

into effect what he advocated the year before. When he came to power he hesitated as to what he should do. He went to the Old country to seek advice. We all remember that on his return from the Old Country everybody expected to have some immediate pronouncement from him as to his policy. It was expected that on his return he would make a declaration. The press representatives gathered around him when he first landed on our shores expecting to be able to give to the people the information for which they were impatiently waiting. But no information was forthcoming because he was 'unready' to give any information. Later on, when a banquet was given in his honour everybody thought that the silence which had characterized the hon. gentleman might be broken and that he would take the people into his confidence. But again he was 'unready.' Parliament met and it was expected that we would surely know something definite as to the permanent policy that the Government was going to adopt, but again we were doomed to disappointment. Again the Prime Minister was 'unready' and even to this day he is 'unready' to declare what is his permanent policy if he has any such thing as a permanent policy. So I think that the term 'unready' applies to him.

As we read British history at this date, we are mortified at the unpatriotic conduct of the English Kings of the tenth century. If this legislation goes through, the future readers of Canadian history will blush with shame for the Canadians of this day, who resorted to the miserable expedient of buying protection by a cash contribution, or, if you prefer it, a barter of this kind.

So sensible was the Prime Minister of the weakness of his contribution policy, and the fact that it is at variance with the principles of responsible government, for which the truly patriotic statesmen of Canada fought, that he sugar-coated the bitter pill with the suggestion that, while in England last summer, he secured some sort of voice in Imperial affairs for us Canadians. The memorandum of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Harcourt, shows how false was the claim thus made. It has been suggested by supporters of the Government, who try to meet the argument that this policy violates the principle of 'no taxation without representation,' that the dominions beyond the seas are to share in the responsibility of advising the Sovereign in matters of external policy including the declaration of war, and the conclusion of the terms of peace. But in this contention they deceive the people, for Premier Asquith, speaking on behalf of his Government at the recent Imperial conference, and replying to Sir Joseph Ward's proposition that the self-

governing dominions should be admitted to participate in the councils of the Empire, said:

For what does Sir Joseph Ward's proposal come to? I might describe the effect of it without going into details in a couple of sentences. It would impair, if not altogether destroy, the authority of the Government of the United Kingdom in such grave matters as the conduct of foreign policy, the conclusion of treaties, the declaration and maintenance of peace, or the declaration of war, and, indeed, all those relations with foreign powers, necessarily of the most delicate character, which are now in the hands of the Imperial Government, subject to its responsibility to the Imperial Parliament. That authority cannot be shared. Mark you the words Mr. Speaker 'that authority cannot be shared.'

It is admitted by Conservatives as well as Liberals that it is a retrograde step, that it is repugnant to our pride and self-respect to make contributions to tax ourselves for Imperial purposes, as this Bill in my opinion proposes to do, without having a say in the direction of that money, without having a voice in determining what wars our ships should engage in. The Government of Britain, through its premier, tells us we cannot have such a voice. And why? Let me answer in the words of Sir George Reid, the Australian High Commissioner, whose loyalty and true imperialism is unquestioned and unquestionable. This question being submitted to Sir George Reid: 'If the dominions contribute otherwise, will they not demand a large voice in the settling of questions of foreign policy?' Sir George made reply:

That question raises many matters upon which it is impossible to be dogmatic at present. Looking at things, as they stand at present, it seems to me that while it is easy to talk of sharing foreign policy between governments thousands of miles apart, it is also full of difficulty. A crisis might arise in the course of a few hours which would call for an instant decision, but if the Imperial brains are scattered all over the face of the globe, how are they to be gathered together in sufficient time to arrive at a united resolve? How are colonial statesmen, who have never been trained in diplomacy, to be expected suddenly to take a leading part in Imperial emergencies involving foreign relations? One thing is to be said about such a proposition, and that is that it is new. I myself would like some responsible statesman, instead of merely talking in this way, to suggest some definite scheme. Then we would be able to discuss the matter to some advantage. At present my profound conviction is that Australia would never dream of accepting a small part in some such scheme of Imperial control.

Do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, that if Australia would not be content to accept some small part in such scheme of Imperial control that Canada would be? He goes on: