

lution to the House without the slightest tinge of partisanship. My hon. friend is doing us gross injustice when he seeks to place that construction on our attitude.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to do anyone injustice, but I do wish the House and the country to know exactly what took place. A few days ago I spoke to the mover of this resolution (Mr. McQuarrie) about the serious international consequences involved in the use of the word "exclusion," and I told him we would gladly accept his resolution if he used language acceptable to the different countries comprising the British Empire. He came to me a day or two ago and told me he regretted that that step could not be taken because the British Columbia members attached so much importance to the word "exclusion."

Mr. STEVENS: Our action was non-political; the supporters of my hon. friend and the supporters of the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) were included in a joint meeting—the whole of the members from British Columbia, of whom we here number seven and the others six.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then I accept my hon. friend's interpretation that it was non-political; I will appeal to him now on the ground of national interest as against sectional interest. A few days ago, I made an appeal to our western friends to consider the interests of the Dominion of Canada as a whole in regard to a measure that was before this House. I appeal now to hon. gentlemen directly opposite in the interests of this country as a whole, and as a part of the British Empire, not to insist upon a resolution the adoption of which is certain to embarrass not only our own country but all parts of the British Empire. Let me say this further and make it perfectly clear, speaking with a full sense of the responsibility that is mine: If this Government to-morrow tried to bring about an effective restriction with Japan and had to meet the Japanese with a resolution to the effect that this Parliament stood for exclusion of Japanese, the Japanese Government would refuse to treat with us. Where would we be? Where would the hon. gentleman go? Whom would he look to in the matter of carrying out a resolution of this kind? How are we going to carry it out?

Mr. STEVENS: Have we no powers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What powers have we to pass a law that is offensive to another nation, in terms that are offensive and which will not bring about the desired results?

Mr. STEVENS: Does my hon. friend suggest we have not the power or the right to pass any law with regard to the exclusion or prohibition to land in Canada of any immigrant from any part of the world that we choose?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I made it plain that every country should have the right to control the composition of its own population.

Mr. STEVENS: Then why negotiate it in Tokio?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not negotiated in Tokio.

Mr. STEVENS: That is what my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suggest nothing of the kind, and my hon. friend knows that perfectly well. He may be attempting to ascribe to me a motive and a position that are absolutely false. But I want to put the position of the Government plainly before him. The Government are anxious to bring about an effective restriction of this oriental immigration in a manner serviceable to all parts of this Dominion. We believe that we cannot do that if a resolution passes this House using the word "exclusion." We believe that we can do it by negotiation, by seeking to foster good-will between the different countries and to keep down ill-will. It is for that reason and that reason only that the amendment has been moved.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I submit that the Prime Minister has used language much stronger than the circumstances warranted. In my judgment he was not justified in going the length he did as respects what would be the attitude of any other nation or as respects just what is going to happen if we do this or do that. I do not myself know how he knows; furthermore, I do not think he does know. We presented this resolution—or, rather, it was presented by an hon. member on this side and another hon. member to the left—with the desire to get an expression of the will of this Parliament upon the real question. There was no desire to offend any nation; indeed, we were not aware of the fact that there was