“23rd July. Today I was introduced to the House of Lords and took my seat as a Viscount. As I took the Oath I thought of many things and one of them, I assure you, was of you and of the debt of gratitude I owed to you for making it possible for me to be there that day ... a Member of the Mother of Parliaments.”¹ So wrote one Canadian to another in the year 1941. The newly-created viscount was no less a personage than Richard Bedford Bennett,² now a permanent resident of England and far removed from the scene of old battles; the recipient of this almost fulsome note, a peer of twenty-five years standing, was William Maxwell Aitken, first Baron Beaverbrook of Beaverbrook,³ who just then was dividing his talents between Fleet Street and Whitehall. Lord Beaverbrook’s absence from the brief ceremony involving his old friend is readily explained, but Viscount Bennett enjoyed the support of a fellow-countryman nonetheless. At his side as he advanced towards the Woolsack was another viscount in the person of Hamar Greenwood,⁴ who had once been a cabinet minister under Lloyd George and more recently was treasurer of the Conservative party. Six other men with Canadian antecedents, had they chosen, might have witnessed this moment of glory in Bennett’s life by simply walking the few steps from the House of Commons.

This incident in itself is of little account, but the names involved point to the fact that from time to time Canadians have been active and even influential in British public life. Questions at once arise as to why these men were at Westminster, how many others from this country made the same journey, what role they played in British politics, and what effect, if any, they had upon relations between Canada and the United Kingdom. In the first half of the twentieth century their numbers alone were surprisingly large, including more than two score peers and elected members who either were born in Canada or had resided here sufficiently long to bear some imprint of this land. Admittedly this was hardly the kind of overseas representation envisioned by the Imperial Federation League or the Round Table
fraternity, but in an era when the concept of Commonwealth was replacing that of Empire even so slender a bond as this might have considerable value. And some of the Canadians who sat in Britain's parliament between 1900 and 1950 were men of considerable stature on one side of the ocean or the other. Andrew Bonar Law,\(^8\) product of a New Brunswick manse, became prime minister, and three others—Beaverbrook, Greenwood, and Dr. Thomas Macnamara—attained cabinet rank, while Lord Haliburton\(^7\) reached the top rung of the civil service. Several more looked back from the Westminster scene upon long careers in Canadian politics. Two of them, Edward Blake\(^8\) and Lord Strathcona,\(^9\) were giants of their age, and in addition to them we find such lesser figures as Charles Devlin,\(^10\) Donald Macmaster,\(^11\) and Joseph Martin;\(^12\) all five had gained parliamentary experience in the House of Commons at Ottawa, and four in provincial legislatures as well. Other names of interest to Canadians will be found on the list, which in all totals six peers and thirty-six members of parliament.

A glimpse at the earlier years of these men will help to explain their presence in the United Kingdom. Twenty-nine of the thirty-six who became M.P.s were born in Canada, and for purposes of analysis they can be divided again into three groups: seven who were only children when taken to live in Britain and for whom the move was an entirely involuntary decision; thirteen more who as adults went in peacetime in search of fresh opportunities or new careers; and nine who chose to remain there after military service had taken them overseas at the time of the Boer War or the First World War. By the first group of these expatriates Canada would be forgotten before long, for memories of childhood, however poignant, soon grow dim. So it was with Bonar Law, aged twelve when sent to Scotland for his education and upbringing, who never again saw the province of his birth (apparently he visited these shores only once). Little would distinguish him from a Scot born and bred, a fact to which Asquith testified in later years by observing tartly that he had “the mind of a Glasgow bailie.” Indeed Bonar Law’s one real connection with Canada was by virtue of his great friendship with Lord Beaverbrook, but even he with all his enthusiasm for Imperial solidarity failed to kindle a flame in Bonar Law’s chilly breast for the cause of “Greater Britain”.\(^13\) Like Bonar Law, several of the others who left Canada while very young—Harry C. Brodie,\(^14\) George M. Brown,\(^15\) and Ian Z. Malcolm—had little enough to remember. But always there are the exceptions. Group Captain Max Aitken,\(^17\) as his father’s son, could scarcely avoid reminders of his birthplace though he might seem English to the core, and Bartle Bull\(^18\) continued to have close ties with his Canadian relatives. Most remarkable among this little group was Dr. Macnamara, who by the tonal quality of his speech appeared to make
a conscious effort—mere pretence in one who was not specially interested in Canada or the Empire—to remind the House of Commons of his transatlantic origins.

Motives that had little to do with a parliamentary career accounted for the arrival in Britain of all but one of thirteen future M.P.s who had attained adult years before leaving Canada. Edward Blake alone (with the assurance of an Irish seat) had the House of Commons as his primary goal on departing, while the others made their way to Westminster by assorted routes of varying length. Lawyers, businessmen, writers, adventurers—all can be identified and their progress traced. To barristers in the several Dominions, the glitter and the gold of the English Bar and of Privy Council cases once proved a most attractive lure. Young Canadians such as Alexander Boulton and Hamar Greenwood attended the Inns of Court, and older hands such as Donald Macmaster and Joseph Martin sought to find in England the rewards which the legal profession at home did not provide. It was in fact with the specific intention of obtaining Privy Council briefs that Martin and Macmaster went to London in middle life. But the profession of law can be a fickle mistress, and none of these four acquired a great reputation as a counsel in his new surroundings.

