

viewed more particularly with reference to its aims, to the method of negotiation followed and finally as to its results. As far as the aims of the conference are concerned, if we take what appeared to be generally stated by those present in Canada on the opening day, it would be conceded, I think, that the aim was that of increasing trade within the British Empire, doing so rather by the lowering of tariffs than by the increasing of tariffs: and in the second place of giving to the world through the British Empire an example of how the world in these times should proceed in international relations so far as trade restrictions are concerned. In other words there appeared to be general agreement in the need for the reduction of tariffs; whatever may have been behind this in the minds of individuals I cannot venture to say. So far however as there was public expression of the aims of the conference they were all along the line of reducing tariffs within the British empire, making possible the increase of trade not by the raising of tariffs but by the lowering of tariffs, the Liberal point of view as it has been presented from this side consistently from the beginning. And there was the still larger belief expressed that if world conditions were to be improved it was absolutely essential that nations should find some way of coming to a general agreement which would enable them to lower their tariffs and thus permit increase of trade among themselves. If these aims have been carried out as evidenced by the agreements, when they are presented to this parliament, the agreements will meet with the wholehearted approval of the opposition. I think there will be no disagreement at all as far as we are concerned with hon. gentlemen opposite if that is the net result of the agreements, provided always that in no particular has our fiscal autonomy been interfered with, or parliament been denied its plenary powers in regard to all matters of fiscal and other policy. So that so far as the desire to see the conference a success is concerned, we on this side are hoping that when the agreements are presented they will make perfectly clear that this twofold aim, in part intra-imperial and in part international, has been carried out.

As to the method of negotiation, I think I should say quite frankly that I believe it was most unfortunate. The method of negotiation adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite was that of bargaining. I believe that the bargaining method as a matter of intra-imperial policy is all wrong, and I believe that what took place at the conference in Ottawa has demonstrated that to the minds of those

who participated. I do not believe we shall ever see again within the British Empire another venture of that kind made, because I think that relations came about as near to the breaking point as it is possible for strained relations to come between different parts of a great empire. There is something of difference between the method of approach and the kind of action that should govern in dealings between the different nations of the British commonwealth and what should govern between the British Empire, or parts of the British Empire, and foreign nations. In relation to Canada, the other parts of the British Empire, the other self-governing dominions and Great Britain, are not foreign countries. We are all members of one great family, united by ties of kinship and race and sentiment and institutions and traditions and common allegiance to one crown. I believe that in negotiations between members of the great family of British nations some method other than bargaining should be adopted to reach whatever may be the desired goal. There are other methods; the conference method is the right procedure to follow, whereby members representing all parts of the empire meet together in conference to freely discuss with each other the various points they have in common and the difficulties with which they may have to contend. There have been other Imperial conferences; there have been other Imperial economic conferences, but at no other conference so far as I am aware was there any such departure as that represented by the bargaining process until my right hon. friend introduced it at the conference of 1930. In that year my right hon. friend went to London and said that the only basis on which he would negotiate with the other members of the empire was a bargaining basis, and he stated further that the bargaining basis should be a Canada first protectionist basis, that it was on those lines alone that he would bargain.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hon. gentlemen opposite say, "hear, hear." I know they can have no difference of view on that. I contend, however, that the conference of 1930 was a gigantic failure and tragedy, as everyone knows, and it was a failure because my right hon. friend adopted the attitude and laid down the policies he did at that time. If the conference held in Ottawa this summer was not an equal failure it was simply because of a retreat from his previous position on the part of the Prime Minister of Canada and because all parties to the conference had