

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said that any hon. member of this house who will prefer a specific charge against Mr. Moore will be entitled to have that charge investigated in a manner satisfactory to the house.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not my question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is my answer.

Mr. BENNETT: My question is, whether or not the same complaint which brought about an investigation with respect to rural postmasters whose names are in the report on the clerk's table will bring about the issuance of a commission in this case. That was not done on the complaint of members of this house.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment. Shall I read the amendment?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Amendment (Mr. Bennett) negatived on division.

SUPPLY BILL—REPRESENTATION AT TOKYO

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is now on the main motion.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): I wish to say a few words in regard to item 342 of the estimates providing for representation at Tokyo. As we are approaching the end of the session I will not speak at any great length on this subject, although it is one I have thought a good deal about, and naturally so, inasmuch as for a number of years I was representative of Canada in London. With regard to this proposal to send a minister to Tokyo my main objection is that it creates a precedent. Canada has a representative at Washington. There were special reasons for a minister being appointed there. The United States is our great and friendly neighbour to the south, with whom we have more trade than with any other country in the world. There were therefore special reasons put forward on those grounds. A vote has also been passed for a representative of Canada at Paris, and there are special reasons why that too should be done. These are largely sentimental reasons. Two-fifths of our population are of French origin and it is a fine gesture that Canada should have a representative in Paris. Moreover, we have a good deal of trade with that country, and our minister should be able at the same time to attend to that trade.

Regarding this particular vote I do not raise any special objection to the appoint-

ment of a minister at Tokyo. Japan is our friendly neighbour across the Pacific, and I should have the same objection to the appointment of a minister from Canada to any other country, apart from the United States and France, as I now voice in connection with the proposed appointment of a minister to Tokyo.

My reason for this objection has reference to what I hope will continue to be the status of this country in relation to the other dominions of the British Empire or, perhaps I had better say, the British commonwealth. Under our present relations with Great Britain and the various self-governing countries that compose the British commonwealth, it seems to me that we should be ill advised to adopt a policy of appointing any more ministers from Canada than the two I have mentioned. When I say this I assume that we wish to keep the British commonwealth of nations intact and that we prefer to try to make permanent this wonderful organization which has grown up through the centuries, called the British empire or the British commonwealth. To my mind, the future holds only one of two alternatives for Canada. One of these is independence. I know there are some people in this country who desire that and who look forward to the time when it will come about. But I for one hope it will be very long delayed. The other alternative before us is to remain with Great Britain and the sister dominions as the British commonwealth. We are at this moment in fact a self-governing nation as far as it is possible for us to enjoy these rights under the present statutes of the old country. The rights of autonomy or self-government we certainly will never give up, but I firmly believe that the best chance Canada has for a full and satisfactory development in the future is in conjunction with Great Britain and our sister dominions. Now how can this problem be worked out? How can half a dozen separate nations, each with complete autonomy in relation to its own affairs, act together in their relations with foreign countries? I submit that this cannot be done in practice, if each part of the British commonwealth is to have separate and independent representatives in foreign countries. I take it that the government has definitely adopted a policy of this kind. The natural sequence to the appointment by Canada of a minister at Tokyo would be that Australia, South Africa and the other dominions would do the same, perhaps not immediately; but that would be the natural thing for them to do.