

else. We have seen what Mr. Champ Clark said. I hear a laugh on the other side. Do my hon. friends find that a droll utterance? For my part I do not. We have that utterance coming from a man, who may be an incurable humourist, but who occupies a position very much the same as my right hon. friend does here, or as the leader of the opposition. It is true that the motion made in the House of Representatives by Mr. Bennett did not emanate from a man possessing similar authority: but from what I see in the United States papers, that gentleman holds a certain position in the Congress of the United States. His proposals were not accepted, but although they were condemned on many sides, they were treated seriously. The entire press of the country, the deliberations in the legislatures recently again—perhaps you saw in the reports of this morning the reference to the legislature of Dakota—lead one to believe that they at least, in perfect good faith perhaps, look upon the real question at the back of this agreement as a question of annexation. In our own newspapers it is very much the same thing. Led on by the discussions, by the trend of public opinion here, they are discussing that question in our own country, and when we read the reports which have arrived here, the telegraphic despatches from the other side of the Atlantic, we find that in England they have taken this question quite seriously, interpolations are made in the House there on the subject, and evidently the least one can say is that this phase of the question has created unrest in a country where we would be glad, I may say, to think that there is no doubt as to the attitude of this country.

Are we entirely blameless in this matter? Are the gentlemen who have brought about these negotiations, and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself able to throw stones right and left? We know what utterances in the past, because we have heard a great deal in and out of the House, have fallen in moments of forgetfulness, probably, from the right hon. gentleman. The difference between a British shilling and an American dollar, ripe fruit falling from the tree, continental free trade—all these matters have been dished up very often, and although I know my hon. friend is not an incurable humorist there was at that time some seriousness in what he said. And my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in that respect, has been a very hardened sinner, I think, because I have not heard him recant, when, time and again in this House, he has been charged with utterances, in the long ago days; of course, in favour of secession and annexation, I think, too.

Mr. FIELDING. I take exception to the statement of the hon. gentleman. When the hon. gentleman says that I was ever an annexationist he is fabricating a statement which no man in this House can substantiate.

Mr. MONK. I assure my hon. friend that I am very glad to hear him make that statement.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman should not be content with that; he should show some warrant for his statement.

Mr. MONK. I could show warrant, if we had the debates of the House in past years, for the statement, that time and again my hon. friend has been charged with holding and expressing in his province views of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend, I can assure him, is mistaken. I have never been charged in my presence until this moment.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend states that he has nothing to retract—

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

An hon. MEMBER. Send and get the book.

Mr. MONK. It will be all right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. MONK. With pleasure. But my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) himself, when younger, in his green and salad days, spoke in that way sometimes. My hon. friend knows it, but he has recanted, he has abjured and denied and the most rigid of casuists would find nothing that would be regarded as a blot on his reputation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. With the permission of the hon. member from Jacques Cartier, I will ask him to what he is referring?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has often been quoted, has he not, in the newspapers of the French language in our province, speeches of his own in which he spoke in the sense that I have indicated?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In what sense?

Mr. MONK. I have the whole paraphernalia here and I can get it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In what sense.

Mr. MONK. In the sense of annexation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I now rise to a point of order. I wish to state most emphatically that my hon. friend is in error. I have never, directly or indirectly, expressed any sentiment, by word of mouth or by writ-