Canadian businessmen, by contrast, often seem remarkably successful in transplanting themselves, and for Charles Rose, J. Allen Baker, and Garfield Weston their English ventures fared very well indeed. The first a banker, the second an engineer, and the third a manufacturer, they possessed sufficient affluence and free time to encourage their steps in the direction of politics. Rather different was the career of Alexander Haycock, whose perfervid pacifism caused him to pay something less than sufficient attention to his own commercial interests.

A remarkable diversity of vocations and achievements before entering Britain’s Parliament was exhibited by the other four men in this group of thirteen. Charles Devlin was a young Liberal M.P. at Ottawa when, following a breach with his leaders over the Manitoba Schools Question, he accepted the post of Canadian Commissioner to Ireland; but he soon forsook Dublin for the charms of Galway (whose member had just been sentenced for high treason) and thence made his way to the Irish Nationalist benches. An even more roundabout route to the House of Commons was that taken by the famous novelist Gilbert Parker, first a teacher and then a deacon in Canada, next a newspaperman and playwright in Australia, and finally a most successful author in England. Another who had tried his hand at more than one occupation was Lawrence Lyon, a practising barrister in Ontario and Quebec before becoming the proprietor of a London journal. And then there is Lord Beaverbrook, who as a thirty-year-old unknown landed in Britain with upwards of a million dollars in his pocket and a thirst for action in his soul. Jason’s gratification at locating
the golden fleece can hardly have exceeded that of Max Aitken upon discovering British politics. Although at the outset of his parliamentary career he was rather unkindly dubbed "the little Canadian adventurer who sits for Ashton-under-Lyne" by A. J. Balfour's private secretary, he nevertheless would have the last laugh on his detractors.

The final cluster of Canadian-born M.P.s, nine in number, present a somewhat more uniform appearance in terms of background and of their reasons for taking up politics. A phenomenon that might have been observed in 1902, again in 1918, and yet again in 1945 was that a number of service officers from the Dominions remained in England after war's end either to retire or to seek entry into public life. It was so with this group, all of them army officers in one or both of the South African War and the First World War, and five of whom held commissions in the regular forces in peacetime. Not unnaturally with this type of man, some came from families of more than ordinary wealth and social position; several, indeed, possessed names that at one time were household words in Canadian industrial and financial circles. Hamilton Gault,\textsuperscript{26} Herbert Holt,\textsuperscript{27} and John Molson\textsuperscript{28} belonged to wealthy and powerful Montreal families whose fortunes were built, respectively, upon textiles, banking, and brewing. But the first two men were listed as retired officers when elected to the House of Commons, and Molson in civilian life was a surgeon. Charles McLean\textsuperscript{29} went from a New Brunswick environment of politics and railways into the army and then to Westminster, while another M.P. from the Maritimes was Peter Macdonald,\textsuperscript{30} born into an old Nova Scotia family and trained for the law. Of the other four, Duncan Campbell\textsuperscript{31} and Alfred Critchley\textsuperscript{32} had both been regular officers before entering political life, although Critchley had a variety of other pursuits, while two with even more colourful backgrounds in terms of peacetime careers were Grant Morden,\textsuperscript{33} a company promoter, and Beverley Baxter,\textsuperscript{34} in turn a journalist, a newspaper editor, and a public relations man.

Another small group in the British House of Commons consisted of seven members who as boys or young men had come to live in Canada but for one reason or another remained for no more than a few years. Once again the effects of the First World War are apparent, as four of them went overseas with the army and did not come back after the armistice. Frank Collindridge,\textsuperscript{35} a miner, and William Leonard,\textsuperscript{36} a cabinet-maker, had just reached years of manhood when they arrived on Canadian soil, but within a decade both answered the call to arms and re-crossed the Atlantic. In the 1920's each man became a trades-union official and later followed a well-marked path to the Socialist benches in the Commons. William Duthie,\textsuperscript{37} a young Scottish bank clerk who emigrated to Canada shortly before the First World
War, also decided after 1918 to build a career in his native land, settling in London and going into business life. Rather like a bird of passage was Maurice Alexander,\textsuperscript{28} a young South African who studied law in Quebec and was called to the bar of that province, only to go overseas with the Canadian Expeditionary Force and remain in England. The last three men who were Canadians by adoption, if only for a short time, belonged to an earlier generation of Englishmen. Richard Fairbairn,\textsuperscript{39} for example, had not emerged from boyhood when his parents emigrated in the eighteen-seventies and settled in Toronto, but life in the new land must have fallen short of family expectations, for his adult years were spent in managing tramway companies in the Midlands. The other two had embarked upon careers in England before looking to North America, Shirley Benn\textsuperscript{40} in the timber business and Alfred Hamersley\textsuperscript{41} as a barrister. Although Benn seems to have prospered in his commercial undertakings and Hamersley achieved a position of some importance as legal adviser to the City of Vancouver, both returned to Britain and entered national politics in the Edwardian era.

