

did he do in regard to the message which was sent on August 18; what did he do with regard to the message which was sent on August 20? Did they ever come here? Was it Canada's dealing with them which delayed reply to Sir Edward Grey? These are questions we must have answered by the men who argue that this policy of consultation is a good one and ought to be perpetuated. It would be interesting to know if Canada did receive a copy of these cablegrams.

But let us proceed. What happened after this? Germany was quick to take advantage of the position and very shortly afterwards two German warships, the Goeben and the Breslau, violating international arrangements of course, sailed into Turkish waters. When Great Britain protested Germany simply said, "Why, we are making up to Turkey the two ships which you have taken over." And in doing so Germany was hailed by the Turks as the country that merited their support, and Britain's diplomatic arrangements were dealt a very severe blow indeed. What was Canada's viewpoint at that time? Were we consulted as to how we should act in the case of these ships? Did Canada agree to Great Britain violating the principle of a contract—a contract which must be regarded by Britishers to be as sacred as the contract guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium—did Canada, I say, agree to the violation of that contract? Were Canadian statesmen consulted on it? Echo answers "were they?" If not what becomes of the consultation policy?

Another instance I have no doubt hon. members are all very well acquainted with—it is the Shatt-el-Arab.

An hon. MEMBER: What?

Mr. McMASTER: Perhaps it is a disguise.

Mr. IRVINE: The Shatt-el-Arab. Not being a Turk I may not be pronouncing it just right, but I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen who have been handling our diplomatic arrangements by consultation will be able to pronounce it correctly, because they must have had a good many dealings in this matter. Sir Louis Mallet complained by wire to Great Britain on October 12th, that two British men-of-war had passed up the Shatt-el-Arab. The reply came the following day that the British government were willing to discuss the passage of those ships in a friendly way. They claimed the legitimacy of the passage up this river—it is a river, by the way. Four days later Sir Edward Grey again telegraphed that it was not the intention of the Espiegle—that is, one of the

British ships,—to pass down again, but claimed that if she did want to pass down again they had a perfect right to do so on the grounds of reprisal. What opinion did Canada have on this point? This is one of the events which so complicated matters in Turkey at the time as to make it impossible for Sir Louis Mallet to gain the favour of Turkey toward the British cause.

Next we come to the question in Egypt; and this is the third point I wish to make in this regard. Egypt was admittedly a part of the Turkish Empire. The United Kingdom had enforced military occupation since 1882, the time of the bombardment of Alexandria, but from that time the United Kingdom had gradually advanced to the position of a sovereign authority. You can readily see the position when war was about to break out between Turkey and Great Britain. What was the actual position of the two powers? Did Turkey's sovereignty justify the entry of Turkish troops into Egypt, or had the United Kingdom the right to treat Egypt as if it were British territory? These were the questions with which those nations were struggling at that time. A number of telegrams were passing between the ambassador of the British government in Turkey and the British authorities in Great Britain in this matter. Was Canada consulted about the matter? Did we receive any of these telegrams? If so, did Canada agree to the decision of Sir Edward Grey in his telegram to Turkey of October 23rd to the effect that if Turkish troops crossed the frontier of a land in which Turkey was sovereign, that would mean a state of war with the three Allied powers? It would be interesting to know whether Canada had any consultation in this matter. Those who wish to verify these instances I have given will find the matters all very fully dealt with in the British Blue Book No. 13, of 1914, pages 1027 to 1205.

But let us come to more recent times. What of the last Imperial conference, which was attended by the present Prime Minister? I presume we are all aware that the policy of Great Britain and the international policy in Europe have changed materially since that conference was held. Let me quote a few sentences from ex-Premier Hughes of Australia. Dealing with this point, he says:

British foreign policy has changed in the last few months without the direct authority of the British electors. There is now a different policy towards France and Russia, and there probably will be another policy toward Italy and other countries. Australia is a part of the Empire but it has absolutely no voice in determining the new policy.

Here again we have an example of the failure of consultation by conferences to settle