

Berlin, or Sir George Buchanan at St. Petersburg? You cannot take weeks to decide a diplomatic matter, you can only take hours. The ambassador of Great Britain says, "I can speak for everybody but Canada." Can we then remain within the empire, remain a partner of the commonwealth of nations called the British Empire? We cannot. There is no difficulty in understanding that.

That is the reason we proposed, and it was not an improper proposal, that we should establish at Washington, as was originally intended, not our own embassy or our own legation, but that our representative should work with the ambassador of Great Britain. I had even hoped that the time would come when the British commonwealth of nations might be represented in foreign countries by Canadians.

Gentlemen here have visited foreign lands as I have, and have experienced the same pride as they looked upon the union jack and the coat of arms of his Britannic Majesty's embassy. We go into the embassy and over the entrance are the arms of his Britannic Majesty and the British flag. What is going to be put over the Canadian legation door?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Does my hon. friend intimate that Sir Robert Borden advocated that the Canadian representative should be attached to the British embassy at Washington?

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think the word "minister" was used. It was intended that our representative, as the minister probably knows, should find quarters in an addition to be made to the embassy of Great Britain at Washington. That was the original idea,—that they would work together so there would be no chance of any disagreement.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): You do not get that idea from his public utterances.

Mr. BENNETT: You should have got it in this House of Commons. What will you find upon the shield outside the Canadian legation? His Majesty's government in Canada with the British flag and the Canadian flag. Let us look at this thing as practical men. We go down to Washington to-day and we find a Canadian flag and the Canadian arms. That is easily understood on the American continent; but you get out to Tokyo and there is a British embassy with the British shield and British flag upon it, and at another place is the Canadian legation with the Canadian arms and Canadian flag. A question comes up which affects every partner in the British commonwealth of nations. What is the ambassador of Great Britain going to do

[Mr. Bennett.]

about it? He arrives at his conclusions as to what should be done, and he goes to the government he is accredited to with his determination. The Canadian minister is advised. If we are going to act in unity with him, then we should be side by side and acting as one people speaking for the whole commonwealth, and not for that partner called Great Britain or that partner called Canada. The Prime Minister says there will be no difficulty because you can compromise and agree, but the world's history is filled with the record of cases where they did not agree. The disagreement of ambassadors brought about wars in times past. Look at the great congress of ambassadors which was supposed to preserve the world's peace after the treaty of Vienna and the Napoleonic wars. This congress was to keep the peace of the world, but differences arose, the first I think being in connection with Brazil.

Let us look at these matters frankly. We are predicating this experiment upon the possibility of men always being able to agree. It is illogical to conclude that this commonwealth of nations can speak as several entities when we know that in matters of foreign policy it must speak with one voice or perish. There can be no division when you come to a question of foreign policy. The king cannot be neutral in one country and at war in another. We cannot be at peace and war at the same time, and this commonwealth of nations must speak with one voice. It cannot speak with one voice if power is given to the representative of Canada or any other part of the commonwealth to speak with a dissenting voice. This is the real reason I make a protest against this expenditure.

Then there is the further question of the expense involved at this time for no corresponding results. What do we offer as a substitute? We say trade commissioners, high commissioners if you will. The trade with Japan has not been brought about by diplomatic interviews. Their business is not trade, it is diplomacy. Ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if the business, with the United States has been improved by the Minister at Washington or through trade commissioners. A trade commissioner's business is trade, not diplomacy, and your trade commissioners bring about the expansion of business. We could keep up five trade commissioners at \$10,000 per year for what this one minister is to cost us. Think what that would mean. It would put trade commissioners in different parts of the world, an additional one in China, two more in Japan, if you will, to