There is no doubt therefore about the intention of the hon. gentleman in bringing this question up at this late day. The hon. member for Niagara asks what position the matter stands in now as far as the Government is concerned. The Government took over all this property by a statute passed in 1870. At that time there were a great many debts due by the Bank of Upper Canada to private individuals. The Government advanced a considerable sum of money to pay those debts, and they were paid off. Since then the Government has realized from the assets of the bank \$352,456. The assets of the bank, at this moment in existence, consist of a certain number of claims which are in suit, and the amount of which I understand from the proper officer, the Deputy Minister of Finance, is \$12,000 to \$14,000; there are other assets which are not in suit from which probably \$30,000 will be realized, making altogether \$44,000, and the Government will ultimately secure about \$150,000 of their debt from the assets of the Bank. Their debt at the time the Bank failed was \$1,150,000. Everyone has been paid but the Government. The Government was obliged to take over the assets, and trustees were appointed for a certain time. With reference to these trustees the Government, in a letter which I hold in my hand, expressed satisfaction with their conduct and the thoroughness with which they managed the assets of the bank for the time they were in office, two years. After that, proceedings were taken from time to time by the Minister of Finance with the result which I have mentioned, that \$352,000 has been realized out of the assets, and about \$40,000 or \$50,000 remains to be realized, and that the Government will ultimately stand

to lose the difference between those assets and \$1,150,000.

## SIR DAVID MACPHERSON'S PORTRAIT.

### MOTION.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER moved:—

That in the opinion of this House this portrait of the Honorable David Lewis Macpherson, late Speaker of the Senate, be not allowed to remain in the Senate Corridor.

He said: It is assuredly a most disagreeable and painful duty, that any member should require to call attention to so insignificant a matter. It is most distasteful to me to discuss small matters. But we are commanded by the highest authority, to do everything decently and in order. In a well-ordered house one should see nothing which can be regarded as an infringement of good taste. I have been accustomed to regard life thus. If a man's noble, disinterested character during his life, and the services he has rendered to mankind are great, and such deserve to be remembered after death, the nation will erect a monument to commemorate them. It is scarcely seemly for an individual to pronounce his own eulogy.

This is virtually what that portrait does. You cannot find in the whole Dominion a man of proper instincts, who does not feel that the placing of such a portrait, of such dimensions, amidst the other portraits of all the distinguished men who have graced the Chair of this House, during the last fifty years, is a simple outrage upon common decency, and bears testimony to sad infirmity of character,—to the hon. gentleman's inordinate vanity.

Such Speakers as Sir John Beverly Robinson, a man of such exalted mind and acquirements as fitted him to grace the Bench in England, or even the Wool-sack in the House of Lords; Chief Justice Sewell, of Quebec, an eminent jurist; Sir Etienne Taché, one of the framers of Confederation, and many other such eminent men, were all satisfied to conform to one uniform size of painting and frame. But this portrait, if it means anything, is designed to convey to posterity the impression that the Speaker in question was a more exalted character, and rendered greater services to the country than any one of