The Canadian peers, as they can be called, occupy a peripheral place in this kind of analysis since their role and influence in British politics was quite small, and indeed sometimes non-existent. But their titles gave them the right to sit and to speak in the House of Lords, and so they too formed a part, however inactive or dormant, of Parliament. With one or two exceptions, these grandees apparently viewed the acquisition of a peerage as a fitting adornment to crown a successful career rather than as an opportunity for public service in a legislative body, but at least in that they were at one with many of their fellow peers. George Stephen,\textsuperscript{42} “financier and philanthropist” (as he is labelled in the Dictionary of National Biography), was already a baronet when created Baron Mount Stephen in 1891, and two years later he retired to England and acquired a country estate where he entertained frequently and on a lavish scale. An even more illustrious Canadian was Donald Smith, one of the most impressive figures at Queen Victoria’s diamond jubilee celebrations in 1897, and it was only fitting that to his knighthood there should be added that same year the title of Baron Strathcona and Mount Royal. Within a few months a comparative unknown who had been Permanent Under-Secretary for War in Britain, Sir Arthur Haliburton, a native of Nova Scotia and the son of Thomas Chandler Haliburton, received the same honour and took the family name for his peerage. No more Canadians entered the House of Lords from this time until the First World War,\textsuperscript{45} when in little more than a year Sir Thomas Shaughnessy\textsuperscript{44} of the Canadian Pacific Railway became Baron Shaughnessy and Sir Hugh Graham,\textsuperscript{45} who owned the Montreal Star and other newspapers, was created Baron Atholstan.
Both men were so honoured for their war services, but of course both possessed wealth sufficient to live up to the title. After that, nearly a quarter of a century would pass before another Canadian (who had not first been a British M.P., as were Aitken, Benn, and Greenwood) became a member of the House of Lords. That distinguished person, as we have already seen, was R. B. Bennett. Perhaps he was the last of his kind.

If the mere act of identifying these forty-two Canadians who were at Westminster between 1900 and 1950 suggests something of their importance, more can be learned from their political activities. To be, in modern politics, is to belong to a party, which means that the label matters greatly. Many of these men were Conservatives, including all six peers, however casual their associations with that party may have been in England. But the 36 M.P.s present an interesting diversity of loyalties, since they were divided into 21 Conservatives, 10 Liberals, 3 Socialists, and 2 Irish Nationalists. Little need be said of the peers as only two of them, Lords Strathcona and Bennett, made anything like a serious effort to attend and participate in the debates of the House of Lords. Politics, British politics least of all, were not the métier of one such as Lord Mount Stephen, and he was a silent observer on the rare occasions when he presented himself in the Lords. Even less concerned with legislative processes was Lord Shaughnessy, who could never be induced to play an active part in political life. Lord Strathcona, on the other hand, gloried in becoming a member of the “Imperial Parliament”, since he fancied himself the vanguard of an ever-growing band of Canadian representatives at Westminster. In 1898 he ventured to introduce a measure regarding the marriage of a deceased wife’s sister which the Lords passed; the Salisbury ministry, however, refused to proceed with it, and to this rebuff was added the disapproval of the Queen, who commented acidly that “his Labrador lordship should be the last to meddle in such affairs.” Lord Strathcona’s enthusiasm for British politics appears to have waned appreciably thereafter, and in the new century he came to be looked upon as something of a colourful anachronism. The last of the six peers, Viscount Bennett, displayed no less pride than Strathcona in becoming a member of the peerage, and though the year was 1941 he spoke of it in similar terms. For the six years of life that remained to him, this lonely and austere figure found some pleasure in the debates of the House of Lords, but his influence in British affairs was negligible.

In the House of Commons three of the four parties included Canadians whose names are likely to be remembered in at least one sphere of politics. The Irish Nationalists enlisted the services of the magisterial Edward Blake and the mercurial Charles Devlin who, if hardly comparable in importance, had had much experience
in Canadian public life. Each man maintained a lively interest in home affairs while in London, and Devlin, although he was a member of the British House of Commons at the time, even went so far as to return to his native province of Quebec to aid the Liberals in the federal general election campaign of 1904. In his few years as an Irish M.P. this volatile figure spoke in debates hardly at all, but he was most assiduous at Question Time, particularly on details that pertained to Canada. Blake, by contrast, seldom concerned himself with Canadian or Imperial affairs in the course of his parliamentary duties at Westminster, conceiving it his one task to advance the cause of Irish Nationalism. Thoughts of Canada were never far beneath the surface, however, and annual crossings to visit home and family and to renew old associations contributed to a certain ambivalence of purpose. Twice between 1900 and his resignation from the Commons in 1907 Blake did interest himself in matters vital to Canada, but as a lawyer rather than as an M.P. At Laurier’s request he acted as counsel in the Alaska boundary dispute, only to suffer a breakdown which forced him to resign his brief, and when his health had somewhat improved he sought an appointment to the British Privy Council in order to work on the Judicial Committee of that body. This elicited from Laurier the offer of the post of Chief Justice of Canada, which, however laudable as an idea, was rendered impossible by Blake’s rapidly failing health. Though his years as an Irish Nationalist leader may have been disappointing success, for our purposes the significant feature of Edward Blake’s career in British politics is that he steadfastly resisted all temptation and encouragement to make himself the voice of Canada in the House of Commons.

