

were a nation we would have consuls or consular agents to represent us in the different countries of the world. Everybody is aware that there are no Canadian consuls. If we were a nation we would not have to communicate with other countries through Downing street, we would be attending to our affairs as we thought best. I therefore say that no doubt can be entertained on this point and that we might as well surrender to the truth and keep on calling ourselves "colonials" and colonialists.

If we are colonials—and we are; if we are a colony—and we are; I fail to see why Canadian signatures appear on the treaty and what benefit the Canadian people will derive from entering the "League of Nations."

Far be it from me to criticise those nations who having the status of a nation, have thought it wise to enter this League. Their purposes are worthy: they want to unite their efforts in preventing the renewal of the most terrible disaster that the world has ever witnessed. No one can find fault with that. But it is a League of Nations, not a League of Colonies, and Canada being a colony has no status to take part in it. I may be retorted with this argument: "Why should you not be satisfied if all the other nations, England included, are willing to consider you as a nation and take you as such?" This to my mind is no argument. Such feeling of condescension may be a compliment paid to the valour and heroism of our gallant soldiers. It cannot be anything else. I am, however, more inclined to believe that it is a way by which English diplomacy wants to bring Canada by a pledge of this Parliament to participate in all future wars on the European continent or in other parts where British interests may be involved. If these are the purposes of the Imperialists, it is my earnest belief that we should be very cautious before pledging the people of Canada to such views, or to such policy.

From now on, the Tories say: "Canada is a nation, Canada has the status of a nation"! Who believes them? I do not. Do you want to test their sincerity? Just force them to vote on a resolution that in the opinion of this House Canada should be independent. You will soon come to the conclusion that the whole scheme of the Government is not sincere, does not and cannot stand. These men do not want to see Canada an independent nation, but they want Canada to have such close relations with the British Government that

they are ready to sacrifice our undeniable right to participate, or not, in wars which Britain may see fit to declare or enter. In other words, these men favour Imperialism, while I stand for Canadian autonomy—"Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in my own".

I have said that ratification of the Treaty and of the Covenant of the League of Nations can bring no benefit to this country, more so when we have, constitutionally speaking, nothing to do with it and when, in ratifying, we are affirming the will of Canadian people to enter any war without securing the people's assent. Let me further explain. The signing of peace on behalf of the British Empire is a prerogative of the Crown. The King himself signs, either in person or by others duly appointed by him for the purpose. In the case of the present Treaty, this principle is well recognized:

His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, by:

The Right Hon. David Lloyd George.
And for the Dominion of Canada by:
The Right Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, etc.

His Majesty, through the gentlemen above mentioned, has signed the peace treaty on behalf of the United Empire, which includes Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, Australia and India. Nothing else is required. The sole constitutional authority having given his signature, the contract entered into has been completed, no other signatures on behalf of Canada or for Canada could give more force and effect to the meaning of the Treaty.

Yet there appear other signatures; we find that the various British colonies are represented by men of their own, who have also signed as mandatories of the King, in the manner I have just read. How can this be justified is the question.

So far as the Peace Treaty proper is concerned, I have no fault to find with Canadian names appearing thereon, for in my opinion it means nothing, and I venture to think and to say that were it not for the Covenant of the League of Nations we would not have been called in a special session to ratify the one which includes the other.

Why is approval required if not because our representatives have the feeling that in subscribing to the Covenant of the League of Nations they have exceeded their powers, their jurisdiction in sacrificing Canadian autonomy when they had no authority to do so? Many articles of this