

gium is at present and has from the outset been represented in this country by Baron Silvercruchs.

Mr. CHURCH: With reference to item No. 505, the supplementary vote to provide for:

Representation abroad, including ministers plenipotentiary—

“Envoy extraordinary” has been left out.—secretaries and staff, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act or any of its amendments—further amount required, \$60,000.

I wish to protest against this form of separatism, of dividing Britain's representation and adding a new legation in Belgium and Holland. It is unnecessary. These services are already covered by the British embassies and our own trade commissioners. It means that we are going to open up a legation in a danger spot of Europe, namely Holland and Belgium, which will be a very sad state of affairs for us. The policy I recommend is that we should close up some of these useless legations instead of opening more. I have protested against this form of separatism at every session I have been here. It was made a plank in the platform of the Twentieth Century Liberals last week; they protested against separatism. What has Canada already in Holland and Belgium? Trade commissioners and all classes of commercial agents of the Department of Trade and Commerce are all over Europe. Yet you are opening up an agency there which divides Britain's representation in two, in places where you have no army, no navy and no league to back up what you are doing there. It will simply mean that Canadian nationals will lose the protection they have, and it will cost this country more than \$60,000.

I wish to protest against this kind of thing. It is going to bring Canada into all the affairs of Europe. Next year we shall no doubt be asked to establish a legation at Rome. The Prime Minister went to Berlin, and there was a proposal a few years ago and last year to open an embassy in Berlin representing Canada in Germany. If we are a separate country, let us get out of the British Empire. I referred to this matter this afternoon in my remarks; I referred to it last year in reference to Japan. I predicted that we would have trouble in Japan before the year was out, and three months afterwards trouble and war broke out. We have a legation there which does nothing. Anyone who wants protection goes to Shanghai and other places, to the British embassy for protection. We are open-

ing up a lot of useless agencies and providing them with secretaries, a subordinate staff, and all that kind of thing. What good will all this division of authority be? It will emphasize our separation from Great Britain, which enjoys the prestige of protecting Belgium and has treaties with France and other countries in regard to it. Are we to be drawn into establishing legations in every petty country in Europe, when it should be the policy of Canada to get out of the League of Nations as rapidly as possible and bring home our envoys extraordinary and all the rest of these officials?

Just to illustrate the principle, we have Sir Herbert Marler, who went down to the Mexican border the other day and made a political speech at Houston, Texas. He gave his opinion on current events, trade, diplomacy and many other matters. He told the people there how large our trade is and that if people will turn their attention to trade relations, political questions will take care of themselves—all that kind of thing. These ambassadors of ours are just causing trouble. They are not necessary. They divide Britain's affairs. Not by the widest stretch of the imagination can it be said that Canada, a country of ten million people, needs to appoint ministers in Europe in this way. Has New Zealand or Australia an ambassador in Holland or Belgium? No. I protest against this vote on behalf of the taxpayers, in a year in which it is difficult for business men to pay their taxes. In another of his speeches our minister at Washington, addressing a Canadian Club in New York, makes some political remarks; I see references in them to Mexico, the demands for the return of oil profits, and Mexico's row with the oil moguls.

When this legation of ours is opened overseas, on one side of the street will be the British embassy, and on the other side will be the rival Canadian legation, but we shall have nothing with which to back it up. If any Canadian national gets into trouble over there, what are you going to do about it? You know the trouble we got into with Italy, through passing sanctions. It was announced with a great flourish of trumpets that we were going to have an ambassador to Italy, and our delegates to the imperial conference went over Europe in part but they did not get as far as Italy; after the imperial conference was over, our emissaries did not see fit to honour Mussolini with a visit.

What is the idea of all this? Are you going to have these useless legations all over the seven seas? We have a Department of Trade and Commerce, presided over by a minister