The Liberal ranks included ten Canadians between the turn of the century and 1924, by which year that strife-torn party appeared to be moribund. The men in this group were a heterogeneous lot; indeed the very diversity of their aims and ideas suggests a few of the reasons for the decline of British Liberalism in that era. Unfortunately, comparisons between their roles and influence in Canada and in England are almost out of the question, since nine of the ten had played no active part in the public life of this country. The exception was Joseph Martin, a coarse and unattractive political buccaneer whose short but strong views involved him in fierce controversy wherever he went. And he went a great many places, sitting in four different legislatures during his stormy career. In Manitoba his indiscretion while Attorney-General provoked the celebrated Schools Question and its string of consequences; at Ottawa he engaged in notable battles against the Remedial Bill and other measures; and in British Columbia he accomplished the truly remarkable feat of becoming Premier when the legislature was solidly against him. With a
firmed-established reputation as an outspoken Radical, whose stock-in-trade was to pose as a champion of little men against the forces of wealth and power, Martin made his way to England. Soon his name appeared as Liberal candidate at a by-election in the Stratford-on-Avon division, but he got off on the wrong foot by falling foul of the local Liberal organization, which quickly had its fill of him. Defeated, castigated, but completely unabashed, Martin proceeded to contest a London constituency at the general election of January, 1910, and with working-class support he was victorious. Once in the House, he made his presence known through attacks upon his own Front Bench, quarrels with the Speaker, and strident criticisms of Canada’s Governor-General, Lord Grey. Bad form, perhaps, but he knew the voters of St. Pancras, and this eagerness to challenge authority and tradition was not without its appeal; “Fighting Joe” was living up to the sobriquet he had acquired in Canada. More than once Martin voted with the Labour party against the Asquith Government—evidence that his own particular brand of Radicalism inclined him far towards Ramsay MacDonald. By 1914 the Liberal association of his constituency had had enough and repudiated him, whereupon he retorted with the threat (not acted upon) to resign and fight the seat under Liberal-Labour colours. During the war years Martin absented himself from England for long periods at a time, returning to Western Canada and attempting to get back into the Liberal fold. This did not deter him from indicating his intention to stand as a Labour candidate in the British general election of 1918, but on nomination day Martin’s name was nowhere to be found. Politically he was bankrupt.

The other Liberals were not quite so eager to flout convention and the party Whip. Four of them sat in the first parliament of the new century, with George M. Brown and Dr. Macnamara returned at the “Khaki” election of 1900 and Charles Rose and J. Allen Baker at by-elections in 1903 and 1905 respectively. Brown was the son of the famous George Brown of the Globe, but curiously enough he seems to have had none of the fiery political spirit of his father. In the Commons he spoke only once or twice, and then as an orthodox Free Trader, not availing himself of the manifold opportunities for making a parliamentary reputation which then abounded for aspiring young Liberal M.P.s, and not bothering to seek re-election in 1906. Such reticence was in marked contrast to another Canadian-born member, Macnamara, whose many questions and frequent interventions in debate speedily earned for him a Commons reputation. His chief interest was education, a subject about which he had great knowledge, but such can be the logic of ministerial appointments that he was made Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, where he continued for a dozen years—an exceptionally long run by contemporary standards. Finally,
in 1920, Macnamara reached the Cabinet as Minister of Labour, but he was not a success in that post, and with Lloyd George's fall in 1922 his ministerial days were over. The other two, Rose and Baker, make an excellent contrast as they represented opposite schools of Liberal thought. The name of the former recalls the great days of Canadian politics in the 1860's, for he was the son of Sir John Rose, once a Cabinet minister and long an intimate friend of Sir John A. Macdonald. Charles Rose became a London banker and a wealthy man, and when the Newmarket division fell vacant in 1903 he accepted the Liberal nomination. Early in his parliamentary career he asked many questions about the Alaska boundary dispute, reciprocity, and Canada's naval defences, but thenceforth his rare interventions were on more general lines about defence and the Empire. His strongly Imperialist views made the Liberal party increasingly un congenial to him, and his position in the Commons became somewhat isolated; indeed on his last appearance at Westminster not a single Liberal supported Rose when he seconded a private member's bill for national service. Meanwhile, at the other end of the Liberal spectrum had appeared J. Allen Baker, who made his way into Parliament by way of the London County Council and who was determined to work for disarmament and retrenchment as the means towards abiding peace and improved social conditions. Here was a true Gladstonian Liberal and, like many another in the party whose political creed belonged to another age, Baker felt bitterly the sacrifice of Liberal principles involved in British participation in the First World War. It is not without interest that his son and his grandson have followed in his footsteps and have upheld his ideals, but as members of the Labour party.

