

not only of this country but of the civilized world, in saying that the time has come when legislation should be adopted to prevent, if possible, the repetition of such horrible crimes as the one which was perpetrated last year. However, as the paragraph states that we should join our efforts to the efforts of the United States, I merely wish to make a reservation. The tone of the press of the United States at the time of the assassination of President McKinley, and since, does not warrant us, I think, in promising to follow them in whatever legislation they may choose to adopt. We should not forget that anarchy and its doctrines, and its apostles, were not bred by the exercise of free speech and action, but were bred by the exercise of tyranny; and we should take proper care in seeking to extirpate this evil that we do not create another evil. Sir, if anarchism has found its way to America and threatens to increase here, it is not so much by reason of the existence of free institutions as of the debasement of moral ideas in modern life. Unfortunately for the neighbouring country, while it has shown during the last century the greatest development of material resources and the most wonderful material progress, the American people have been constantly taught that the possession of wealth, the accumulation of wealth, the combination of wealth, is the one great ideal to which humanity should look forward, and under this teaching the way has been prepared for the development of these anarchistic theories. The evil cannot be cured by law alone. I think the existence of the evil is due chiefly to the education which has been given to the people. But as long as the nation insists that in the common schools of the country nothing but technical education should be afforded to the young, as long as the old principle is forgotten that at the same time a child is taught the elements of science he should also be taught the elements of the moral law and be guided throughout life by the fear of God and by strict adherence to moral and religious principles, I fear that very little improvement can be expected from the operation of any laws that may be adopted. I say no more on this subject; but, while talking about the United States I may say that I was very much astonished with one word that fell from the lips of the right hon. the leader of the government relating to the Alaskan boundary. The right hon. gentleman said:—

Neither have we mentioned in the speech of His Excellency, the Alaskan boundary matter, and the reason why we have omitted a reference to it is simply because it is to-day in the very same position it was in last year. It has made no progress since then.

And later on :

I have to say to my hon. friend—

Referring to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax).

That we have pressed as much as we could; nay more, I may say that we have pressed in season and out of season, on the Imperial authorities to bring that matter to a close.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an exact picture of the situation, but I think also that it is to be regretted that between last session, and this session, the British government have been brought to consent to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. And, to all appearances, this has been done with the tacit consent of the government, whilst the rights of Canada and the rights of Great Britain in the Alaskan boundary have not made one step of progress. I am not referring to what passed in the Anglo-American Commission as I am precluded from it, but I am speaking of what was the general impression in England, in the United States and in Canada. No later than the months of November and December last, the then Minister of Justice in this government, the Hon. David Mills, whose authority on constitutional and international matters cannot be disputed, published two most remarkable articles in the 'Empire Review' of Great Britain, stating that Great Britain could not and would not abandon her rights in Nicaraguan affairs unless compensation should be given Canada in regard to the Alaskan boundary. Where stands the question to-day? In the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Great Britain had rights with the United States affecting only the continent of America. And she has now abandoned those rights without any regard to the interests of her Canadian subjects, and has not exacted anything for them. The only other treaty where she had purely continental rights, there was a proper cause for the application of the Munroe doctrine, it was this one having reference to Nicaraguan affairs and to the Alaskan boundary in which American interests were at stake. There was no question of bringing America under European influences. There were two questions in which Great Britain and the United States had rights. It was always said—and so much so that last year it was a current issue in the public press of the United States—that the stumbling block in the way of repealing the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was the obstinacy of the Canadian government in refusing, and refusing very rightly and very properly, to consent to the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without compensation being obtained from the United States in the matter of the Alaskan boundary. However, a motion is on the Order paper for the correspondence relating to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and I hope that sound doctrine which was so well exposed in the British press by the late Minister of Justice will be made clear so that we will know the reason why the situ-