

*Supply Bill—Representation at Tokyo*

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When my hon. friend looks into his own argument he will see that it comes down pretty much to a single control.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: His whole argument was this: How is it going to be possible for half a dozen people to represent the different parts of the empire at Tokyo? How can the British Empire be represented at Tokyo by half a dozen representatives from the different dominions? Half a dozen representatives means joint control. One representative means a monopoly of control on the part of that portion of the British Empire which places that particular representative there. There is no more reason why there should not be single and united action on the part of a group of men in Tokyo than that there should be single and united action on the part of a cabinet. Indeed the rest of my hon. friend's argument—and that was the point I wanted to make—was a direct proof of the accuracy of what I have been saying. He spoke about all the different dominions being represented at Versailles; he said: We got into our quarrels there amongst ourselves; we went into a room and threshed those things out for a whole day at a time, I think he said.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Not a whole day. An hour or two.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, that is not so bad. At Geneva the representatives of the different dominions and the British government, after an hour or two of threshing out differences came to one opinion and acted with a united front. Why can they not do that in Tokyo just as well as in Geneva? Certainly differences will arise and they will be solved exactly as all differences are solved under our British institutions. They will be solved by collective opinions to which individual opinions will give way. I submit very strongly that such a method of representation is a method that is going to help to keep the British Empire united, because back of whatever expression of policy is put forward where different parts are affected there will be the knowledge that that policy is part of the united opinion arrived at by the different countries that are there represented.

May I say to my hon. friend there is another feature to be thought of in connection with the representation of different parts of the empire, at particular centres? Not only is there the benefit of consultation among all the groups immediately affected, but there

[Sir George Perley.]

is also the creation of new ties and links of empire. May I point to what is taking place in the United States at the present time? In the United States we have the British ambassador, Sir Esme Howard, working in cooperation with the Canadian minister and the minister from the Irish Free State. Does my hon. friend mean to tell me that Ireland and Canada and Great Britain are not being united more closely than they have ever been in the past, by virtue of these three gentlemen working together in Washington. I say to him that the fact that you have there at Washington these three representatives of different parts of the British Empire conferring together on matters respecting their respective countries, is the surest way of bringing about that unity of opinion that is going to prevent differences within the British Empire. What is the alternative? The only alternative is to have some single minister who acts for all the others, and if a mistake is made, who is going to be blamed for the mistake? My hon. friend says that you could easily deal with a single minister and bring him back. I would like to know how you are going to deal with him. If the British ambassador at Tokyo made a mistake, for instance, on a matter very seriously affecting British Columbia, does my hon. friend mean to say that just by some action of this government we could deal with that British minister? I say to my hon. friend that one of the ways to prevent friction arising within the empire is to see that with respect to its external affairs, the different parts of the empire are represented by ministers who are responsible to the government of the country which they represent, and who may be recalled by them if the necessity arises. Let me give my hon. friend, not my view, on that point, but the view of a British ambassador himself, the ambassador at Washington, given since the present legation has been opened. What he says applies equally to Tokyo, Paris and elsewhere. Sir Esme Howard speaking before the Canadian Club at Vancouver in May, 1927, had the following to say:

Now may I say one word more with special reference to the relations of Canada to the United States of America. In the last few months, as you are aware, a new step has been taken in the relations of Canada and the United States by the appointment to Washington of a special Canadian diplomatic representative in the person of my friend Mr. Vincent Massey. Whenever I have been asked, long before the appointment was made, what I thought about it, I have always been able, fortunately, to say quite unreservedly that in my humble opinion it would be an excellent thing to have a Canadian representative at Washington. Canada has now so many and so important questions to treat with the United States government