

power in regard to external affairs in so far as they relate to this Dominion. The Imperial conference has distinctly stated that Canada's position in that regard is precisely the same as that of Great Britain herself. I know my hon. friend does not wholly subscribe to the doctrine of equality of status, and I am not going to discuss that question to-day, but I do want to give to this house once for all a statement that I propose to rely on in the days to come as my authority respecting Canada's position in the matter of equality of status when dealing with this question. I hold in my hand a volume entitled, *Our Inheritance*, being a collection of speeches and addresses delivered by the Right Honourable Stanley Baldwin, M.P., Prime Minister of Great Britain—a book which I think every citizen of the British Empire will be proud to read. Among the addresses are several delivered in Canada and one which Mr. Baldwin delivered within the walls of these houses of parliament on the occasion of the visit of himself and His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to Ottawa last year. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition was there on that occasion, and heard this speech delivered. I shall not read the whole speech, but just one or two passages dealing with the significance of the Imperial conference of 1926. Mr. Baldwin spoke in the presence of all the members of the Privy Council on all sides of politics who were able to attend, and in the presence of other distinguished citizens and visitors. He said:

I had the great honour of being chairman of that conference, and I think that it marked an epoch in the relations between the various parts of the British Empire. . . .

So perhaps it may be of interest, not only to you but also to Canada generally, if I try to explain very briefly how I personally interpret the main results of the conference.

Its most important work was, by common consent, the unanimous report of the committee on inter-imperial relations, a committee which had the good fortune to be presided over by one who was a master of language no less than of thought—Lord Balfour.

What that committee did was to attempt to define in a phrase the living relationship of all parts of the British Empire to one another, and to begin to work out the practical application of that relationship.

The phrase to which His Royal Highness has already alluded has been widely quoted, and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that it will go down to history. You will pardon me if I repeat it here:

And this is the phrase which His Royal Highness himself gave to that gathering on the same evening:

"Great Britain and the dominions, are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs—"

Mr. BENNETT: That is in the report.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

"—though united by a common allegiance to the crown, and freely associated as members of the British commonwealth of nations."

That paragraph, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition remarks, was quoted by His Royal Highness from the report of the committee on inter-imperial relations. Then Mr. Baldwin goes on to say:

This formula is founded on two principles, the essential equality of status of all the self-governing parts of the empire, and the unity of the whole empire under the crown. . . . We may well be content with the declaration thus unambiguously completed and agreed.

The words I particularly direct attention to are these:

To define in a phrase the living relationship of all parts of the British Empire to one another, and to begin to work out the practical application of that relationship.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to domestic affairs we have full and complete sovereign power; that with respect to our external relations, our powers are just as complete as they are with respect to our domestic affairs; the same is true of the powers of the British parliament as to their domestic and external affairs; the same is true of all the self-governing parts of the British Empire. That being so, we believe we should now work out the application of a living relationship that is fundamental. When we have great questions arising between ourselves and a country such as Japan—which we have—we feel that the practical application of this living relationship which Canada bears to the British Isles is to associate with the British ambassador at Tokyo a minister from Canada who will understand Canadian problems and be able to interpret them direct to the Japanese, and also to the other representatives of the British Empire who may be associated with him at Tokyo. We believe there is no danger of the Japanese or the oriental mind mistaking in any particular what as a consequence is involved with respect to sovereignty. Indeed, I think my hon. friend would be the first to admit that the Japanese are not oblivious to what has taken place at Washington; they are not oblivious to what has taken place at Paris. If the oriental mind is to get wrong impressions with respect to Canada's relations with the other parts of the empire, or of possible independence, that difficulty will have arisen already. But I do not think that any people anywhere will be quicker to appreciate the accuracy of the relationship which exists than will the Japanese nation itself.