

dominions on a much extended scale of discriminating duties against foreign countries. A free trade empire disarms foreign hostility; an empire which aims at closing or partially closing its markets against foreign countries invites hostility; and such a policy may end in another series of disastrous tariff wars, which would make the task of universal disarmament not merely difficult, but impossible.

I have in my hand the exact quotation from Sir Arthur Salter, who has been referred to many times and whose reputation needs no commendation in this house. In an article which Sir Arthur wrote a very short time ago, which has been widely quoted from in the press, he says:

Last, and not least important, what will be the relations between Great Britain and the dominions on the one hand and the vast colonial—or non-self-governing—empire on the other? Will the governing principle of policy continue to be to lead each constituent unit as far and as fast as possible along the path of both prosperity and a participation in government? Will it be an open empire, supplying its resources and offering its markets freely and equally to the world? Or will it tend to be more of a closed preserve in breach of the main traditions of the last century?

So far we have been considering the self-governing members of the British Empire, and it is they who conducted the negotiations. But it was contemplated throughout that the preferential arrangements agreed upon would in general apply also as regards the "colonial" empire; that is, that large part of the empire which is in whole or in part non-self-governing. The colonial empire is likely, then, to enjoy—or to suffer—the consequences of the Ottawa decisions. But it cannot, I think, be denied that their interests received a very subordinate consideration. We find no proposals for specific preferences for characteristic products of the colonial empire, such as rubber.

This opens a new issue in imperial development of the utmost importance. Increased imperial preferences with the dominions raise, as we have seen, the problem of most-favoured-nation treatment, the principle incorporated in agreements with equal and independent states. The application of preferences to a dependent empire, especially of preferences decided with special regard not to its interests but to those of the self-governing members, raises the question as to whether the basic principle of policy should be the "open-door" or the "closed preserve."

The former has been the guiding principle of British policy for more than half a century.

Elsewhere he goes on to speak of the concern to the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, it is not only of the utmost importance to the British colonies themselves; it is also (to adopt phrasing from the report of the United States commission of 1922) a matter of serious concern to the rest of the world if, in the greatest empire, the old mercantile principle of the reservation of colonial products and colonial markets to the mother country is reintroduced. The breach with the old British tradition is not yet very considerable, if we measure it by its economic

effects; but it is a recent innovation, which has already been extended, and is likely to be extended further as a result of Ottawa.

We thus see that Great Britain has recently made a substantial, though still partial and incomplete, change in her domestic policy from free trade to protection. She has made some tentative, but hesitating steps towards the goal of an integrated imperial economic unit by negotiation with the self-governing dominions. She has simultaneously taken a few steps towards a closed colonial empire.

Elsewhere he goes on to stress again how dangerous that particular policy is, not only to the trading relations of the British Empire with the rest of the world, but even to the peace of the world. I say, Mr. Chairman, that for a parliament that has reached its present autonomous position after years of struggle such as we have had in this dominion, I think it ill becomes us, having regard to the rights and future evolution of these non-self-governing dominions and protectorates, by any act which it is possible for us to avoid, to reduce them still further in their position of subordination to any government in any part of the empire.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I think it only fair to the committee to disabuse the minds of hon. gentlemen of much that is apparently concerning the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). In the first place it will be noted that His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom undertook to invite the governments of the non-self-governing colonies and protectorates to accord to Canada certain preferences, schedule D. I am glad to be able to inform the house that the following colonies have already, very gladly and cheerfully, passed legislation giving effect to this article in the agreement: Jamaica, Trinidad, Antigua, St. Vincent, British Honduras, Fiji, Federated Malay States and Hongkong.

An hon. MEMBER: They were told to do it.

Mr. STEVENS: And there may be some additional of which we have not yet been officially advised.

Now the right hon. gentleman referred to what is commonly known historically as the Boston Tea Party, and indicated that this is on a par with what lost the thirteen colonies to the British crown. In that instance it will be recalled that taxation was proposed direct from London. In this instance each of the colonies passes its own legislation and deals with the matter voluntarily on its own behalf.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Upon invitation.