

wishes to keep the house much longer. However, I consider this one of the most important matters to come up this year and I wish it could have been discussed at greater length. In Great Britain they try to keep all questions with regard to foreign relations out of party controversy. The leader of the opposition is kept well posted with regard to matters as they come up, so that if by the turn of the wheel he becomes Prime Minister he will be au fait with the situations which may arise. I am strongly of the opinion that the relations between the different parts of the commonwealth should be dealt with in that way; I do not believe the government of the day should take a step of this kind, which is really the adoption of a definite policy in regard to a very important matter, without having a full discussion beforehand. It is true that the Prime Minister will tell us that this house has the right to vote against this proposal, but as a matter of fact the house cannot do that without putting the government out of power.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, my hon. friend could vote against it without putting the government out of power.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I said the house could not vote against it without putting the government out of power, and in my judgment this is not the best way to deal with this matter.

Let us look at what has happened this session. On the question of increasing the salaries of our judges, a purely local matter pertaining only to this Dominion, the government were unable to make up their minds as to whether or not this should be done. They came to this house and asked for a committee to discuss the question, when it seems to me it was something the government should have decided for themselves. On the other hand, regarding the appointment of a minister to Tokyo, they did not appoint a committee for that purpose. That was a proper question to have discussed by all sides of the house before any action was taken. I go further than that; regarding the matter of the appointment of a minister to any of these foreign countries, other than the United States and France, I claim the proper method would be for the question to be brought before this house first and discussed; for the Prime Minister to rise in his place and say that every member of this house might consider and discuss it and vote as he thought best, and not tie the hands of the house as he has done by first making an agreement, subject to the approval of parliament, and

bringing it down in an estimate which makes it impossible for the house to reject the idea without its being a vote of want of confidence in the government.

I do feel strongly that the government has taken a step in the wrong direction. I believe that the members of the government on the whole wish to preserve the British commonwealth, and to look forward to our full development as a self-governing nation within that commonwealth. That is my firm belief, but I feel that this action is on the path towards independence and if that policy continues, and other dominions adopt the same policy, I cannot see how it will be possible in the future for the various component parts of this commonwealth of nations always to act together without friction in regard to the serious matters of foreign policy. Therefore, I move, seconded by Mr. Ross (Kingston):

That all the words after "that" in the motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor, namely:

The bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions to the said committee that it have power to reduce vote No. 342 by the sum of \$49,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before I take up the argument of my hon. friend with respect to the advisability of opening a legation at Tokyo, may I refer to the concluding part of his address in which he made mention of the fact that we were considering this item only at the last moments of the session. May I say to my hon. friend that no one regrets more than myself that it does so happen that we are, during the last hours of the session, endeavouring to discuss this all-important subject. I would, however, point out to my hon. friend and to the members of the house that it is not the fault of the government if there has been delay in the discussion of this matter. The government took the earliest possible opportunity to acquaint hon. members of its intention in this matter by making mention of it in the speech from the throne, and my hon. friend was one of those who, on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, made very much the same speech as he has made this afternoon. His hon. leader also spoke at considerable length and I venture to say presented the very arguments in the course of his address at that time which he will present this afternoon or on some other occasion when he may speak. As I recollect, the matter was very fully discussed on the address. May I quote the paragraph in the address: It has mention of other features which help to