The Liberal landslide of 1906 brought three more Canadians into the Commons—Alexander Boulton, Harry C. Brodie, and Hamar Greenwood—and save for Joseph Martin no others appeared in Liberal ranks until Maurice Alexander and R. R. Fairbairn were elected in 1922. Since the last two sat only in that one parliament, which was of but a few months' duration, neither had much opportunity to achieve political fame, and perhaps the one point of interest is that Fairbairn was an Asquith follower while Alexander was a "National" (or Lloyd George) Liberal. Brodie also was pretty much an unknown quantity who left no mark on British politics, but the career of Boulton deserves some notice because of his descent from eminent Canadian jurists. A staunch champion of the British Empire and the common interests of Anglo-Saxon nations, he shared in the founding of the "Atlantic Union", later called the "English-speaking Union", and advanced his views in the House of Commons. The third man in this group, Hamar Greenwood, enjoyed a long and successful political career. In his student days at the University of Toronto
Greenwood was an enthusiastic disciple of Laurier, but in England he made the discovery that his feelings were much more akin to those of the Liberal Imperialists than of the Gladstonians. His conviction that the British Parliament was an Imperial body can be seen in his maiden speech, where the phrase “Speaking as a Canadian . . .” occurs in the opening sentences. Although he was very active as a young member, especially on the subject of temperance and the licensing of public houses, some of Greenwood’s opinions made him suspect to old guard Liberals, and in his first twelve years in the House he came no closer to holding office than a spell as Winston Churchill’s parliamentary private secretary, in itself no slight experience. But at war’s end he cast in his lot with Lloyd George’s Coalition Liberals, and this brought its rewards. After a brief period in lesser posts he was offered in 1920 the then highly unpopular job of Chief Secretary for Ireland. Nothing daunted by that graveyard of reputations, Greenwood proceeded to deal vigorously—some thought ruthlessly—with the turbulent Irish by free use of the Black and Tans, and before his term of office ended he had the satisfaction of seeing Home Rule implemented and a new era begin for Ireland. The fall of Lloyd George ended his days as a minister; indeed he lost his seat and only returned to the Commons in 1924 as a “Constitutionalist”, a label used by a few nomadic Liberals (Churchill among others) who sought escape from the political wilderness. This move towards the right was timely, and for him the future still held a peerage and important work within the Conservative party.

In many respects Labour took the place of the Liberal party in British politics, and it may therefore be appropriate to consider next the three Socialist members who had lived in Canada. It has already been observed that the Canadian experiences of Frank Collindridge and William Leonard were very similar, each finding employment in this country as a young man for a few years before the First World War, but it is improbable that either had any emotional commitment other than to England. Eventually both were to hold minor positions in Clement Atlee’s administration after 1945 and then sink into obscurity. If their link with Canada was brief and transitory, Alexander Haycock had roots that went much deeper, for his father had been leader of the “Patrons of Industry” party in the Ontario legislature during the 1890’s, a farmers’ group with somewhat Gladstonian notions of retrenchment and laissez-faire. The son moved beyond this old-fashioned and bucolic level of political thought to become a pacifist and a keen follower of Norman Angell. Haycock sat in the short parliaments of 1924 and 1929-31 but did not have much success in British politics or the Labour party; only recently he made a rather pathetic and ineffectual attempt at a comeback during the Rochdale by-election of 1958.
Canadians were sprinkled through the ranks of Conservatives fairly uniformly throughout the half-century, and the twenty-one members to be found here constituted nearly two-thirds of Canada's contribution to the House of Commons. Some of them became famous and some were political nonentities, but the majority held in common a strong faith in Imperial or Commonwealth ties, a factor of unquestioned importance when one comes to assess the role of these men in the relations between Canada and Britain. In the first decade after 1900 were to be found Bonar Law, Ian Malcolm, and Gilbert Parker, three markedly different personalities who spent some twenty years each in parliament. The story of Bonar Law has been told well and sympathetically in Robert Blake's biography, but it can hardly escape notice that Canada mattered little to the future prime minister, notwithstanding the influence which Lord Beaverbrook exercised over him. Malcolm, though more inclined towards the cult of Empire, appears to have been in politics something of a wealthy dilettante whose circle of acquaintances was wide but who had little opportunity to affect events. A more obvious influence than either of these two upon the feelings of Canadians and Englishmen for one another was Gilbert Parker, who considered it his duty to act as interpreter of Canada and her history and who strove with missionary fervour to educate British audiences on the natural affinity between the Dominions and the Mother Country. Joseph Chamberlain found in Parker a most enthusiastic lieutenant in the fight for Tariff Reform, which reflected well his unswerving devotion to Imperial ideals and interests. Famous and respected as Parker became, his best efforts never won him a place in the front rank of British politics, and his years at Westminster were perhaps most notable for a considerable degree of success in acquiring honours, first a knighthood, next a baronetcy, and finally membership in the Privy Council.

