

HON. SIR DAVID MACPHERSON
—No.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—And now it devolves upon me to make one or two comments upon the carefully prepared statement of the Hon. George W. Allan, which, perhaps, he thinks in the holy simplicity of his heart, to be a conscientious statement. He has not displayed his usual adroitness by confessing, as the other hon. gentleman has also done, that the books of the bank, which were in the possession of his cousin, Mr. Clarke Gamble, had been destroyed. They had been placed in a basement room on Church St., when the sewage came in upon them and they became so offensive that they had to be destroyed. What a confession of the means had recourse to, to hide and conceal the dark deeds of certain men, living at the top of society! They dare not burn the books, or they would have been arraigned on a criminal charge; but they place them in a dirty cellar until they become offensive, so that they must destroy them. They thus think that proof cannot be produced as to the debts of certain parties, and as to the frauds perpetrated upon the people of this country, by the improper compromise of debts owing them, by men living in such mansions as Moss Park. In conclusion, what shall I say of this carefully prepared statement, of a gentleman who carries upon all occasions the mantle of religion on his shoulders? I cannot say that in the whole of my life of three score and ten years that I ever heard a tissue of allegations, so much at variance with truth. Does he pretend to forget that from the moment he became president of that bank, it was one continuous struggle on my part, to eject him and two members of the board, who always acted in the interests of the debtors, and in the interests of those who were thrusting upon us bad mortgages? Does he pretend to forget that along with his wealthy colleague on the board, to whom he referred in his speech, both combining together, threw me out of the board, somewhere about 1863, for one year? And why did that wealthy gentleman combine against me? Because I referred to a \$92,000 rotten mortgage of his brother-in-law which had appeared to me to have been

wrongfully taken by the bank from improper influences. And that wealthy friend of the president united his forces to get me ejected, and we did not speak for twelve months afterwards.

HON. MR. GOWAN—I rise to a question of order. I see by the 26th rule of this house all personal, sharp or taxing speeches are forbidden. If this rule means anything I cannot understand the house listening to the speech of the hon. member, which seems mostly pointed to insulting two hon. gentlemen of this Senate. There must be some good reason for this rule, and I really think the hon. gentleman's remarks ought not to be permitted. The hon. member has used language and insinuations that touch the honor of both those hon. gentlemen without one particle of fact, and in a manner and spirit that cannot commend itself to any reasonable mind. His whole proceeding throughout, I feel—and I hope I may be excused for saying so—is not a little out of harmony with the spirit of courtesy which finds its home in the heart of every christian gentleman. I appeal to this hon. House to say whether this rule 26 means anything or is to be carried out at all? If it is carried out it is impossible in my mind to conceive a case to which it more directly applies than the one now before us.

HON. MR. ALEXANDER—My hearing is so affected by age that I have not heard the hon. gentleman and I am therefore unable to reply to him.

THE SPEAKER—The rule to which the hon. gentleman calls the attention of the House is the 26th. It is a very simple rule, and now that my attention has been called to it I may say that the hon. gentleman has been out of order from the beginning of his speech up to the present time. It is not the one rule merely of Parliamentary practice that the hon. gentleman has transgressed, but several rules; it is not my duty to cail the hon. gentleman to order as long as my attention has not been called to the fact. Now that my attention is directed to it I must tell the hon. gentleman from Woodstock that the personal allusions in which he has been