

She has guaranteed Greece as a monarchical and independent state by the treaty of 1832 and 1863 and the perpetual neutrality of the Ionian islands also by the treaty of 1863.

She has especially guaranteed as against Russia all the Ottoman (Turkish) possessions in Asia, engaging to defend them by force of British arms, in the treaty of 1878.

She has engaged to 'respect the independence' of the Sultan of Muscat (on the south shore of the Gulf of Oman, near the Indian ocean) by the declaration of 1865, and to 'promote the integrity and independence' of Persia by an agreement with Russia embodied in correspondence extending from 1834 to 1888.

And most especially and most repeatedly has Great Britain guaranteed her most ancient ally, Portugal, to defend and protect that country itself as well as 'all its conquests or colonies'—an obligation which seems to extend to Delagoa bay in Africa—by various treaties beginning as far back as 1373 and coming down to 1703.

'Thus,' says Mr. Bowles, 'singly or together with other powers, Great Britain is under the most serious and solemn treaty engagements with respect to Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Sweden, Turkey, Portugal, Greece, Muscat, Persia and China—engagements which might at any time only be capable of being carried out by force, and for the forcible carrying out of which all her power might not be too much.'

I mention these things because, so far as I know, they present a feature of the case which has not been insisted upon during the discussion up to the present moment. Now, I say that we guarantee the integrity of the empire—that is the way I understand this agreement—that is what we do, and why endeavour to conceal the existence of the obligations we are assuming? We receive no guarantee as to the maintenance of the integrity of our own Dominion. Most important of all, we have no voice of any kind in the conduct of imperial affairs, while being bound by imperial obligations towards foreign countries. We become liable to the political and financial results of those obligations, without any representation, or administrative responsibility. I say, therefore, that, by this policy, we associate ourselves with Great Britain as a world power, deeply interested in and responsible for international happenings in every part of the world, and obliged to exercise continual vigilance upon our part. Let me quote to the House what is said on this point by a newspaper of Ontario, 'The Weekly Sun,' of the 26th of January last:

Some points arise out of the discussion that call for special consideration.

The first was contained in the speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; the second in what was said by Mr. Monk.

The premier said that when Britain is at war Canada is at war as well. This has always been true in a theoretical sense, but it will become most emphatically true, in a very practical way, if the proposal to build a Cana-

dian navy is gone on with. During the present generation Great Britain has been engaged in a dozen petty wars without so much as creating a ripple on the surface of things in this country. This was because the scene was far away, and Canada was not directly engaged. So long as we confine our forces to land forces Britain may engage in a very considerable war, with a distant country, without Canada also becoming directly engaged unless our parliament and people deliberately decide that Canadian troops shall be moved to the scene of conflict. If we create a navy the situation will be wholly different. A naval force will necessarily be on the sea; its officers, bearing the King's commission, will be under the same direction and control as officers in the royal navy bearing a like commission. The consequence will be that the moment Britain engages in any future war, that same moment, if a Canadian warship is within reach of the field of operations, Canada will, through her navy, become engaged as well.

The consequences arising from this situation were well stated by Mr. Monk. Canada will thus, without any control whatever over British diplomacy or British treaties, become liable to find herself at any moment plunged into war because of this diplomacy or as a result of these treaties. In other words, statesmen in Britain, who are not responsible to our people, who cannot be called to account at polls held in Canada, will be placed in a position to use forces armed and paid for by this country in any war Britain may choose to wage. We may at any time find ourselves actively engaged in conflict without our consent, and in a conflict, too, of which the Canadian conscience would not approve.

That is possible. The members of this House have heard of the China war which has been called the opium war. It was a war which was waged by England in order to oblige China to open her treaty ports to the opium dealers of India. There may have been some treaty obligation on the part of China, but, at any rate, that was the object of the war. Applying what I have just read to the case would it be with enthusiasm, that, having convoked parliament, the people of this country would engage in a war which must necessarily cost us at the very least some \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 for the purpose of forcing Ching-Ching-Chinaman to eat opium? I doubt it. To continue the citation:

Another consequence will arise from this situation, and one that was not spoken of either by Mr. Monk or the premier. Because Canada will be thus made responsible for British policy the attention of our people will be constantly diverted from our home affairs to British affairs. Canadian people are sufficiently complicated already. We have a wide stretching territory; the interests of one section of Canada are not always in accord with other sections; we have representatives of all races under the sun; we have enormous resources to develop. We require the wisest statesmanship and the most carefully thought-out constructive policy for the purpose of meeting the problems presented. If we are to be continually distracted by old-world poli-

Mr. MONK.