

integration than integration, towards separation rather than combination.

This was the serious difficulty that presented itself to the mind of Mr. Courtney, a very able man, as Mr. Chamberlain admitted when he came to discuss the matter with him. How did Mr. Chamberlain reply to that? Mr. Courtney remembered that the party that was in power in Canada had a few years ago advocated commercial union with the United States: He feared, and it was no wonder, that when these same men came asking for the denunciation of these treaties, their object was simply to obtain it so that they could differentiate against Great Britain, as the liberal party in Canada had proposed a few years before.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Does he say that?

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—He does say that:

A few years ago there was a strong party movement in Canada in favour of promoting almost complete fiscal freedom between the United States and Canada.

And then he goes on and says he feared that the denunciation of these treaties was a step towards the disintegration of the empire—to give these people a chance to go on with their nefarious work—that was what his language pointed out; and in order to show that I am not misinterpreting what he says, we will see what Mr. Chamberlain said in reply:

My hon. friend introduced some remarks to which I am inclined to take exception. He laid it down that if Canada had proceeded to make arrangements with a foreign government by which differential duties would be imposed on the mother country, then, as a matter of fact, the mother country would have had to submit. Now, I do not think that the most enthusiastic free trader ever laid that down as a policy of this country, and I repudiate it altogether.

He repudiated altogether that if Canada was to differentiate against the mother country Great Britain would submit to it. That is what we told the Liberal party in their wayward course, we told them that Great Britain would never allow it. Oh, they said, the advantages she will get by the good-will of the United States will compensate for all this, and Great Britain will be happy and glad to have all difficult questions out of the way and see Canada and the United States in a commercial embrace. Mr. Chamberlain said no, Britain would not allow it, no more than she would allow these gentlemen to legislate in

the face of a circular despatch from the British Government, such as the Marquis of Ripon had sent out in 1895. But I will read on:

I am happy to say it has never been the policy of the representative government of any colony, though it may have been advocated by some politicians; but there are, as we know, politicians who will advocate anything. (Laughter.)

There are politicians the right hon. gentleman said who will advocate anything; and in this connection he was discussing Mr. Courtney's pointed reference to the Liberal party in Canada when they were advocating commercial union with the United States. But, he said no representative government of any colony has ever done this; it is only politicians, such politicians as will advocate anything that were doing it. He continued:

We must not judge the politics of a country (we are inclined to thank Mr. Chamberlain for that) by the views of the individual politicians. But it is, I think, most undesirable that a politician in the position of my right hon. friend should, as it were, hold out an invitation to a colony to take a step which would be certainly most unpatriotic, coupling it with an assurance that there would be no objection on the part of this country. A step of that kind would be a step that must lead to further and very important results—results, I am convinced, not desired by the colonies or the people of this country.

Now, so far from their policy or their past history or from anything that they had done, giving strength and force to the movement for the denunciation of these treaties it turns out that their past waywardness on these commercial questions interposed a serious objection in the minds of some of the best and ablest men in Great Britain and furnished doubts and reasons why these treaties should not be denounced at all. On these grounds I think they are entitled to no credit whatever with regard to the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties. But it appears, as I have already indicated, and as many of the hon. gentlemen of this House now know, after the announcement made the other day by the Secretary of State, that they were even more radically wrong in this so called reciprocal resolution than we had claimed or pointed out that they were. Not only were they proposing to fly in the face of Lord Ripon's despatch, not only were they disposed to ignore treaties that every school boy ought to know were binding on the government of Canada, not only were they doing all this, but they entirely misunderstood and misinterpreted the force of the favoured-nation