

treaty made with Great Britain on the 6th of September, 1855; Venezuela, under treaty made with Great Britain, on the 18th of April, 1825, confirmed by another treaty made with Great Britain on the 29th October, 1834, and again renewed and confirmed by an exchange of notes with Great Britain on the 3rd of February, 1903.

Your first question, I suppose, will be: Is it necessary that we should so be bound? Can we get out of this servitude?—because, after all, it is servitude. What did we do in the case of Japan? We made representations to England, and what happened? England gladly renounced her treaty with Japan. Honourable gentlemen, why should we not act similarly in all these similar cases? Now let me tell you how this most favoured nation clause works out. The nations that benefit by this clause (I cite from the customs tariff of 1907, with amendments, up to the first of December, 1919) are the following: the United Kingdom and colonies; France and colonies—I do not need to deal with those; the Argentine Republic. What business do you think we transact with the Argentine Republic? We import from it \$49,000 worth and we export to it for \$33,000. What is the sense of conceding such extraordinary advantages to a country that brings such an insignificant amount of business? At any rate, the result is that we lose \$16,000. Colombia: we import \$502,000 from her, and we export to her \$101,000. The net result, while it may be insignificant, is unfavourable to the extent of \$401,000. Denmark: we have a favourable balance with her although small; it amounts to \$2,832,000. Then there is Japan. What do you think is our business with Japan? We lose with her to the extent of \$5,903,000 a year—practically \$6,000,000. Norway, we make something on Norway—\$4,336,000. Russia: it is no use speaking of Russia now; we do not know when we shall be able to trade with her. We lose with Spain a small amount, \$444,000. On Sweden we make a shade over \$3,000,000. We lose with Switzerland over \$6,000,000. On Venezuela we make a very small amount, \$367,000.

Now let us add together what we make and what we lose, and where do we stand? Mind you, we make an immense sacrifice in being unable to treat separately with any nation in the world unless we say to them: "The advantage that we are going to give you is only a fraction of an advantage; it will have to be shared by no less than twelve other nations." Of course, they immediately retort: "What is the use? That

is no advantage. We are prepared to grant you exclusive concessions and you, in return, offer advantages shared by a group of nations." You see at once on what footing of inferiority we are placed when negotiating commercial treaties. Well, taking all those nations together, we lose over \$3,000,000 a year. It costs us over \$3,000,000 a year to bear shackles of that kind. Is this reasonable? I put the question to you: are you willing to agree to that?

Now, what is the purpose of my motion? The purpose is to show you, first of all, that it is worth our while getting free from the restraint of the above treaties so that we may go to France, our second best customer, and say—not that we are going to grant her our intermediate tariff, as was proposed on the 26th instant by the Minister of Trade and Commerce; no, but that we are willing to give her exclusive advantages on certain lines of goods, which we do not manufacture, provided we are given equally exclusive concessions for such of our goods that we can sell to best advantage on the French market as a result of the introduction of our goods into France during the war or by reason of the needs of France for the purposes of reconstruction or on account of replacement of goods that France used to import from Germany and Austria.

Prior to the war we used to export to France \$3,630,000. During the eleven months ending on the last day of February of this year—the entire period being after the war and in fact beginning a number of months after the armistice was signed—we exported to France \$57,427,000. There will be a slight difference between the figures for the eleven months and the total for the year which did not close until the end of March.

Our trade with France for the eleven last months comprises no less than thirty-one lines of goods which we did not export to that country prior to the war.

I know that with your business acumen you will come back to me with the question: "Is this permanent business?" Very well, let me answer it, if I can.

First of all, I think I may say that Canadian goods have acquired quite a reputation in France. Of course, you will have to accept my word for that, because there is no evidence except the volume of our trade to support my affirmation. That reputation is worth a great deal of money and should be preserved.

I mentioned reconstruction in France. Do you know that France has lost no less than 600,000 houses, 500 city halls, 1,200

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN.