

of Parliament is in his place perhaps I shall bring up this question again in order that we may have this point settled. At all events, it was asserted in this House and not denied.

Mr. BLAKE. Not that I know of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether there is to be an amendment moved to the Address or not. I thought I gathered from the hon. gentleman's remarks that he did not intend to move an amendment. The Speech I believe and consider to be a plain, straightforward, business-like document. The subjects to be submitted to Parliament are important, and we invite the earnest consideration of Parliament to those measures. We believe the time of the House will be usefully employed in the discussion of those measures. We have not put into the Speech, inserted into the mouth of the representative of Her Majesty, long essays upon constitutional law or upon the question whether myself was right or wrong, fallible or infallible. We have called the attention of the House to important subjects, and if it carries, as I believe it will, the measures that we are going to submit, the members of this House will have the pleasure of knowing and feeling, when they go home, that they have passed a useful Session and done great service to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I think it may be fairly left to the impartial judgment of this House, and also of the country, when they read the report of the two speeches, whether my hon. friend for West Durham (Mr. Blake) or the First Minister is the more obnoxious to the charge of having unduly wasted the time of the House on the present occasion. I partly agree with the First Minister, that it would not be expedient to enter on a discussion in detail, particularly as I propose at the earliest opportunity to discuss a good many questions to which the First Minister has alluded. I think I may also fairly congratulate the First Minister and the House on the fact that on the present occasion the First Minister has observed a moderation of tone and statement which it might have been well had he observed on other occasions. The First Minister, Mr. Speaker, is no bad type, on the whole, of that Spanish hero immortalized by *Punch*, who was awfully determined when he had twenty men to one, but who, when the odds were less enormously in his favor, usually found it convenient to remember that discretion was an important part of a general's duty. The First Minister, in old time, in fact, in very recent times, as some of us know to our cost, has found it much more convenient to gerrymander his political opponents out of existence than to face them on the floor of Parliament. Now, Sir, as I have said, having this propensity and this habit of mind, it might have been as well had he been less valiant, less pot-valiant, I might say, on the occasion of some recent demonstration in his honor when that hon. gentleman made certain statements to which I propose to call the attention of the House to-night—not solely on account of the personal elements they contain, but because there are certain important questions greatly affecting the welfare of this country underlying that hon. gentleman's utterances. He has had the opportunity to-night, if he had chosen to use it, to retract or to modify some of those statements, but he tells us that he adheres, if I understand him aright, to every word he has uttered. Sir, I propose to edify and amuse—perhaps to instruct—the House, by giving them a specimen of the statements to which the hon. Minister adheres, and which he is not disposed to modify or alter. I must apologise to the House if my own unworthy name appears a little too prominently in some of the statements I am about to read. It was not I who introduced it. I find that by reports in his organs, the First Minister is represented, on a very recent occasion to have delivered himself as follows:—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

“He was an old Tory, the son and grandson of old Tories—and if it be true, as we believe, that grandfathers and fathers can look down upon what is going on among their descendants, how they would shudder, they who have sacrificed everything to their country and their Conservative principles, when they could see the honor conferred upon him because he had sold his party. (Loud cheers.) Ah, yes, gentlemen, he was a knightly man, was Sir Richard Cartwright. We know that knighthood is an order of chivalry, and that a knight should be a chivalrous man, and the first duty of every man is to be true to his allegiance, to be loyal to his party. (Cheers.) The duty of the knighthood, when occasion calls for it, is to surround the Sovereign and the Crown, and if necessary to fight in defence of that Crown. But Sir Richard Cartwright has set himself up as the champion of independence; he is set up to see how such a thing will be received by the people of this country. Mr. Blake will not commit himself to the policy yet; he will wait to see how the cat will jump—(laughter and cheers); and so they tried it the other day, and gentlemen, only think of it, the man who is a Privy Councillor of Canada, who has sworn allegiance to Her Majesty, Her heirs and successors—only think of it, the man who has accepted the order of knighthood at Her hands, who is supposed to have knelt at her feet, kissed Her hand and received the accolade on both shoulders—”

Now, Mr. Speaker, a question has arisen here of very great practical moment. I recollect, Sir, on the occasion that I received the honor of knighthood, I only received and the hon. Finance Minister only received the accolade on one shoulder. Now, I want to know, in my own interests and in the interest of the Finance Minister, in the interest of several of his own colleagues, has there been a mistake? Looking at the subsequent language of the hon. gentleman it may become an important question to the hon. Finance Minister and all the rest of us, who only got the accolade on one shoulder. Are we only half knights? I refer the question to the hon. gentleman, because knights of high degree, like the First Minister, are expected to be well up in the science of heraldry as well as of constitutional law. I refer to him—do knights of his high degree get the accolade on both shoulders, and do knights of the inferior order—Knights Commander—only get it on one? I only mention the question because, really, it seems to me that if it be otherwise then, Mr. Speaker (and I only venture the suggestion as a possible explanation of an otherwise inexplicable difficulty), is it possible that when the First Minister says he received the accolade on both shoulders, I say, is it possible he may have seen double? However that important question may be decided, and I commit it with all confidence to the Minister of Finance, who is interested with myself. It appears that the hon. gentleman continues:

“saying, ‘Rise, Sir Richard Cartwright, true, faithful and loyal’—fancy him preaching independence; fancy him casting aside the loyalty he has sworn to maintain and still flaunting the title of K.C.M.G.”

Up to this point the hon. gentleman had confined himself to simple prose, but here his feelings become too much for him and so he finally dropped into poetry, in the following remarkable fashion:—

“Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when reading of this I think of the language put into the mouth of Lady Constance by Shakespeare, when he addresses the Archduke of Austria, after he had caused Prince Arthur to be killed—

‘Now, cold-blooded slave,
Didst thou not speak like thunder on my side,
Being sworn my soldier, bidding me depend
Upon thy star, thy fortune and thy strength,
And dost thou now pass over to my foe?
Thou wear’st a lion’s hide—doff it for shame,
And hang a calfskin on thy recreant limbs.’”

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to the First Minister to say that that great rhetorical effort from which I have quoted, and of which I make no doubt the hon. gentleman and his friends are justly proud, abounds with passages like these, passages of equal stateliness of diction, of equal loftiness of thought, of equally exquisite good taste. These little outpourings, as one may say, of a thankful heart and mind, tinged probably with a little glow of after-dinner enthusiasm, do infinite credit to the First Minister. I know from old recollection that the First Minister was