Two general elections in 1910 and a by-election in 1911 brought five more Canadians to the Conservative benches in the Commons. Four of them—Shirley Benn, Duncan Campbell, Alfred Hamersley, and Donald Macmaster—have long since passed from the scene, leaving little by which to remember them, although two were recognized in the House as strong advocates of a more closely knit Empire. According to one writer, Benn "did all in his power to further the interests of Imperial trade, particularly trade between Britain and Canada”, and Macmaster, with his first-hand knowledge of Canadian affairs, stood up for the interests of his native land while he was at Westminster. But Macmaster was another like Blake, Devlin, and Martin who could not quite forget earlier political battles, and in 1911 he found time to return home and take a hand in the campaign against reciprocity. While the Canadian people were exercised about that issue, strange things were taking
place in the Conservative party in Britain and a strange figure was near the centre of them. At the second general election of 1910 there had appeared in the political firmament a star of then unknown magnitude whose orbit was to defy all known laws, Maxwell Aitken. As a Unionist Tariff Reformer he won a Lancashire seat under the very nose of Lord Derby, virtual feudal chieftain of that county, to whom Protection was anathema. In 1911 Aitken contrived by some adroit manoeuvres to help secure the Unionist party leadership for his close friend Bonar Law, a result that properly astonished contemporaries. Even better things were to follow. His genius for playing the part of go-between displayed itself in late 1916 when he prepared the way for the coalition of Lloyd George, Bonar Law, and Sir Edward Carson which destroyed the Asquith ministry (and the Liberal party). One entirely unforeseen result was that he himself wound up in the House of Lords, to his own discomfiture and the great annoyance of the fountain of honours, George V. His Majesty’s irritation then was as nothing compared with the public outcry that arose in 1918 over Beaverbrook’s appointment as Minister of Information, which many people held to be highly improper in view of his Fleet Street holdings. Not until the Second World War did he hold office again, although the intervening years were anything but serene. Bonar Law’s death in 1923 robbed him of his one great friendship, but he found some solace in mounting an attack against Stanley Baldwin which increased in virulence until 1930 when Beaverbrook, in utter exasperation at Baldwin’s imperviousness and lethargy, launched his own short-lived United Empire party. The final round in this famous match of Beaverbrook versus Baldwin was not fought until the abdication crisis of 1936. Politically Beaverbrook reached the apogee of his success during the Battle of Britain when, with Churchill’s powerful backing, he effected wonders in increasing aircraft production. In the closing chapters of his life he has turned historian, for which those interested in recent British politics have cause to be appreciative.

In eight general election between 1918 and 1945, another thirteen Canadians obtained election as Conservatives, but none of them achieved anything like the kind of success or fame enjoyed by some of those who had preceded them. Four entered the House at the notorious “Coupon” election of 1918—Lawrence Lyon, Charles McLean, John Molson, and Grant Morden—and so belong to that vast horde of new members who rode to Westminster on Lloyd George’s Victory chariot and were immortalized as “the hard-faced men”. Although undistinguished in parliament, the first three did possess notable family connections in Canada (Lyon, for example, was the grandson of one Chief Justice of Canada, Sir Henry Strong, and the son-in-law of another, Sir Henri Taschereau). Grant Morden, if not an attractive
character, is interesting for a single incident in which he had a prominent part. In 1924 his newspaper *The People* printed a sensational interview in which a thoroughly irritated Stanley Baldwin gave vent to his true feelings on certain of his dearest political enemies—Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, and Lords Birkenhead, Beaverbrook, and Rothermere. Overnight this became a *cause célèbre* which enlivened considerably the vacation period of that otherwise dreary summer when Ramsay MacDonald and his colleagues were struggling to learn the art of government. But in spite of such a rare kind of publicity, which caused the circulation figures of *The People* to jump appreciably, Morden ended up as the subject of bankruptcy proceedings a few years later.

The remaining nine Conservatives consisted of three elected in the 1920's (Hamilton Gault, Herbert Holt, and Peter Macdonald), four in the 1930's (Alfred Critchley, Beverley Baxter, Bartle Bull, and Garfield Weston), and two in the 1940's (Group-Captain Max Aitken and William Duthie). Their achievements were many and varied, although not in the sense of having had a noticeable effect upon British political life, and therefore they hardly need to be considered in detail. What does emerge as constituting something of a common factor among these members is their spirit of enthusiasm for the British Commonwealth and for closer Anglo-Canadian relations. Peter Macdonald, for example, founded the Parliamentary Imperial Affairs Committee of the Conservative party and was chairman of that group for twenty years. And Alfred Critchley belonged to Beaverbrook’s merry band of “Empire Crusaders” in the early 1930’s, even if he earned a greater measure of popularity with a certain section of the English public by introducing greyhound racing into the country and building tracks for that sport. Then there is Beverley Baxter, who early in his career struck the right note with Lord Beaverbrook and quickly found himself occupying an editor’s chair in the *Daily Express* empire, where innumerable variations could be played upon his master’s theme of Empire solidarity. It is doubtful if this cause was advanced very much by another Canadian, Bartle Bull, who drew attention unto himself in the Commons by his habit of uttering stentorian asides during debates, which gave birth to the phrase “the bartlings of Mr. Bull”. The contrast to the mellifluous strains of Beverley Baxter could scarcely have been greater.

