

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the evening I do not intend to trespass upon the time of the House at any great length. In fact, I had intended to reserve any remarks I had to make for the specific debate on the differential or reciprocal resolution. As I shall be absent from the House during next week, I thought it only proper that I should place upon record my own views in respect particularly to that feature of the tariff which has been brought down. For eighteen years the Liberal party have been decrying the Conservative party and the National Policy. Certainly the Government's own friends have been considerably disappointed at their unexampled vaulting. They have not attacked the National Policy in principle, but they have meddled with it in detail sufficiently to disturb the industrial development of the country seriously, I fear.

As my remarks are to be directed particularly towards the reciprocal feature of the tariff, I will proceed immediately to discuss that feature. I presume that there is not a man occupying a seat in this House who is not anxious to recognize in some way or other the debt of gratitude we owe to the mother country. We owe the mother country considerable that is not recognized by the people of Canada generally. Just in what way that debt should be paid, I am not prepared this evening to suggest. For the immense advantages we derive from the oversight which Great Britain exercises in distant quarters of the globe over our commerce, and for the benefits conferred upon us by her consular agencies in every corner of the world, we have hitherto paid nothing. There is not in contemplation any provision that we shall in the near future pay anything, but I scarcely think this the proper way to recognize this debt of gratitude. Great Britain is extending to her colonies no favours; she is extending no favours to any country. She simply pursues a line of policy that, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, is adapted to the development of her industries and the extension of her trade. Still, as we owe her a debt of gratitude, which has never been recognized in any way, I, for one, am prepared to give my support to any special and reasonable recognition of that debt of gratitude and repay it in some way, and I think that there is throughout the country a feeling that England should have, in return for the favours granted us, as far as the colonial world is concerned, some differential treatment, some special favour in matters of trade. But while I recognize that as the correct principle to adopt and am strongly in its favour, yet I think that the principle incorporated in these resolutions is a bad one—bad, not because it shows any special favour to England but because it shows no special favour to England. Before I take my seat I think I can successfully show to this House, that not only does this Government's policy not dif-

Mr. McMILLAN.

ferentiate in favour of England but it hands over to England's commercial enemies—aye, Sir, and her political enemies as well—favours equally as great as it extends to the mother country. If these resolutions are constitutional these favours must be extended to Belgium and Germany. Now, I express no opinion as to whether or not these particular resolutions discriminate against these countries which have the benefit of the most-favoured-nation clauses in their treaties with Great Britain. I am not going to rest my case upon that particular view. But what I claim is that this Parliament has no power to pass those resolutions on other grounds. If we pass these resolutions they must be disallowed, or rather if we implement them in a statute, that statute must be disallowed by Her Majesty. So far as the most-favoured-nation clause in treaties like Belgium and Germany's treaties with England is concerned, there have prevailed two diametrically opposite opinions. There is the American view and there is the European view, the one diametrically opposed to the other. The American view has been asserted by the United States time and time again, and it is this: that in a treaty between two sovereign powers, those mutual agreements contemplate, not obligations in the ordinary sense of the term, but simply that one high contracting party shall extend to the other the same degree of comity it extends to other nations. That view was adopted, in the first place, by a very clear-headed statesman, eminent in the councils of his country, John Quincy Adams. Since that time it has been reaffirmed by Clay, by Livingston, by Gallatin, by Frelinghuysen, by Evarts, by Bayard, and by different American foreign secretaries, from time to time, and it received an authoritative recognition from the highest court of the United States of America in the year 1886. In the judgment which was given in the case of *Bertram vs. Robertson*, will be found this authoritative statement of the American view, and according to that judgment, the most-highly-favoured-nation clauses in a treaty were agreements that a parity of comity should be extended by the one high contracting party to the other—that there should be no differential treatment so far as mere comity is concerned, but that they did not concern concessions made by one of the contracting parties for valuable consideration or a return for concessions made in order to obtain the same. In accordance with the American view, these most-highly-favoured-nation clauses in treaties do not prevent either party entering, for a valuable consideration, into a special treaty with another power for reciprocal concessions, and neither of the high contracting parties is entitled to claim the special favours extended by that special treaty to the other. But while that is the American view, they also hold that if either of the high contracting