

interfere with their market. The London traders who were making colossal fortunes from the sale of hardware in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts could not tolerate the intrusion of the foreigner in their trade. Much of what we now call imperialism—the fine creed of union and co-operation from continent to continent—had its origin in the jingling guineas at the bottom of the breeches-pockets of the London merchants. Some of it, perhaps, even to-day is tainted with original sin" (a).

Professor Ashley has said:

"The relation of Great Britain to the Dominions was that of a monopolist to tied traders" (b).

Herman Merivale (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1847-59) said in his lectures (p. 671):

"The benefit of colonies to the mother country consists solely in the surplus advantage which it derives from the trade of the colonies over the loss. *That benefit has been enormous, calculated in figures alone* (c).

(c) The argument that because the United Kingdom expended money in acquiring Canada, therefore Canada owes her something, becomes very obviously fallacious when put in clearer form. For it is really this, that because the people living in the United Kingdom 150 years ago expended money in acquiring Canada, therefore people now living in Canada, are indebted to people now living in the United Kingdom. But present-day Canadians are partly the descendants of persons whose country was, by the expenditure, taken from them, and partly the descendants of persons who came here afterwards. Is it pretended that either of those classes owe the money? Is it suggested, for example, that the United Empire Loyalists (who were driven from their homes in the south because of a stupid British war) or the later emigrants from Europe or the British Islands brought with them an obligation to pay not only for the land which their efforts, and their efforts alone, made valuable, but also to pay a part of the old war-expenditure?

2. A second reason for the proposed contribution sometimes given is that Canada is part of the British Empire. That argument was fully dealt with in Paper No. 10 (Vol. 1, pp. 318-21).

(a) University Magazine, December 1911, pp. 535-6.

(b) British Dominions, p. 11.

(c) Upon this subject please read Volume 1, of the Kingdom Papers, pp. 32-48; 64-7.