

a voice in the conduct of that policy, that we are to be responsible for everything while having no voice in the conduct of anything? That was not what on more than one occasion—I have simply mentioned the principal one—was stated at the conference, and stated not by colonials but by men who knew that it would never work with Anglo-Saxon people to have in any sense taxation without representation.

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend admits the soft impeachment. But, does it not strike hon. members of this House that if we are going to carry out this policy that is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, we will become responsible generally and severally with the people of the British Isles for the whole foreign policy of the empire without having a voice in the formation of that policy?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend admitted that himself a moment ago, because he said that it would come by-and-by.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not concerned with my hon. friend about that. I am interested, for the moment, in my hon. friend's relations with the hon. member for North Toronto. I will deal with the other matter directly.

Mr. MONK. You had better attend to your own divisions.

Mr. MACDONALD. Now, the gentleman who made this statement, might I say the windmill against whom the Prime Minister tilted, as described by the hon. member for North Toronto, was the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who just sat down.

Mr. MONK. And himself a year ago.

Mr. MACDONALD. And the hon. member for North Toronto had the audacity to say that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had never used any of these words at all. He said that the tilting of the Prime Minister against these words was a pure figment of the imagination, that nobody had every uttered them anyway. I do not know whether the hon. member for North Toronto regards the gentleman who sits behind him as nobody, or whether he regards him only as a windmill. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier goes down to Quebec, and, in conjunction with his ally, Mr. Bourassa, wants to propound all those theories that the hon. member for North Toronto says there is nothing in. Rag baby autonomy! If it is a rag baby, it is a very serious kind of a baby. If the hon. member for Western Ontario who has just interrupted would sit down and read the speech delivered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, he would not think that it was any rag baby, but he would realize that it was a very live kind of baby. I do not think the hon. member for North Toronto paid his colleague behind him the

compliment of listening to his speech. I do not think that he read it, because if he had, I think he would have avoided the utterances which he used in regard to that hon. member. I quite concede that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, if he thinks the autonomy of this country is imperilled in any way, has the right to state his position before the House, but he has no right to be ignored by one of the joint leaders of the party, who turns around and tells him that nobody had ever made use of these arguments in this House. But, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier need not worry; the hon. member for North Toronto was tilting with everybody, and he used language as reckless with regard to several other hon. gentlemen as that which he used in regard to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

We hear something about a plebiscite. I wonder if the hon. member for North Toronto is in favour of having a plebiscite about the question as to whether we should give \$25,000,000 to the empire? We have not heard anything about that. Because we propose to spend \$11,000,000 among Canadian workmen, in Canadian workshops, and in developing the interests of Canada, forsooth, we must have a plebiscite; but when we take \$25,000,000 and let it go there is no need for a plebiscite at all. I notice that even the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has not extended his resolution to cover this \$25,000,000 that his friend the leader of the opposition proposes to give.

Mr. MONK. It covers everything, as my hon. friend will see if he reads the resolution. It covers the whole scheme.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend say that his amendment proposes that there should be referred to the people of this country the proposition of the leader of the opposition that \$25,000,000 should be given to the people of England?

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will read it he can understand it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I did read it with some care, and, according to the construction I put on the English language, I came to an entirely different conclusion. It is rather news to me if the hon. gentleman's resolution has any such meaning. His proposition is:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out.

He proposes to strike out the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, and in place of the proposal of the leader of the government he proposes to substitute this:

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion, that the Bill now submitted for its consideration change the relations of Canada with the empire and ought, in consequence, to be