

the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) would see that the signatures are exactly as provided for in the Treaty. In the Treaty, instead of enumerating in the preamble those through whom the contracting parties act, the form has been adopted of saying "the undersigned, acting under the powers conferred upon them by their respective Governments, have come to the following agreement." It is unfortunate that the signatures of the plenipotentiaries do not appear in the copy as printed. As far as the British Empire is concerned, just as in the other Treaty, the same signatures are of the same plenipotentiaries, acting in the same capacities and acting for the same component parts of the different nations of the Empire, appear.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am perhaps led astray by the heading of the document, which says:

Agreement between the United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, and France, of the one part, and Germany, of the other part.

An ordinary man with nothing but ordinary foresight would expect that that document would be signed by the parties mentioned on one side or the other side, the great powers mentioned, and Germany. There being no reference at all either by inference or otherwise to Australia, New Zealand or ourselves as dominions, I naturally thought it would be unnecessary for us to give our assent.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is the British Empire that is making the contract. Therefore, all of the nations that compose the British Empire sign it. That is the simple explanation. The British Empire is not one thing and Canada and Australia other things. The United Kingdom, the Crown Colonies, Canada, Australia, etc., make up the British Empire and we, in order to have the signature of the British Empire, must have the signature of each one of the distinct self-governing nations which compose it. That is the reason why we sign.

Mr. McKENZIE: Without desiring to enter into any new discussion, I do wish to put myself on record in the most emphatic way as saying that I do not agree with the argument of the learned Minister of Justice that the consent of the British Empire to an international treaty cannot be effectually obtained without the dominions signing separately. With that proposition as a principle of international law I do not agree. It is a practice that seems to

have arisen at a very recent date. For many years the British Empire, or Great Britain, has been making treaties, and it was not the custom to make any difference between the British Empire as a party and any of its dependencies or dominions, or any of its parts by whatever name they might be called.

The practice seems to be growing now that each division of the Empire is to sign by itself; but as a member of this House and a lawyer of some practice and experience, I contend that the moment the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain are authorized by the King to sign the Treaty for Great Britain, or for the British Empire, and do sign, that is binding on all of us. Perhaps it is no harm for the other plenipotentiaries to sign, but I view the matter exactly in this way: If I undertake to buy a piece of property from John Brown and his wife, the property being vested in John Brown, the moment that John Brown and his wife sign that deed and deliver it to me I have all the title in that property that they own. If would be a matter of sentiment for me to ask the children to sign, so that possibly after John Brown and his wife died they would be estopped from saying that their parents had not signed the deed, but I do not think it would in the slightest degree affect the validity of the title which I have obtained from John Brown and his wife. That is the way that I regard the present situation. We are a component part of the British Empire, we enjoy the protection of the great Empire to which we belong, we are subject to its laws, and we take advantage of every privilege that that great combination of nations or dominions brings to us as citizens of that great Empire; and if the King and those representing him sign this document, I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is binding on the whole Empire. Perhaps, as a matter of practice, the other procedure is better; but I submit that according to international law and practice, which has been handed down through the ages, when one plenipotentiary does sign on behalf of the Empire we all fall in and it is binding on us.

I wish to make perfectly clear at this point, and it may be my only opportunity of doing so, my own attitude in connection with this matter. The President of the Council (Mr. Rowell), who is a temperance man and a Godly man beyond most of us, and who thanks God that he is not like other men, should bear in mind that one of the duties of such a highly-favoured citizen of this country is not to bear false wit-