In conclusion, it is apparent that the Canadians at Westminster were declining in importance after the first quarter of the century, where hitherto they had played a part by no means negligible. By the mid-1920’s Bonar Law was dead and Edward Blake had long departed from the scene, Hamar Greenwood and Dr. Macnamara were finished as ministers, Gilbert Parker and Donald Macmaster had gone; of
those with more than ordinary attainments only Lord Beaverbrook continued upon his remarkable way. But the numbers of M.P.s continued much as before, and the mere presence of these men in British politics cannot be entirely ignored. It is true that the activities of Canadians in English affairs, or of some of them at least, did not always win the approval of certain segments of opinion at home. Some who held very clear views about the future of Canadian nationhood occasionally gave expression to their irritation. Goldwin Smith, for example, wrote to an English friend, “Your opinions are much too swayed by the Canadian Jingoes who perambulate England and hold forth on platforms and at public dinners.” This was one point of view only, and perhaps a narrow one at that. But other letters than those of Goldwin Smith were crossing the Atlantic, as Canadians in the parliament of the United Kingdom kept in constant touch with their countrymen at home, some of whom were leading statesmen of the day. Perhaps one day a thorough and systematic study of this particular kind of correspondence will reveal that the role of the men who went to Westminster was even more noteworthy than has been suggested here.

NOTES

2. Richard Bedford Bennett, first Viscount Bennett (1870-1941); M.LA. (N.W.T.) for Calgary West, 1898-1905; M.LA. (Alberta) for Calgary, 1909-11; M.P. (Can.) for Calgary, 1911-17, and for Calgary West, 1925-38; Minister of Justice and Attorney-General, 1921; Minister of Finance, 1926; Prime Minister of Canada, 1930-35; Leader of the Opposition, 1927-30 and 1935-38; P.C. (U.K.) 1930; Viscount, 1941; title extinct upon death.
3. William Maxwell Aitken, first Baron Beaverbrook (b. 1879); M.P. for Ashton-under-Lyne, 1910-16; Knight, 1911; Baron, 1917; P.C. (U.K.) 1918; Chancellor of Duchy of Lancaster and Minister of Information, 1918; Minister for Aircraft Production, 1940-41; Minister of State, 1941; Minister of Supply, 1941-42; Lord Privy Seal, 1943-45.
4. Hamar Greenwood, first Viscount Greenwood (1870-1948); M.P. for York City, 1906-09, for Sunderland, 1910-22, and for East Walthamstow, 1924-29; Baronet, 1915; P.C. (U.K.) 1920; Baron, 1929; Viscount, 1937; Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs, 1919; Secretary of Overseas Trade Department, 1919-20; Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1920-22; succeeded by son, David Henry Greenwood, as second Viscount.
5. Andrew Bonar Law (1858-1923); M.P. for Glasgow, Blackfriars, 1900-05, for Camberwell, Dulwich, 1906-10, for Lancashire, Bootle, 1911-18, and for Glasgow, Central, 1918-23; P.C. (U.K.) 1911; Parliamentary Secretary to Board of Trade, 1902-05;
Leader of Opposition in House of Commons, 1911-15; Secretary of State for Colonies, 1915-16; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1916-19; Lord Privy Seal, 1919-21; Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury, 1922-23.

6. Thomas James Macnamara (1861-1931); M.P. for North Camberwell, 1900-18, and for North-West Camberwell, 1918-24; P.C. (U.K.) 1911; Parliamentary Secretary to Local Government Board, 1907-08; Financial Secretary to Admiralty, 1908-20; Minister of Labour, 1920-22.

7. Arthur Lawrence Haliburton, first Baron Haliburton (1832-1907); K.C.B., 1885; G.C.B., 1897; Baron, 1898; title extinct upon death.

8. Edward Blake (1833-1912); M.L.A. (Ont.) for South Bruce, 1867-72; Premier of Ontario, 1871-72; M.P. (Can.) for West Durham, 1867-72 and 1879-81; and for South Bruce, 1872-78; Minister without Portfolio, 1873-74; Minister of Justice, 1875-77; President of the Council, 1877-78; Leader of Opposition, 1880-87; M.P. (U.K.) for South Longford, 1892-1907.

9. Donald Alexander Smith, first Baron Strathcona and Mount Royal (1821-1914); M.L.A. (Man.) for Winnipeg, 1871-74; M.P. (Can.) for Selkirk, 1871-79, and for Montreal West, 1887-96; High Commissioner for Canada in United Kingdom, 1896-1911; K.C.M.G., 1886; G.C.M.G., 1896; Baron, 1897; G.C.V.O., 1907; barony passed to his daughter, Baroness Strathcona and Mount Royal, and upon her death in 1926 to her son, Hon. Donald Howard.


13. It seems that Bonar Law was guilty of an amusing blunder when present at the opening of a hospital for Canadian veterans after the First World War. When the band struck up a vigorous rendition of "The Maple Leaf", he turned to his neighbour and innocently asked, "What tune is that?" (Manitoba Free Press, October 30, 1923).


