

hon. gentleman would make the whole of Canada independent of the whole of that Act. 'Independence for me,' says the Prime Minister; 'independence for me,' says the Bill we are considering. But, 'the lack of independence for us,' say the slavish supporters of both. So that this Bill, I say, is void in conscience and in principle. This House has no authority to alter or overthrow the constitution; this House has no mandate from the people to change the relations between Canada and the motherland, this parliament was elected to make new laws, but not to make a new constitution. This parliament has no autonomous right—oh, how they love that word, 'autonomy'—to change the constitution of Canada. This parliament was elected by the people of Canada as their trustees. The people of Canada are our masters and we are their servants, and we have no right, without a mandate from those masters, to change the relationship and weaken the tie that binds this country to the motherland. If this parliament, or any parliament, were to introduce a Bill to do away with the appeals to the privy council, or, as the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) would seem to wish, to do away with the Royal assent and the services of the Governor General, would any man assert that such an act would be valid? Would any man be insane enough to assert it? And, would the insanity of that assertion be mitigated by the insertion in the Bill of the provision that the government 'may' allow appeals to the Privy Council, the government 'may' treat the Governor General as the King's representative? Everybody will admit that it would not. As well might a man imagine that the blow by which he destroys his wretched body at the same time annihilates his immortal soul, as for this House to imagine that by the abuse of its own constitutional rights it can destroy the King's power in this country.

Of course, the right hon. gentleman the leader of this House assumes, and perhaps rightly assumes, that the home authorities, especially in the present crisis, will not openly and actively resent this invasion of their rights. 'His ambition, he tell us, is to exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by the consent of both countries, and in such a way as to preserve the good feeling and good will of the motherland.' But what a time, Mr. Speaker, is this to make that exhibition, and what an exhibition! The present now, when there is a call, unvoiced it is true, but none the less urgent, a call from Great Britain to her own protected kith and kin across the seas, not a call to build separate navies, that cannot fight in defence

of the empire, and perhaps would not if they could, not a call even to help Great Britain—Great Britain has yet to utter the Macedonian cry—but a call to help ourselves, a call to be men, a call to share in the glory of preserving the peace of the world, to share in that glory by giving and giving at once not to the royal navy, but to the imperial navy, by giving to that navy a giant that no rival power will dare to test. Why not forego our lip loyalty and hearken to that call? Why not, with the faith of freedom, make that sacrifice for the sake of ourselves and the world's peace? And we shall find that the new wine of Canadian patriotism will burst the old vessels of the constitution and will give us and the other dominions across the seas, better than anything else and quicker than anything else, the right to prompt the mother's voice when it speaks abroad, and that before we have even had time to settle down to a permanent naval policy.

Separation and independence! That is not the tendency of the time, the great force of the age is democracy, and it is a federating force. Amongst its great works are the federal union of the states to the south of us, the union of this great Dominion, the union of the Australian commonwealth, and more wonderful still, the recent union of the South African colonies. The task to which democracy will next address itself will be that of moulding the different parts of the British empire into a closer and firmer union under one kingly head. But the right hon. gentleman the leader of this House, would reverse the hands on the dial of our destiny, he would block the wheels of democratic progress. Why not, Mr. Speaker, close now, and close for ever, the gate that leads to separation and independence? Why not give, and give now, according to our means? Why not give, and give now, to that imperial navy which all admit is the best guarantee, and in fact the only guarantee, of our permanent peace and of the empire's peaceful progress? In support of his policy of a permanent navy independent of the imperial navy, the right hon. gentleman goes gunning for authorities. The only author in the old land that he can find is Kipling:

Daughter am I in my mother's house, but
mistress in my own,
The gates are mine to open as the gates are
mine to close,
And I set my house in order.

Thus the poet makes Canada speak. Of course every school boy knows that the gates to which the poet refers are the customs gates, and the lines were written merely to point out that each country has absolute control of its own tariff. But does the right hon. gentleman not know that out-