

Now, in the paragraph from the speech from the throne which I read, reference was made to the importance of personal communication, of personal contact in international relations. I submit, from what little experience I have had thus far in dealing with these external affairs that too much importance cannot be attached to immediate personal contact between representatives of different countries when considering in common some large problem of mutual concern. May I cite a matter which comes to my mind. Hon. members will recall a speech made in this house, in the course of the debate on external affairs, in which a friendly nation to my mind had reason to feel it had been insulted, at least indirectly, by the remarks of a certain hon. gentleman. I will not say more than that. The remarks, however, I may observe were made in application to the people of the orient. Those of us who are assembled here know how easily the hon. gentleman who spoke rolls off some of his various remarks, and we know how much to discount his language. But words of the character to which I refer sent across the Pacific and repeated in another country, as coming from one who has been not only mayor of a great city in Canada for seven years or more in succession but also a member of this parliament for several years, are likely to assume a significance in the orient which they do not begin to assume here. How are you to explain to the oriental people or to any people the significance of many such public remarks which do more mischief in international relations than anything else? Yet a thing of that sort can be explained in a moment, through personal contact, where it could not be explained by weeks of correspondence.

I desire for a moment now to stress the importance of the trade which is growing up with the orient. Do hon. members realize that Japan is our third or fourth largest customer in the matter of trade? The exports to Japan in 1926 amounted to \$35,000,000, and in 1927, to \$30,000,000; the reduction in 1927 is to be accounted for by the war in China as well as commercial depression in Japan. In 1926 Japan was our third best customer, our exports to that country being exceeded only by those to Great Britain and the United States. In 1927 she was our fourth largest customer. Our exports to Japan are 300 times as great as they were thirty years ago. And our imports from Japan, while only about one-sixth of our exports are still large enough to give Japan rank as sixth in the list of countries from which we purchase goods. It is a striking fact that our exports

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

to Japan in 1926 were greater in value than were our exports to the United Kingdom and France combined in the first year in which we sent a High Commissioner to London and an agent to Paris.

May I now refer to what I believe to be the true significance of the step we propose taking in this regard? Action in this field is a natural and necessary development of self government. The different self-governing units of the British Commonwealth have great traditions and many interests in common. But they have also distinct problems to solve. As Canada has grown in population, industrial development and foreign trade, it has become necessary for her to make provision for her special interests abroad. We began by sharing in making commercial treaties with foreign countries, and later in making them ourselves. We are now participating directly in general treaties affecting wider political interests. We are sending representatives to Paris, Washington and other places to deal with special and individual problems arising between foreign countries and ourselves, and the natural, necessary and inevitable development is to send as conditions warrant permanent representatives to the capitals of foreign countries.

As a concrete indication of the advantage of the step we now propose, may I say that since this government decided to ask parliament to appropriate a sum sufficient for a legation in Tokyo, the government of Japan has asked its parliament to appropriate a similar amount for the opening of a legation in Ottawa. The discussions which took place with regard to the opening of these legations were supplemented by discussions with respect to the great question of immigration from the orient, more particularly immigration from Japan. As a result of these discussions, and largely as an expression of good will on the part of Japan herself at this new step which is about to be taken, we have succeeded, as I mentioned to the house the other day, in materially modifying the agreement which was formerly concluded between this country and Japan. Japan has to-day undertaken to restrict the total number of immigrants coming to this country per year as agricultural labourers, domestic servants and the wives and children of Japanese immigrants resident in Canada to 150 persons. Moreover, Japan has agreed that, as respects these persons leaving their country to come to Canada, our own minister in Japan shall vise their passports, so that in future there shall be no question about the genuineness of any passports presented or accepted. Japan has also agreed that, despite