

of giving any consideration to the matter in its far-reaching inter-Imperial and international bearings. I think that is not the course which the Government should have taken. Parliament should have been fully apprised of and given opportunity to discuss the essential matters relating to this far-reaching step before the Government came to any final decision in connection with it. (1)

Mr. Fielding also demanded full information respecting the negotiations, moving an amendment in supply on May 17th. (2) A considerable debate ensued, and Mr. Fielding's motion was defeated by a small majority. The subject came up again upon the consideration of the estimate for representation at Washington on June 20, 1920; a debate ensued, and Mr. Mackenzie King moved to reduce the amount by \$30,000; the motion was negative by 57 votes to 32. (3)

On May 10, Sir George Foster had replied that "all papers in connection with the negotiations will be brought down as quickly as possible and presented to the House." Apparently, however, this was not done. In the following year, Mr. Meighen asked Christie, his Legal Adviser, to ascertain what copies of correspondence could be brought down, and Christie advised that none should be released, as they were privileged and involved three governments. On April 21, 1921, Mr. Meighen told the House of Commons that the correspondence could not be tabled. (4)

(1) House of Commons Debates, May 10, 1920, III, pp.2177-8.

(2) Ibid, pp.2422-4.

(3) Ibid, Vol.V, p.4533.

(4) Ibid, April 21, 1921, p.2490.