15. George Mackenzie Brown (1869-1946); M.P. for Central Edinburgh, 1900-05.


19. Alexander Claude Forster Boulton (1862-1949); M.P. for Huntingdonshire, Ramsey, 1906-09.
20. Charles Day Rose (1847-1913); M.P. for Cambridgeshire, Newmarket, 1903-09 and 1910-13; Baronet, 1909; succeeded by son, Frank Stanley Rose.
22. Willard Garfield Weston (b. 1898); M.P. for Macclesfield, 1939-45.
24. Horatio George Gilbert Parker (1862-1932); M.P. for Gravesend, 1900-18; Knight, 1902; Baronet, 1915; P.C. (U.K.) 1916; title extinct upon death.
25. Lawrence Lyon (1875-1932); M.P. for Hastings, 1918-21.
27. Herbert Paton Holt (b. 1890); M.P. for West Ham, Upton, 1924-29.
28. John Elsdale Molson (1863-1925); M.P. for Lindsey, Gainsborough, 1918-23.
29. Charles Wesley Weldon McLean (1882-1962); M.P. for Lindsay, Brigg, 1918-22.
31. Duncan Frederick Campbell (1876-1916); M.P. for North Ayrshire, 1911-16.
32. Alfred Cecil Critchley (1890-1963); M.P. for Middlesex, Twickenham, 1934-35.
33. Walter Grant Morden (1880-1932); M.P. for Middlesex, Brentford, 1918-31.
34. Arthur Beverley Baxter (b. 1891); M.P. for Middlesex, Wood Green, 1935-50, and for Southgate since 1950; Knight, 1954.
35. Frank Collindridge (1893-1951); M.P. for Barnsley, 1938-51; Comptroller of the Household, 1948-51.
36. William Leonard (b. 1887); M.P. for Glasgow, St. Rollox, 1931-50; Parliamentary Secretary to Ministry of Supply, 1945 and 1946-47.
37. William Smith Duthie (b. 1892); M.P. for Banffshire since 1945; Knight, 1959.
38. Maurice Alexander (1889-1945); M.P. for South-East Southwark, 1922-23.
40. Arthur Shirley Benn, first Baron Glenravel (1858-1937); M.P. for Plymouth, 1910-18, for Plymouth, Drake, 1918-29, and for Sheffield, Park, 1931-35; K.B.E., 1918; Baronet, 1926; Baron, 1936; titles extinct upon death.
41. Alfred St. George Hamersley (1848-1929); M.P. for Oxfordshire, Woodstock, 1910-18.
42. George Stephen, first Baron Mount Stephen (1829-1921); Baronet, 1886; Baron, 1891; G.C.V.O., 1905; titles extinct upon death.
43. Early in the new century a third Canadian, had he chosen, might have joined Mount Stephen and Strathcona in the House of Lords. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was offered a peerage in the coronation honours of Edward VII, but declined. (Julian Amery, The Life of Joseph Chamberlain, Vol. IV. [London: Macmillan, 1951], p. 419.)
44. Thomas Shaughnessy, first Baron Shaughnessy (1853-1923); Knight, 1901; K.C.V.O., 1907; Baron, 1916; succeeded by son, William James Shaughnessy, as second Baron; he died in 1938 and was succeeded by his son, William Graham Shaughnessy, as third Baron.
45. Hugh Graham, first Baron Atholstan (1848-1938); Knight, 1908; Baron, 1917; title extinct upon death.
46. One of the few divisions where his name appeared was that of November 30, 1909, when he voted with the huge Tory majority in rejecting Lloyd George's "People's Budget".

47. The following story is illustrative. At 3:30 on the day that Shaughnessy was to take his seat in the Lords, he was toiling at his desk in the London offices of the C.P.R. An hour later he entered the Lords for the necessary formalities and received the congratulations of brother peers present. At 5:30 he was back at his desk transacting business. Apparently he never returned again to that scene. (Montreal Star, December 11, 1923).


49. "I have been a member of a Town Council, a Municipal Council, a Territorial Legislature, a Provincial Legislature, a Dominion Parliament, and now of the Imperial Parliament." (Beaverbrook, Friends, p. 110.)

50. The story of Blake's years in British politics has been told with a wealth of detail in Margaret A. Banks's Edward Blake, Irish Nationalist: A Canadian Statesman in Irish Politics, 1892-1907 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.)


52. L. S. Amery, who was Greenwood's brother-in-law, wrote not long after his death that he was "first and foremost an ardent patriot and believer in the British Commonwealth, proud of his United Empire Loyalist antecedents . . . . his spirited speeches on defence were more apt to be cheered from the Conservative benches than from his own side." (The Times, September 21, 1948).

53. The Unknown Prime Minister (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955).

54. It seems that one goal eluded him. When it was mentioned to Lord Strathcona that Parker might be his successor as High Commissioner in London, he snorted: "Utterly useless, utterly useless! He would only use the office to get into the House of Lords. That is all he wants it for." (W. T. R. Preston, The Life and Times of Lord Strathcona [London: Eveleigh Nash, 1914], p. 262.)

55. The Times, June 15, 1937.

56. Tom Driberg, a Socialist, gives Morden much credit for his part in this affair (Beaverbrook, A Study in Power and Frustration [London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1956], pp. 183-4). But a Baldwin Conservative, Earl Winterton, wrote at the time that Morden was one "whose reputation is not of the highest." (Orders of the Day [London: Cassell, 1953], p. 126.)

57. By parliament, the numbers of Canadians in the House of Commons were as follows: 1900 (9), 1906 (10), January 1910 (8), December 1910 (12), 1918 (10), 1922 (7), 1923 (4), 1924 (6), 1929 (4), 1931 (5), 1935 (6), and 1945 (6).


59. As an instance, the Laurier Papers in the Public Archives of Canada contain a substantial amount of correspondence between Laurier and the following while they were British M.P.s: Aitken, Baker, Blake, Devlin, Greenwood, Macmaster, Martin, and Parker.