

question, because it involves a principle of profound importance to Canada and to the future of the world.

Now let me quote an editorial from the London Times, which may be encouraging to those of us in this country who hope for the time when Canada will not have to fall back on the policy of consultation, but that she will enter as a free nation herself into all necessary negotiations with other countries, without any advice from any Imperial authority. This is an editorial from the London Times, written in respect to a declaration of the Prime Minister of Canada, on Imperial relations:

This is unimpeachable doctrine. No one supposes that our community of nations can stand on any other foundation than their full and equal participation in this common heritage of self-government. And no one supposes that a nation is self-governing if it has no voice in the shaping of its foreign policy. It is doubtful, indeed, whether public opinion in the Dominions yet realizes how unreservedly the principle of equal status has been accepted in this country. Already, before the war, the old notion of colonial "dependency" had long been regarded as an anachronism. The war made it an absurdity. Englishmen may not be richly gifted with imagination, but at least they can see with the eyes of their fellow-members of the commonwealth as far as this—they can appreciate the grotesqueness of supposing that the men who fought at their side were not, for some reason or other, entitled to precisely the same measure of self-government in any field of politics as they themselves enjoyed. And when British ministers avowed and reavowed their acceptance of the principle of absolute equality they were merely saying what seemed obvious to the public mind. The dominions, nevertheless, still have their doubters. There are politicians and publicists in Canada and elsewhere whose language sounds like an echo from the early Victorian age. The weather-worn bogy of Downing-street despotism is still occasionally paraded. Even the Chanak appeal was represented in some quarters as a symptom of Imperialistic domination—a quite fantastic charge. For unfortunate as was its language and unwise its publication, yet, when all is said, it was nothing more than an appeal. It was not, as some of its critics seem to suggest, an order to march, a sort of Imperial Ukase.

These are ghosts from a buried past, and a modern-minded statesman like Mr. Mackenzie King is certainly not haunted by them. When he stated the doctrine of equality the other day, he knew that it is whole-heartedly accepted by the Imperial government. But the acceptance of a theory and the putting of it into practice are very different things.

If Canada, then, is to have a foreign policy, if there is to be any common sense in the Canadian foreign policy of the future, clearly this parliament must take such steps as will define the precise relations between Canada and Great Britain and when that relationship has been clearly established, let it be one in which we shall not be held responsible for a treaty which we were not consulted about, know nothing about, and want to know nothing about. Let me impress upon this House that this is the moment for us to act. It must be

obvious that if we have not now the courage to disentangle ourselves from the dangerous web of an anomalous position when there is no war, we shall be unlikely to do so when there is a war thrust upon us as a result of some nation violating part of the present treaty. If a war should arise out of this treaty that is being discussed here to-day, it will be argued when the time comes that Canada is bound by the treaty, and that to dissent from it when war is on will not only be dishonourable but will be treasonable to the Empire. It will be said that we would be deserting the Mother Country in a crisis, in short, we would be held disloyal to the king. I say if we cannot now have vision and the courage to extricate ourselves from the entanglements of Europe when the world is having a breathing spell between two wars, it is not likely we shall be able to do it when the war drums are beating. No, we shall not be able to do it then. Now is the time to do it. If a war should arise out of this treaty or out of some other, it will be represented as a blot upon our honour to refuse to fight in that war, and accept our obligations under the treaty. Those who at such a time may point out the truth that we never signed these treaties, were not consulted about them, did not ratify them, will be drowned in the uproar of war hysteria. But let us reflect, and reflect now, that if any such dread misfortune as war should be the outcome of this treaty at any time in the future, and the sons of Canada are called upon to defend what will be called the honour of our country, it will be in reality the dishonour of this parliament they will be defending, because we failed to have the courage to step out of these entanglements while we had the opportunity.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it proposed to go on with this item now?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the amount spent on sundries last year, and what is proposed to be spent this year?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The total for contingencies last year was \$37,000. This year the amount is being reduced to \$32,000, a reduction of \$5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can see that; that is not what I asked. I want to know if it is a real saving or only a paper saving. What was spent last year on sundries?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: For contingencies, Department of External Affairs, 1923-