

the provisions of the commercial treaty in existence which gives certain rights to her people in travelling to and fro, our own officers of the Department of Immigration shall apply to Japan the immigration laws of Canada in the same manner as they are applied to all other countries, regard being had of course to the limited restriction of numbers to which I have referred.

I should not be doing justice to the attitude of the Japanese government in the negotiations towards this end if I did not express, on behalf of the government of Canada, our high appreciation of the manner in which the negotiations were conducted on behalf of Japan by Mr. Tomii the present Consul General of Japan at Ottawa. These negotiations were carried on largely between Mr. Tomii and myself, they were further carried on of course by immediate reference on my part, to the other members of the Canadian government, and by reference to the Japanese government on the part of the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Japan. I wish to say that throughout the entire negotiations every effort was made by the Japanese representative here to have it clearly understood on the part of Canada that Japan was seeking only the friendliest relations with this Dominion and that she was prepared to go to very great lengths in the matter of accepting conditions which in some respects are wholly unwelcome to her as an evidence of the international goodwill which it is her hope and ours that these legations in Tokyo and Ottawa respectively may serve to maintain.

Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie King) has very correctly indicated that in committee the other evening we dispensed with discussion of this matter in the hope that we might be able to complete consideration of it before prorogation, which was expected to have taken place on Saturday night. That is the only reason why the matter was not discussed at length in committee of the whole when the estimates were under consideration.

There would not appear to be very great difference between the right hon. gentleman and ourselves with respect to one matter, although there are very vast differences between us in another regard. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has referred to what he calls the Tory mind. May I point out that it was the Tory mind in Canada that gave this country trade commissioners. It was the Tory mind that conceived the idea that this country should be represented by Canadian rather than by British trade commissioners in every part of the world. It was the Tory

mind, speaking through a Tory government that made possible the development of this trade in Japan to which the right hon. gentleman has referred. And other trade commissioners were appointed by this so-called Tory administration. Of course, there are no Tories in the world now; everyone knows that. There are no Tories nowadays; there have not been any Tories since the days of Peel, who coined the phrase "Liberal Conservative", for the reason that the toryism of Wellington had ceased to exist, as Trevelyan tells in his *History of the Nineteenth Century*. The word "Tory" disappeared with the death of Wellington and Lord Eldon. That is the fact, as the right hon. gentleman no doubt knows. There are great differences between us, I say, with respect to some matters, and I cannot better summarize our position than in these terms.

First, we say there is no complaint that existing arrangements for the transaction of Canadian diplomatic business at Tokyo are unsatisfactory. We have no minister at Tokyo, yet the Prime Minister tells us that he has just concluded a most satisfactory arrangement with respect to Japanese immigration. That in itself is conclusive proof that existing conditions are satisfactory. In the old province of Quebec they have a maxim which hon. members from there will bear me out is correctly stated in these words, "Whenever no change is necessary it is necessary not to change." Therefore, there being no necessity for change, and the Prime Minister just having indicated the satisfactory character of existing diplomatic arrangements, which enabled him within the last few weeks to conclude arrangements entirely satisfactory to Canada, there is no necessity for the contemplated change.

Secondly, in dealing with our relations with other states it is essential to the maintenance of the commonwealth of free communities known as the British Empire that there should be but one foreign policy. I think no one will dispute that. How is it possible to maintain unity among the free communities which we call the British Empire if Australia has one foreign policy, New Zealand another, Canada another and the remainder of the British Empire another? It follows beyond question that if we are to maintain the life of the free communities as an empire—the British Empire—there must be but a single foreign policy.

Thirdly, this leads us logically to the next point, that independence of action in diplomatic matters is not compatible with the ideas of partnership and of a united empire