

Mr. BENNETT: They are included in the immigration returns.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Those who stayed.

Mr. BENNETT: No, the whole lot.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The criticism of my hon. friend, I gathered, was that the miners should have remained in Canada as immigrants, and that because all had not, our immigration policy, had in this regard, fallen down. In bringing miners over to help to harvest the crops in the west we were simply extending to Great Britain a policy which in former years had operated within the Dominion, the policy of bringing in the harvesting season from our eastern provinces men to help as harvesters in the west. Some of them stayed there after the harvest, but most of them returned to their home provinces. A large number of the miners have remained in Canada; a still larger number, it is true, returned to Great Britain. My hon. friend takes exception to some contribution to their return passage. It was the understanding arrived at in advance of their coming, that if they were unable to find employment to justify their remaining here, then the transportation companies would be responsible in part to see that they were returned to the old country.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask the Prime Minister, if the primary purpose of the government was to supply harvesters for the west, why was it that the later excursions from both British Columbia and the maritime provinces were cancelled?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry that I cannot give my hon. friend an answer at the moment, but no doubt in the course of time the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Forke) will supply the required information.

Now, may I refer to another matter in which the leader of the opposition appears to have come more into agreement with the government than in former years? A very substantial paragraph in the speech from the throne relates to the recent appointment to Canada of representatives of the governments of Great Britain, of France and of Japan, and also to the appointment which has been made by Canada of a minister to Paris, and the contemplated appointment of a minister to Tokyo. My hon. friend says that we may pass over this matter and leave it at the point where we discussed it last session. I take it that since that discussion my hon. friend has seen that these steps not only are approved by the country generally, but that

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

they are in the right direction, and that as the speech from the throne says, we may expect as a consequence of this development a better understanding between our country and the countries to which I have referred, and more in the way of cooperation in matters of mutual concern.

May I say that I was not a little surprised at the reference by the leader of the opposition to the multilateral treaty and to the statement in the speech from the throne which says that it will be submitted to parliament for approval. Just why he felt called upon to go out of his way to enlarge on certain articles which he says are appearing in some of the periodicals and press of a neighbouring country, I am unable to tell. Instead of questioning the good faith of any one I prefer, myself, to follow the example of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Great Britain, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, who, when asking the British government to give its approval to that treaty, said he believed the treaty had been passed by the United States without any reservation, and in good faith, and that the United States as well as Britain intended to live up to every word of it. That, too, is my belief, and I do not think my hon. friend, (Mr. Bennett), was called upon to send out from this House of Commons to the neighbouring country any word capable of being interpreted as implying a doubt on the part of Canada as to the good faith of the United States in respect to a treaty to which that country has put its name.

My hon. friend spoke of jingo articles; had he left the matter at that I should have thought he was correct, for that is what I regard those particular articles to be. There have appeared in some American journals articles of a jingoist character. But that is no reason why my hon. friend need make in this parliament a jingoist speech, calculated to throw a doubt on the good faith of the neighbouring republic. May I say to my hon. friend that if there should ever come the moment when, as between Great Britain and the United States, relations should become in the least strained—I do not suggest that anything of this nature is evident at the present time, but if this should happen—then I believe that, as never before, it will be the duty of every member of this parliament, to do his part not to increase any tension that may exist but to relieve it as far as it may be in his power to do so.

Mr. BENNETT: Has my right hon. friend read the speeches in the senate of the United States—not the speeches of jingoists but those made in the senate?