

come to the conclusion in the end that in the eyes of the world the risk would be too great to allow it to fail even though the cost of agreement might be considerable.

There is another point, Mr. Speaker, which suggests itself in this connection. If good has come from the conference of 1932 and if great results have been achieved, why were not similar results achieved in 1930? Why for two years past have we not enjoyed the benefits that we are told will be derived from what has been achieved here this year? I think I have answered that question already, and I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite grow restive at any mention of it. It was simply because of the policy pursued by Canada's Prime Minister in 1930. To all intents and purposes the line taken then was, that unless the British government would undertake to change its fiscal policy there would be no agreements made with it, that only by increases of tariff and not decreases could any series of preference be worked out.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hon. gentlemen opposite say, "hear, hear." What does that mean? It means that as far as Canada was concerned this country said to Great Britain that she would have to change her fiscal policy—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —and hon. gentlemen opposite say, "hear, hear," so there is no doubt that they are in agreement on that point of view. I notice that some of the supporters of my right hon. friend, no doubt among them some of those who are saying "hear, hear," claim that when my right hon. friend assumed the attitude he did, he did so deliberately, with a view to making Great Britain change her fiscal policy. Do hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear," now?

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Certainly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then in what position are we? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the basis on which we are to make arrangements within the empire in regard to matters of trade is by one part of the empire interfering with the domestic affairs of another part. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if this is to be the basis of negotiation between different parts of the British Empire, we will disrupt the British Empire in a very short time. I say that we cannot expect Canada to take an attitude towards Great Britain which we are not prepared to have taken towards us by Great Britain or any other part of the British Empire.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear." How long will we in Canada tolerate any other part of the British Empire interfering in our domestic affairs? If that is the basis on which hon. gentlemen are going to negotiate hereafter, I say the sooner they get out of office the better it will be for Canada and for the empire. If there is one essential ground for the maintenance of relations between all parts of the empire on a friendly basis it is the recognition of the complete autonomy of each self-governing part and the right of each member nation to have that autonomy respected with regard to all policies. If Canada can interfere in Great Britain's domestic policies and cause her fiscal policy to be changed then Great Britain can do the same thing with respect to our domestic policies, and if it can be done with respect to the fiscal policy it can be done with respect to other matters as well. It can be done with regard to defence; it can be done with regard to immigration, and it can be done in connection with matters of a constitutional character or any other question that may arise. That is the great fundamental difficulty at the root of all this bargaining business; sooner or later it involves one part of the empire interfering in the domestic affairs of another part. I think already we have had enough expressions of views from the old country to show that what has taken place is creating dissension within the old country itself, and that it will create needless and endless dissension between different parts of the empire as well.

Let me point out one thing more. I gather from the attitude of some hon. gentlemen opposite, and from what I have seen of their utterances, that they claim that a great victory has been achieved by Canada through the amount of pressure and force that was exerted upon the British government by Canada's Prime Minister in putting forward Canada's demands in connection with the agreement which has been made. In other words, I understand their contention to be that these agreements were arrived at not by any free will on the part of the British ministers who were present but rather under duress which amounted to a threat to break up the conference itself unless agreements could be reached along a certain line. I am not saying that anything of the kind has taken place; I am taking the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, but if anything of the sort has happened I venture to say that it is most regrettable and was wholly unnecessary.