

that the outlook in his old constituency, where he is best known and from which he was dismissed by the verdict of the people at the last election—notwithstanding his boasted wealth he was compelled to abandon that constituency, and he trembles now lest he may not find it easy to get back into the House at all. The hon. gentleman may find the electors of this country share the sentiment he uttered the other night, that a Minister—and, of course, he who aims at being a Minister—should be like Cæsar's wife, above suspicion. The hon. gentleman told us that he prays sometimes. Let me recommend him when he does so to use that model and best of prayers in which he will find: "Lead us not into temptation;" a prayer that he may never again be Finance Minister, and never have the chance of repeating his operation on the money markets of the world. That is a prayer in which the intelligent electors of this country will most devoutly join. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman concluded his somewhat vague and stilted address with the following statement:—

"For those men may boast of their great majority here to-day, they may boast of their full Treasury, they may boast of their devoted supporters, but I can recollect some ten years ago when these gentlemen were just as insolent, just as arrogant as they are to-day, when they had just as strong a majority behind them, just as full a Treasury, when they were prepared to be just as unscrupulous in maintaining their places as they are to-day, yet in twelve months after that time I saw them scattered and driven into deserved ignominy. The fate that befel them in 1873 may well befall them in 1883, and I see signs and tokens, not a few, that if they do not take care, and if they do not mend their ways, that fate will assuredly befall them again."

Now, Sir, does the hon. gentleman not see that, just in proportion as he can sustain the charge of our being dismissed from power with deserved ignominy, he is heaping a greater amount of it upon himself. Does the hon. gentleman not see that it is bad enough for a party, strong in power, with a great majority in this House behind them, as they had in 1878, to go to the people against a high-minded honorable set of gentlemen on the other side, and sustain an overwhelming defeat? But, Sir, what shall be said of men who, after the people of this country have had an opportunity of weighing them in the balance, say of them: "For heaven's sake give us back anything rather than let them again have control of the Government." If we are open to those charges, what was the hon. gentleman's conduct to induce the people of this country, by an overwhelming majority, to say: "Get you gone, and let better men take your places." If we are bad, what must you be, who, by the verdict of the intelligent electors of this country on September 18th, 1878, were consigned to the humiliating position you occupy now, and placed in your position my right hon. friend and his colleagues whose services to the country were known. I would, therefore, recommend the hon. gentleman not to venture upon that line of argument again. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me what signs of the times he sees. I am afraid they are visions; and I think the hon. gentleman must be asleep when these visions come over him. I do not see how any waking man can see any such signs or tokens. As I said before, history is philosophy, teaching by experience; and what does the history of that day and of this teach the people. Why, Sir, when a change of Government is imminent, when the public mind is on the waver, when a Ministry are shaken in the public confidence, there are signs of the times. There are tokens, and they are unmistakable. Do you see them now? Let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to portentous signs of the times that point with unerring fidelity, in free countries such as ours, to the direction the public mind is taking. What was the position of the hon. gentlemen opposite when they had been in power for three years and four months? It is true they went to the country with a great majority; but we told them it would be swept from their feet, and I gave them the reasons

why. They were plain and distinctive reasons which, under parliamentary forms of Government, have been found to be conclusive upon such a question as this. I said: "Look abroad over the face of the country; remember the great majority you had and tell me where it is now." I showed them that, out of sixty-one Government seats that had become vacant, they had only been enabled, including the Ministerial elections—a dozen of them or something like it—to elect forty-seven supporters. I showed them with reference to the twenty-six seats of the Opposition that had become vacant, that we had been able to elect out of them, and out of the seats which had become vacant on the Government side, no less than forty. So that at the end of four years we stood in this House twenty-eight votes on a division better than when the Government was formed. These were the signs of the times—the unmistakable signs of the times; and, Sir, when the then Government went to the country we realized them to the fullest extent, the overwhelming verdict of the people confirming the verdict of the by-elections as it almost invariably does. But what is the position of gentlemen opposite to-day? Thirty-four seats have been vacant on the Government side, and out of those thirty-four how many have we won? Thirty-two, Sir, and hon. gentlemen opposite, out of thirty-four seats and in three years and four months have taken exactly two seats from us. What more? Twelve seats on the Opposition side have been vacant. Of course a great many could not become vacant because the Opposition is so small numerically. But twelve seats on that side have been vacant, and out of those twelve we have taken six. So that we stand, to-day, giving them the benefit of the two seats they carried out of the thirty-four that became vacant on our side, eight votes stronger on a division, in consequence of the by-elections, than we were on the day that the General Election was over. I ask the hon. gentleman what, under these circumstances, he thinks the signs of the times point to? I tell the hon. gentleman this—and I have said it elsewhere as well as here—that so long as the people of Canada are compelled to look forward to the administration of its financial affairs by the ex-Minister of Finance of this country, we are safe. I tell the hon. gentleman that the worst sign of the times for us would be his retirement into private life, because it would give his party an opportunity it does not at present possess. I trust he will not do anything so much at variance with our interests. But, as I remarked, at the end of three years and four months we have a majority of ninety members in this House, at our back—a majority strengthened, as I have said, by the free will of the sovereign, independent people of this country; and we are sustained, to an extent that no Government can expect to be sustained, because there are a variety of things—for instance, disappointed parties looking for a great deal from a Government, who naturally cannot have their expectations realized—which cause Governments to suffer occasional defeats. We, however, stand in this position: that we have the assurance, not only that the sovereign electors endorse, from end to end of Canada, the policy of this Administration, but that they recognise that, under that wise and judicious policy, the blight that fell upon the country under the Administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite has been removed, and that the true interests of every class of the population is involved in maintaining that great policy to which this Government has committed itself, and which has proved so eminently beneficial to the people of Canada.

Mr. CAMERON (South Huron), moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is pressed—and I beg pardon of the hon. gentlemen for speaking to the motion of adjournment, though it is my