

Supply—Lausanne Treaty

matters of international policy. If I have now proved, Mr. Chairman, the undesirability and the impracticability of this policy, its absurdity should be evident. Surely it is absurd to continue with a policy that is undesirable and impractical.

But let me press the absurdity of the policy a little before I finish. Let me refer to a few matters mentioned in the *Manchester Guardian* of May 30th, 1924. I want to refer to these because they are of comparatively recent date and because they are dealt with in one issue of one paper, which is an indication of the numerous matters that Canada would have to be consulted about if she is taking her place on the equal status that has been claimed for her by some hon. members who adhere to the consultation policy.

First it says in this paper that Turkey and Great Britain have been
1 a.m. negotiating about Mosul. Did I hear the hon. member for Battleford (Mr. McConica) say that Mosul was a new kind of breakfast food? No, he is not in his seat; it could not have been he. Perhaps some other hon. member said so. In fact, it may be a new kind of breakfast food, I am not certain. But we have been informed that it is a state somewhere in Mesopotamia. Then there is Nepal, only one of some five hundred other states just like it and that they may all want to negotiate treaties with Great Britain. But to return to Mosul; the fact is, that Great Britain is now negotiating about Mosul. What has Canada to say about that? Has Canada been consulted about Mosul?

There are two main points about this Mosul business that are of great importance. The first one is the freedom of the Arabs from Turkish rule, promised by Britain as a war promise. What is Canada going to do in this regard? The second point is that at the San Remo conference of April, 1920, Great Britain accepted a league mandate for Iraq, and at present there is a deadlock between the negotiating parties. Can Canada break the deadlock? if so what is she going to do it with? If we are to continue this policy of consultation, surely we have a right to ask that those responsible tell us what they are being consulted about, and what advice they are giving.

Next, we are told in this same paper that the Anglo-Russian conference has been going on for about six weeks; that they have now exhausted the possibility of further progress by discussion and have come to a proposal concerning a draft treaty. Has our Prime Minister been in close touch with all that has been discussed at that conference during these six weeks? Has he been consulted

about them? If not, then is it not absurd to talk about Canada being taken into consultation? Then there is a treaty between Great Britain and Iraq. No, Mr. Chairman, I did not say hay rack: you spell it with an "i", Sir, and you finish it with a "q",—and that is the means, I presume, by which we shall put an "English" on it. It is not a hay rack; I have been told by a very well informed person that it is another name for Mesopotamia. Well, this treaty will settle the main lines of the government of that country for four years to come. Has Canada been consulted about that? If so, what is Canada going to say about it? Do you not see the absurdity of the whole thing, the utter absurdity of maintaining a policy of this kind?

Again, a settlement has been arrived at between the British and Italian governments on the Jubaland question. This question was originally launched by the pact of London of 1915. What do we know about the Jubaland question? What do we know of the pact of London of 1915? What do we want to know about it? I am sure we want to know about it just as much as we do know about it, which is nothing. If Canada is to have any relations with other countries and particularly with Europe, and if such relations are to be intelligently entered into, and to involve responsibilities, then Canada must deal directly with such countries herself and not in any roundabout, second-hand way under the name of consultation.

Mr. PUTNAM: Cannot the hon. member conceive that Canada's wisdom may be consulted before these questions become acute and troublesome?

Mr. IRVINE: I am afraid Canada will be bound to some policy before she is asked any questions at all. That is the situation. If these questions did not involve perhaps war for Canada in the next ten or fifteen years, or less, I would not be interested, but the trouble is, according to the statements of both the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, that Canada is to be held responsible for every treaty that is signed by His Majesty the King, and he is signing treaties about many matters now. We have been told by the leader of the opposition that we ought to be taken into consultation about these matters. Therefore I am speaking right to the point. My boys may have to fight over this Jubaland business, and I want to know what the government of Canada is doing with regard to this matter. It is not merely a matter of talking at this hour of the night. I am extremely interested in this

[Mr. Irvine.]