

opening up of plenipotentiary communication and arrangement between Canada and foreign countries; but I have yet to find anything done, or any plan promised for the future, for the strengthening of unifying influences and for the purpose of keeping this Dominion in such close touch and liaison with Great Britain and the other overseas Dominions as would carry out the second part of that understanding to which you have obligated yourselves.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But that remark of my honourable friend would apply to all the component parts of the British Commonwealth.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Yes, but I am addressing myself now to one of the component parts, and to an honourable leader of the Government in that component part. I listened very attentively to what the honourable gentleman laid down yesterday as the basic reasons why we should undertake these diplomatic alliances or arrangements, and he did not satisfy me at all. He gave us a story of the ambulatory and tutorial excursions of Sir Joseph Pope in Washington: it was interesting, but I could not help wondering whether such little difficulties as were met there could not have been overcome by a less drastic and less perilous excursion into the field of foreign diplomacy.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But that was the action of my right honourable friend and the Borden Government.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: We know that, but, after all, there were many policies advocated by the Borden Government to which the present Government has not felt itself obliged to conform. It is not the best foundation for my honourable friend to place himself and his Government upon, to say that Sir Robert Borden made such action possible.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: He settled all the conditions and the policy.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Now, I desire to say just two or three things with reference to that matter. Let us consider it just as a set of reasonable people, dissociating it entirely from party views or anything of that sort. Take the history of diplomacy in the past, and consider what it has come to be and what its functions are; then ask yourselves the commonsense question, has Canada any particular reason to adopt that system? Should it be adopted simply because it has been set up and still in a certain measure exists?

What were the objects of the old diplomacy, and what the conditions under which it was carried on? The appointment of diplomats grew out of the old custom of the monarch of one country sending to the monarch of another a special ambassador laden with sweet spices and other presents and bearing the message: "I hope you will be a friend of mine, as I desire to be a friend of yours." Those monarchs made themselves acquainted in a pleasant sort of way, one with another. Centuries intervened and ultimately there developed the appointment of resident or permanent diplomatic representatives of the sovereigns. Read the records of the diplomats, read of the conditions under which they worked, and you will see that diplomacy was the means whereby states which were in rivalry with one another, or which sought alliances in order to protect dynasties from aggressive operations, became acquainted and arranged concessions. The diplomat was sent to Russia by a British Government first to keep the British Government in touch with the policy of the Russian Government as regards security of nationalities, as regards the alliances that might be entered into with contemporary sovereigns, or as to how these alliances might affect British interests. The diplomat was to obtain and transmit to his Government that kind of information, all of it looking towards war or peace, or towards the alliance which was necessary in order to protect material interests and national boundaries. Those are in brief, though very ineffectually stated, the purposes and duties which diplomats were appointed to fulfil. Always there has been the idea that danger might come to their territories if such and such countries were to ally themselves against them; that they must prevent such offensive alliances and must try to get as many nations as possible in sympathy with themselves and in support of their policy. It was with war and dynastic interests and all that sort of thing that the diplomacy of old and the diplomacy up to the time of the Great War, was concerned, and it is most illuminating to read the revelations contained in the histories or biographies of the diplomats. Such conditions no longer exist. The old diplomacy is going out of date and the new diplomacy, widely different from the old, has taken its place. To-day, if there is a hint of difficulty in Serbia, we will say—if Jugo-Slavia and Italy are not on the best of terms, the diplomat, if he can be useful at all, may possibly be useful in negotiations at Belgrade or at Rome. But the present diplomacy does not wait for that. The thing that is done now is not to call in the diplomat, but to push