

the advice and consent of the Lords and Commons, while here it is His Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and the House of Commons, and unless there is action taken by appropriate legislatures and parliaments the equality of status of Canada cannot be established.

To what equality are we looking? Great Britain has an independent status; do we desire to be placed in a similar position? If so this is a step in that direction. That is our position with respect to it, and the people must decide upon this matter as they decide upon all other matters, after it has been properly and clearly presented to them. It will be recalled that I mentioned in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne that I believe every student of international law, even the casual reader, would admit that there is no equality of status as between Canada and Great Britain and that there can be no such thing in international law as equality of status between Canada and Great Britain until such time as this country has the powers of a sovereign state and absolute independence both within and without our country. Then, and then only, may we have equality of status. I have said, and I repeat, that as far as I am concerned I propose to die protesting against that independent condition being achieved. That is all I can say with respect to that.

I submit further that such appointments make for separation as against solidarity. How must this Britannic commonwealth of nations speak with respect to foreign policy? As I have said, it must speak either as a unit with a single voice or as individual partners with many voices; it must speak with one voice or many. Can it speak on matters of foreign policy with more than one voice? It cannot and remain united. When it speaks with many voices then you have disunion and you destroy the solidarity we now possess. The difficulties which arose in connection with the making of the Versailles treaty were matters which could be taken up easily and decided this week or next week, or hour by hour or day by day. It took a long time to negotiate the treaty and they discussed matters and arrived at compromises and conclusions. The Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva does not always arrive at the same conclusion. There was a vote recorded last year in which Canada voted one way and another part of the British Empire voted another way. My friend the Minister of the Interior knows that is so, for he was present, I think, on that occasion. So you see you can hardly compare that—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That did not disrupt the empire.

Mr. BENNETT: It did not, nor is it likely to. The League of Nations is nothing more than an organization set up by various countries in the world, and has nothing to do with the question of peace or war, or the status and position of this country or any other. I put this question to the right hon. the Prime Minister: How can you have at any capital ministers from Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa together with a minister from Great Britain? How can they differ and have unity in the empire?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why should they always differ?

Mr. BENNETT: The point I am coming to is this; I do not think they would always differ, I hope they might always agree, but this empire should have but one representation of its foreign policies. It can never speak with many voices, it must always speak with one. In every great capital where it is necessary that there should be representatives of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, there should be an ambassador who speaks for the empire. Who is going to speak for the partners who comprise our commonwealth of nations? Not Sir Austen Chamberlain, as was said the other day. Suppose a difficulty arose in France. Sir Austen Chamberlain consults the French foreign minister and he determines upon a course of action, so far as he is concerned, speaking for Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand. But Canada has a representative there, and he says, "No, I do not agree to that; I will have to wire my home government." He wires his home government at Ottawa and they do not agree. Then what happens? It means one of two things; either Sir Austen Chamberlain speaks and says, "I cannot speak for Canada;" and simply speaks for the rest of the empire. Are we ready for that?

It means that if the Canadian representative in Tokyo is confronted with a problem that affects Canada and other parts of the commonwealth of nations, and the ambassador of Great Britain agrees upon a given line of action, and there are no other representatives of any part of the king's dominions there except the ambassador of Great Britain and the Canadian minister, and the Canadian minister says, "I cannot agree to what you propose doing," the ambassador of Great Britain must agree with our minister or no action can be taken. What if we are faced with a condition similar to that which confronted Mr. Ambassador Goschen, at