

railed against this government because this Naval Bill is lacking in all these considerations which ought to be present if the interests of England were to be protected. Now, which of them is right? Is the leader of the opposition right or is the member for Jacques Cartier right? If these gentlemen hold their views honestly and sincerely it is absolutely impossible for them to work in concert. One of them must be wrong; there is no use trying to preach peace, peace, when there is no peace. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier cannot honestly work in harmony with the leader of the opposition, because the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier are absolutely and diametrically opposed to everything which the leader of the opposition said he believed. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier disclaims any desire to make trouble, and he agrees with something in the resolution of the leader of the opposition. What part of that resolution is it with which he agrees? Does he agree with the proposition that we should send over \$25,000,000 to the home government?

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend is as intelligent as I believe him to be, surely he understands that the part of the resolution which proposes a plebiscite is the part with which I agree.

Mr. MACDONALD. That then is the only part, and we are to understand that he does not agree with the proposition of his leader that we should send \$25,000,000 to the mother country?

Mr. MONK. I will give my views at the proper time.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then this great tribune (Mr. Monk) who has been leading his people along certain lines, who has been telling them what their duty is with regard to this question of the navy, is not prepared to tell them whether he is in accord with his leader or not on the question of sending \$25,000,000 to the home government. My hon. friend presented a petition this afternoon. I do not know whether that petition was against sending the \$25,000,000 or against our building a Canadian navy, but I hope that, after he gets into conference with his friend and ally, Mr. Bourassa, he will be able to tell us just where he does stand on this question. In any event he does not stand behind his leader, and I say that he had no right to invoke in this House the memories of the heroes of 1837. Nor had he any right to charge the men who are supporting the government from the province of Quebec with having voted against his resolution in 1905 in connection with the French language in the northwest. He had no right, on a question such as this, to appeal to any sentiment of that kind.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD.

Mr. MONK. Why had I no right?

Mr. MACDONALD. Because my hon. friend was raising the question of race in this country.

Mr. MONK. I defy my hon. friend to point to a single instance during this controversy in which I have appealed to race or anything of that kind. I defy those who are applauding him to prove it. I have been before my constituents, and I have not spoken anywhere else except here.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has the right, as every free man has, to say what he thinks in this House, but he has no right to conjure up in his address the heroes of 1837 in order to give point to his contention that the autonomy of this country is becoming in any way imperilled by the measure before us. In so doing he declares his dissent from the opinions of his own friends. He puts himself diametrically in opposition to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who has said that this autonomy business is nothing but a rag baby anyway; and when he seeks to import into this discussion the men of 1837, he is simply raising the racial cry.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows nothing about it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I have the same rights here as my hon. friend. I come from a race of men who, in the little province of Nova Scotia, fought the battle of responsible government, just as did my hon. friend's compatriots in the province of Quebec. Our fathers in Nova Scotia won that battle, and won it a little earlier and without any particular display, but we won it nevertheless, and it is just as dear to us as it can possibly be to the people of any other province in this Dominion. But what I complain of particularly on the part of my hon. friend is this language which he used on February 3 in this House:

I have seen these gentlemen in this House—

(Referring to Liberal members from the province of Quebec.)

—vote against the maintenance of the rights that were claimed for the minority in the organization of the new provinces of the west, I have seen them vote against the maintenance of the right which all parties in this House admitted to exist with regard to the French language in these provinces when at one time I moved for the maintenance of the strict right of the French Canadian to speak—only to speak—in that language in one of the assemblies of this province.

What possible relevancy has the use of the French language to do with the question as to whether we ought or ought not