

difficulty was under consideration and when, as was pointed out, I think, by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) we should hold to all these privileges until we on our side had obtained a just and fair treatment of our claims. Everything was given away without equivalent obtained. And I am wondering this evening after what has been told us, if what happened in regard to the Alaska boundary is true. Is it true that Lord Alverstone, after having agreed with our own Canadian representatives as to the judgment that they were about to give, went, the day after to the final meeting of the Joint Commission, and there to the intense surprise of Sir Louis Jette and Mr. Aylesworth, changed his award and gave out two valuable islands—valuable from a strategic point of view—without having re-conferred with his fellow delegates. How can we explain such a thing as that? Certain it is, in regard to that transaction, that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself stated that our representations were ignored, that the three men named by the United States government were not, as the treaty required, impartial jurists. My right hon. friend stated in this House that his government made representations at that time, and yet the British government proceeded to accept the nomination of these three representatives of the United States without paying any attention to our protest. Members of this House will recollect what the Prime Minister said at that time in a moment of, to my mind, just irritation. I merely mention these facts, and have no wish to go into detail. There are many other facts that might be cited to prove this claim that any man who says that we owe a debt of gratitude to the mother country in respect to these many transactions under which our territory has been greatly fragmented, is speaking of what he knows nothing about. But let us look for one instant at the internal work that has been done here. What of this pretension that if British supremacy is not maintained upon the sea, we cease to exist? I think that is carrying assertion a little far. Whatever we have in this country in the way of economic development or in the way of free political institutions is our own work. We built it up ourselves. And my right hon. friend will admit that, in the early days, we had to wrest concessions from the mother country. The Act of 1774, the Constitution Act of 1791, the responsible government of 1848, the different Constitutional Acts of a later day, confederation itself—were these things originated in England and brought out here for execution? Let us be fair; they were carried out by our own people. Our own

Mr. MONK.

people framed the confederation and brought it to England for sanction. Our own people extended the confederation from one side of the continent to the other. And the merit of England is that she recognized, as Spain did not, that, unless she entered upon a Liberal policy with her great dependencies she would have to submit to the fate that ultimately overtook Spain itself.

I would not open the chapter of 1837 as my right hon. friend has done. But I must confess to my friends from the province of Quebec, on the other side, not that I think them more intelligent than my friends of English origin on this side, that it is a surprise to me that they who know what it has cost us in blood, and sacrifices, and money, the liberties which we have earned, should treat so lightly, in such a childish manner, the scheme which has been brought before us to-day, and which, to my mind, inflicts a grievous wound upon the self-government which cost us so dear in the province of Quebec. I say that is to me a subject of surprise. It is not so long ago that men were thrown into jail for claiming just such things. There is not a man in this House who would continue to live in this country if he did not enjoy what was asked for by the ninety-two resolutions. I would not live in a country which did not possess the full enjoyment of what was claimed by those resolutions. Yet men were thrown into jail for claiming that which we could not live without to-day—no accusation, on suspicion, respectable men, honest men, put in jail for more than a year, and then released with nothing against them. Others were sent to the scaffold. I have been intimately connected and related with men who were not French Canadians, the counsel and defenders of those men at that trial, and I can say this from information received from them, men who have obtained a high judicial position in this country, that that trial left upon them many bitter reflections. Think of an officer, being a good hand at sketching, sitting down and sketching with levity a picture of one of those men hanging on a scaffold, showing it to his neighbour, before the trial was terminated. But I do not want to enter upon those events to-day. I will say this, however, that if this system of branding a public man of honest convictions as an ingrate, as a coward, continues, I will reopen that chapter, and say things which I believe will silence them for ever.

In all those discussions at the imperial conferences it has struck me that our representatives seem to have been impressed with the desire of giving every thing and claiming nothing. Whether my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who I regret to see is not here,