

or others is always preferred to the interests of constituent states, or outlying provinces.

Another explanation of British generosity, where our interests alone are concerned may be found in that cynical maxim of de la Rochefoucauld—that Providence has given every one sufficient magnanimity to enable him to be liberal with the goods of others.

But recrimination is useless—or even worse—so long after the event. The things done in the past must not be judged by present rules, and could not recur under our present status—without our consent. That is enough.

There have been many instances, no doubt, if we look for them when the material interests of this great domain of ours could have been better served than they were by the Home Government having them in charge. It is easy to see that now. It is so easy to be wise after the fact.

The alleged neglect of the rights of our Seal Fishers by our dominant partner still rankles here against England, pardonably enough, in some quarters, though strangely enough, while the guardians are blamed, the real oppressors seem to have been readily forgiven.

THE ALASKA BOUNDARY AWARD

The strain of the Alaska boundary award was a little stronger, and is perhaps the last straw of the kind that the "camel's back" would bear; or the last frontier sacrifice that our relations with London would patiently sustain.

Lord Alverstone in that case may have been guilty, as alleged, of grave discourtesy to his two distinguished Canadian colleagues by changing front in the face of the enemy; by moving his gun overnight from one shoulder to the other, in order to placate the adversary, without first consulting with his friends. But never in such case would Canada consent, nor be asked, to arbitrate a territorial claim when half of that Board of Arbitrators she had amiably accepted, were men who had already declared themselves openly on the very first question in dispute. The refusal of our signature to that document may be our permanent protest. But it came too late.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

Now we may all exclaim against the Foreign Office for not protecting us sufficiently in these past diplomatic negotiations, and on international commissions. And this is what this polemist has done. But protecting us from whom? Let us ask? For if we have called in the protector it was because our liberties were invaded. Who is it that has intrigued against us, and taken our frontiers and our fisheries, our outlets, our resources and our rights in the defence of which Britain is accused of not having taken sufficient interest nor acted with sufficient zeal?

And in all this fault-finding with our parents, or our partners, or our Imperial guardians—who do not much care what names you call them—how comes it that they alone are reproached? And that we do not hear one word of reproach against our amiable neighbors whose aggressions have been the cause of all our appeals for imperial protection, and our complaints of imperial neglect?

YET CONSIDER—"WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN"

The Behring Sea matter, the Alaska boundary award, our Atlantic fisheries dispute and our Fenian Raid Claims constitute the gravamen of the charges laid by our learned friend. But if these amiable enterprising and purely commercial neighbors of ours—of whom we might say, not unkindly, but more correctly, that blood is much thinner than water—have always put it over us, or imposed upon us, as it is claimed, in all these cases, despite the diplomatic ability of Ottawa and of Downing Street combined, then let me ask, what would those past masters of bargaining not have done to us poor defenceless Canadians, outnumbered ten to one, if we had been left to deal with them absolutely alone and unprotected? What they would not have done to us might fairly be left to

the imagination. And fancy could be stimulated by reference to the steady absorption of adjacent or contiguous territory such as the Mexican, the Maine, and the Oregon boundaries; violation of the sacredness of our sealed ships stores, in their harbours, and barring our free access with supplies to our own people in the Yukon today.

BRITISH BLUNDERS

Now, first of all, I am not about to deny any of the charges laid by my learned friend against Downing Street for British bungling, British diplomatic ineptitude, in the sacrifice of Dominion frontiers, rights and interests—sacrificed to satisfy the insatiable and to placate the implacable.

And I may be allowed to digress here to regard our foreign policy for a moment. For it concerns us and the subject in hand. Mr. McCrossan nor I need not be looking backward in order to find fault with the Imperial policy. I do not believe it was ever more tortuous or more inconsistent than at this moment.

FOREIGN POLICY

The Duke of Northumberland, a great Englishman and a good honest Tory—for you will admit that there are some such—remarked the other day in a notable speech in London that the neglected opportunities and the political blunders of Britain constitute the greatest tragedy of modern history. And I am certain of one thing, that if he were making that same address today after reading the illogical offensive bombastic bluff of our restless Foreign Minister, then his reflections on the foreign policy of his country would be still more severe. His Grace of Northumberland reminds us, how for four years we have steadily estranged our best friends and encouraged the dishonesty of our bitterest and most dangerous enemy. And that policy is another tragedy of history. Until at last, after doing his best to embroil the Empire, and to draw Canada and her sister dominions into a senseless war

THE Rat Portage Lumber Co.

LIMITED

Lumber Manufacturers

DOUGLAS FIR, SPRUCE, CEDAR
and HEMLOCK

We Specialize in

AIR-DRIED CEDAR SHINGLES

ESTIMATES GIVEN FOR HOUSES AND OTHER
BUILDINGS

Phone—Bayview 354

OFFICE AND YARD

1816 Granville St. Vancouver, B.C.