

imagery here scarcely jumps with nature, and his metaphors are somewhat mixed. It is not usual to find incense of any kind inside a man. The right hon. gentleman charges Pharisaism. I will not admit that he is a judge even of that article in which he is a wholesale dealer. But let that pass. What the House will notice is that he is not not at all dealing with the subject of a naval Bill, but he is dealing with the subject of a Bill of attainder. And so, too when he trots out Talleyrand and charges loquacity, and Pêter the Hermit, and Papineau, and the fiasco of 1837, and Lord Durham, and Lord Elgin, and Lafontaine and Baldwin, and periodical contributions, and Sir Charles Tupper, and Lord Milner, and Sir Walter Scott and 'Quentin Durward'; and these references happen to cover fifteen out of twenty-seven pages of his speech. However, the right hon. gentleman does find time to say in one part of his speech that he had said in the speech in which he introduced this Bill, that 'when England is at war we are at war', and he there defended that statement. But later in his speech he says: 'It does not follow that because England is at war we are at war'. To say nothing of the sense of those two statements, would not the sound of them jar a stone wall? 'When England is at war we are at war,' but 'it does not follow that because England is at war we are at war.' To the satellites of Jove that may be symphony, but to my mortal ear it is mere cacophony. But bad as the sound is, the sense is confusion worse confounded—'when England is at war we are at war.' but 'it does not follow that because England is at war we are at war.'

Perhaps a remark of the hon. gentleman the Postmaster General would afford a clue to the meaning. It may be that one of these statements is intended for consumption in Quebec and the other for consumption in Ontario. The right hon. gentleman tells us that he has been assailed in Quebec because there it is said that under no circumstances shall his little navy go to England's war; and he has been assailed in Ontario because there it is said that under all circumstances his little navy shall go to England's war. And he tells us that he speaks from a double standpoint and his policy is the expression of a double opinion. What a Janus-faced policy! Why, the thing is cross-eyed. It looks two ways. It is like the little nigger's coon trap, set to catch them 'gwine and comin'. Now the right hon. gentleman is a very intelligent and very able man, and he knows that those two statements cannot agree together. When England is at war, we are at war, but it does not follow that when England is at war we are at war. He knows that those two statements cannot get into bed together, and

Mr. COWAN.

he knows too that his policy, because it pretends that both these statements are true, is in itself mere opportunism and not true. By the way, I am reminded that this double-jointed statement and policy is very much on a par with that statement which he made at Toronto on the 5th of January last with all the ambiguity of an oracle. It was reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of that date, whose editor was chairman of the meeting at which the statement was made. The statement is this:

We are under the suzerainty of England; we are the King's loyal subjects; we bow the knee to him, but the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our own Canadian parliament. If this is not a nation, what then constitutes a nation? And if there is a nation under the sun, which can say more than this, where is it to be found?

Again in those remarks, there are no two statements that will agree. If the one be true, the other must be false. And indeed both and all are false. The whole thing is compact of error and misstatement. Those remarks are the very concentrates, the very quintessence of error and unwisdom regarding the relations of Canada to the motherland. Let us examine them. If the King of England is suzerain of Canada, then we are not only not his loyal subjects but we are not his subjects at all. Prior to the South African war, the King of England was suzerain of the Transvaal republic, but the citizens of that republic were not citizens of the King and could not be. That suzerainty gave to Great Britain a certain control over the external relations of that republic with the other nations of the earth, but it did not give and could not give to the King, as such, any rights over the people of that republic as his subjects. So that if the King of England be suzerain of Canada, the people of Canada are not his subjects, and those two first statements of the right hon. gentleman cannot agree together.

Again, the right hon. gentleman says that we are the King's loyal subjects, but that he has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our Canadian parliament. I venture to assert that no loyal subject can say that the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our Canadian parliament. The King has the right to assent to every Bill of this parliament before it can become law. That right was not allowed him by this parliament, but reserved to him by the British North America Act and cannot be taken away. The King, by his representative, has the power to dissolve this parliament at this moment. These powers were not 'allowed' him by this parliament; these powers were reserved to him by the British North America Act. And