

go around in gaiters and who are drawing immense sums of money. I read in the paper the other day of one celebrated divine who gave away twenty-five million sterling. Where did he get it? Was he a disciple of the Galilean Fisherman, who walked about in bare feet and spread the gospel? I say that the amassing of such wealth has absolutely perverted the gospel. The true spirit and intention of saving the race, of endeavouring to make it Christian, is gone. Christianity has disappeared.

Coming down to the divine right of kings, I am against that too. I am loyal to the King; the King is doing all he can; but hereafter the people must say who is going to rule them. The name of the Royal Family has now been changed to that of the House of Windsor. They had to do it, and we are on the eve of a struggle all over the world between the smaller and the larger man.

I do not know who Flavelle is. I have seen his name in the papers. He has millions of money. There are more millionaires in Canada today than ever before. How did they get their money? Where did it come from? Who has suffered? Where was their patriotism when they would accept all that? The women down our way have been working with their fingers from early morning till late at night making socks and all sorts of things to send to the troops, and here are these magnates flaunting their wealth before the country. Yet there is considered to be no vice in that. I do not want to throw any slurs at anybody, but I say the whole principle is wrong.

As I said long ago, it was not my duty to find fault or criticise the Government, or to vote against them until the proper time came; but when they did wrong, then I had the right to criticise and find fault. The Liberal party has contributed something towards the welfare of this country; but I should rather have seen the Conservatives continue in their magnificence—the magnificence of their power, the magnificence of their elections. I could tell you something about elections, too, if I wanted to do so, for I have seen how they are conducted. Sir John Macdonald, before he went down to defeat in 1874, had a majority of 34. I was with him then and had the honour of supporting him, but if I were asked to-day if I would belong to this party, I must reply that I could not. Why? I cannot change all the time, and I would vote against this party because I must be faithful to my duty. When Sir John Macdonald went down to defeat in 1874, what was his answer to me? This, perhaps, may be a state secret, but it is well that it should be

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE.

known. He said: "We cannot get along. We have been long enough in power, and we must give place to the Liberals; but they will not stay long, and we shall become stronger than we were before."

As to the Pacific scandal, there was absolutely nothing in it, although because of it and because of his honour and his appreciation of public opinion Sir John Macdonald went out of power. There were two companies concerned. Macpherson had one and Sir Hugh Allan had the other. In order that there might be no trouble, Sir John Macdonald offered two charters, and whichever one could fulfil the conditions and build the Canadian Pacific railway was to be granted the charter. What did Sir Hugh Allan do? He contributed \$200,000 out of his own pocket—not out of the country's treasury, but out of his own pocket. He filched nothing from the treasury. Good old Scotchman as he was, he took nothing for himself. He thought that it was his duty to assist in getting that railway built for the development of the country. My honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Bostock) referred in his speech to the importance of the transportation problem, the problem of bringing food products out of the country. Sir John Macdonald said that what Sir Hugh Allan did was a leap in the dark. Well, Macdonald felt so keenly his acceptance of the \$200,000 for election purposes that he went down. There was a man whom I would follow to-morrow to Hades if necessary.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: A little later on.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE: I am afraid I shall not have the honour of meeting some of you there, because I think the devil has reserved me a better place.

As to the present situation, we must rise superior to it. It shows how far the people can be led by erroneous ideas and sentiments. The women carried this election. Families were divided over the issue, and there was more animosity amongst the women in my district than would be imagined possible. It is difficult to say what the result would have been if all the women in Canada had been given the vote, which, I think, would have been fairer. I was always opposed to granting the vote to women. If I were asked about it to-day, personally, I would not favour it, because it might result in the destruction of the Empire, judging by the rows and wrangling and the false impressions given to the women by this, that, and the other preacher. That vote could never be utilized in a common-sense way. Perhaps what we are saying will go