

conducted in this country. We knew what they could do, but we placed our trust in the good sense and in the judgment of the people of Montreal, and, Sir, we have seen the most gratifying results. We appealed solely on the ground that no faith could be placed in the gentlemen who then composed the Administration, because of the fact that they were not sincere in the promises they made. And, Sir, as we view that decimated Administration, that weak and vacillating Administration, that Administration shorn of its strongest elements (that is if we are to believe the ex-Minister of Finance, because he claims all the intelligence of the late Government for the "bolters")—we are satisfied that the people understood what we told them. We claimed that no faith could be placed in them. Were we wrong when we claimed that it was not a capable Government? Were we wrong when we claimed it was not a strong Government? The other day we witnessed the Minister of Finance in this House stating: We have resigned because we have not strength, and because we are incapable to govern this country. That bore out the truth of our claims in Montreal Centre. We insisted that the Government were incapable of governing the country, because we pointed out the proportions of the national debt, we pointed out the immense amount of money which had gone into wrong channels; we pointed out the long list of scandals, and we added that the Government were unable to show a good record of administrative ability. We pointed out that the ex-Minister of Finance has a worse financial record than any man who ever had charge of the finances of this country. We affirmed that that gentleman in one short year built up a deficit of five million dollars, and if he touches a deficit at all it has got to be five millions. The people of Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier understood the truth of these statements, and the answer they gave to them has smashed the Administration to-day. Mr. Speaker, we appealed to the electors of Montreal Centre on good honest grounds. We explained what the platform of the Liberal party was. They understood what it was. They appreciated the platform of the Liberal party. They understood that if this country is to be honestly governed, it must not be governed by men who are constantly boasting of their loyalty when there is treason in their hearts, even against their own leader; for men who have treason in their hearts against their own leader cannot be expected to be loyal to their country. More than that, I would point out this fact to the ex-Minister of Justice, that in that very election of Jacques Cartier, where he claims appeals were made by the Liberal party to Roman Catholics and French-Canadians, the majority of the English Protestants voted against the Administration. That is about as good an answer, I think, as he could wish to his statement in Cardwell.

Mr. DEVLIN.

No, Sir, we are quite satisfied that if we could only have the happiness of a dissolution of this Parliament to-morrow, there will not be here at the next session of this House any such men as the bolters, and much less the present Government.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there is just one phase of this question which has not been thought about, that is, that if the time of the present leader of the Government is necessary for the reconstruction or the filling up of the Cabinet, much more time has been taken up in the discussion this afternoon than the next two sittings of the House would have taken. But, so far as that question is concerned, I am not going to discuss it further than this: I understand that it is unconstitutional to adjourn otherwise than from day to day; but on that question, I, individually, am perfectly content to throw the entire responsibility upon the Government. There is just one other word I desire to say, that is, that recently I had the pleasure of attending several meetings in company with the hon. leader of the Opposition, both in Roman Catholic and Protestant constituencies. As I have the pleasure of understanding the French language about as well as the English language, although, unfortunately, I cannot speak it as well, I can certify that on no occasion at any meeting did the hon. leader of the Opposition divert from the one course. He dealt with questions in exactly the same way before a Protestant community as he did before a Roman Catholic community. I was also a witness of the contest in Montreal Centre, and I can state, and verify the statement most fully, that so far as the Liberal party is concerned, questions of race, nationality or religion did not, in any sense, enter into the contest.

Motion to adjourn until the 14th inst. agreed to, on division.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th January, 1896.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 14) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This is the same