

that in our day, because of the tremendous discoveries that have been made, which annihilate time and distance, and the great facilities which have been furnished the world at large to trade with one another and engage in commerce and other human activities, the necessity for representatives between one country and another seems to have grown rather than lessened.

If Canada wishes to take full advantage of the opportunities which are now offered to all nations, it is going to make much more progress by having some representative in one or more of the capitals of the world to remind the country to which he is accredited what Canada holds, and to call attention not only to trading and commercial relations, but to make known the great resources of our country, and give an insight into our future.

We should have a representative who can secure free access to the head of the country to which he is sent. This latter function is one of the most important, for no mere commercial man could to-day interview Mr. Briand on trade conditions in France: he would not be received. A minister of foreign affairs—Mr. Briand in France, or Sir Austen Chamberlain in England—would not think of denying a plenipotentiary or a high commissioner who was sent over as representing Canada. So I repeat that the requirements of diplomacy seem to me to be greater to-day than they were at any time to which my right honourable friend referred.

My right honourable friend seemed to think that the only reason for appointing a representative to a foreign country would be because its territory was contiguous to that of Canada. Well, as far as our relations with the United States are concerned, there would probably not be very much reason for our appointing a representative if the whole matter must be judged merely by considerations of that kind. But I submit there is no country in the world in which we require a resident plenipotentiary more than we do in the United States, with which we do so much of our business. But there are many occasions for a plenipotentiary to advance the interests of Canada abroad, apart from merely trade and commerce. There are questions of immigration that may involve very serious international problems. We have had possibilities of great difficulties with Japan in that very regard. Would not the presence of a diplomat at Tokio, devoting his time, attention, and talents, to creating a better understanding between Canada and Japan, make better known our views and desires? Would not that serve the country's interests in a very marked way? I put the question to

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT.

my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster). I would go so far as to say that because of those great international difficulties that may arise at any moment there is an absolute necessity to-day to have right on the spot a representative who can daily commune with the leaders in Japan and put squarely and honestly before them the views of Canada and the difficulties of this country in dealing with that subject. Certainly we want the amity of Japan.

May I here be permitted to indulge in a little egotistical retrospection which has to do partly with this subject and also with the subject that I dealt with previously, that is, the benefits to be derived from the visits of leaders of the different parts of the British Empire and possibly of the leaders of thought and the political leaders in other countries. In 1906, twenty-two years ago, on the first day of the Session, I moved in the Commons for an Address inviting His Majesty King Edward, the Great Peacemaker, and Queen Alexandra to visit Canada, and I urged at that time, among other reasons, that as King Edward had been successful in creating an entente cordiale with France, he should be invited to visit Canada a second time, in order first to see what progress we had made, but mainly to make possible a conference between himself and the then President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, who, notwithstanding his warlike inclinations and dispositions, was at that time talking peace to anyone and everyone wherever he found the opportunity. I indulged in the hope, perhaps vain, perhaps fantastic, that a meeting of those two personages would bring about an extension of the entente cordiale which would take in the United States of America; and I added that it would be easy at that time to extend the entente cordiale not only to the United States, but also to Japan, and thus to create an alliance encircling the whole world and composed of two of the great nations of Europe, the greatest nation of America and the greatest nation of the East. I expressed the hope and belief that if that meeting could be brought about and such an alliance consummated at that time, as seemed very likely, we should have secured peace throughout the world. Who to-day doubts that if that alliance had been completed we should not have had the Great War through which we have just passed? Is it conceivable for one moment that the Kaiser would have dared to take the risk involved in opposing such combination? I think we may all believe that he would not have done so, and therefore there would have been no war.