

no voice at all in matters of peace and war? If so, I for one vote against being an appendage.

There is fortunately another alternative. There is the usual method of procedure when two nations wish to act together in case of war. They make an agreement about it. They do not interfere with one another's foreign affairs. One does not, usually, consult the other. One agrees merely to support the other in certain eventualities.

Are we ready to agree to engage in war with France, or the United States, or Japan? Are we ready to send contingents to fight with Germany? Are we willing — no matter what the cause of the war, even though it be one wholly opposed to Canadian interests? Are we willing — although at the same time settlement of our own quarrels is taken out of our hands and hushed down by generous diplomatic concession "in the interests of the Empire at large," as goes the customary phrase? If so, let us deliberately say so. For my part, I think we shall not say so.

And if we think such a position too humiliating, altogether too unworthy of a people twice the size of the United States on its first independence day, let us say that too, and let us, if we can, enter into some well-defined arrangement with the United Kingdom. Let the promises, and the powers, and the advantages, be mutual. Canada must some day have something to say upon the greatest of all national questions — the question of peace and war.

We cannot accept Mr. Chamberlain's idea of our duty. At the Colonial Conference of 1902, through the Colonial Defence Committee, he asked the colonies

"to give some assurance as to the strength of the contingents which they should be able to place at the disposal of His Majesty's government for extra-colonial service in a war with a European power."