

Mr. MACKENZIE: The House was not deceived.

Mr. MASSON said when he first brought up the question he was met by the declaration of the hon. the Minister of Public Works that the transfer of the barracks could not be made because there were technical difficulties in the way. The return subsequently brought down showed that, immediately after the Session was over, the barracks was transferred without any further correspondence with the Local Government. He again brought the matter up, and it was promised that the correspondence should be laid before the House. When it did come down, a letter of the 5th April was wanting. When he brought this to the notice of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, he said there might have been a mistake, and that it existed in some other correspondence. However, when that correspondence came down, the letter of the 5th April was still wanting. He would say openly and frankly that he did not think the hon. the First Minister wanted to deceive the House, but he really believed that the hon. gentleman had been deceived by somebody.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am very much obliged for the repeated attempts of the hon. gentleman to cast evil imputations on my statements, but I throw back the imputation with the utmost scorn with which it is capable of being thrown back. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that I do not care what his opinion is, and I tell him further that I made no statement at the expense of any party. The statements I made in reference to the matter I believed to be correct. The hon. gentleman and those around him endeavour systematically and continually to give the worst possible interpretation to anything said on this side of the House.

Mr. MASSON: Was there any correspondence going on?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I do not intend to be catechised by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL said his object in making the motion was simply to give a young member of the

House who was sat upon whenever opportunity offered the chance to make a personal explanation. It was better to exercise a little forbearance in such matters, and not compel hon. members to make a formal motion. The hon. the Premier had said the Opposition deliberately misrepresented him. He (Mr. Mitchell) had never done so. As an independent member, he had always considered the motives and dealt with the measures of the hon. gentleman in a fair, honourable and straightforward manner; and he hoped the hon. gentleman would reconsider that statement. He had no disposition to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, nor had he had any experience of its being done.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT called attention to the fact that the hon. member for Victoria (N.S.) was now in his place, and that the hon. the Minister of Militia had moved that the letter should be laid on the table of the House.

Mr. BOWELL asked if it would not have been as well for the hon. the Minister of Militia to have stated the fact that the letter first appeared in a Halifax paper. He was not apologising for any paper, but the evident intention of the hon. gentleman was to cast the whole odium of the publication of the letter on a Toronto paper. The hon. gentleman knew well that it first appeared in a Halifax paper and had been copied by the Toronto paper.

Mr. VAIL said the Halifax paper had systematically abused him for several years, but, when such a thing appeared in a paper like the *Mail*, he felt compelled to bring the matter before the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL said, when he asked leave of the hon. the Minister of Militia to refer to a certain paragraph in the letter, he only read as little as he possibly could for the purpose of substantiating the statements he had made. He was not willing to make use of the rest of it until occasion required it. If he had read it incorrectly, the hon. the Minister of Militia should have taken him to task for it at the time. He did not think he was now in a position to bring that letter forward and expose the rest of what the hon. gentleman said.