

and then was shackled for all time to come in her business relations. Germany, indeed, said to her: "Our troops will not quit your soil until such time as you bind yourself not to grant commercial favours to any nation in the world unless they are automatically extended to us." So France has gone on for over forty years carrying these chains and making good the business of Germany. As soon as war was declared France thought of breaking her shackles, and in the month of September, 1918, she did so. But, honourable gentlemen, these shackles dragged other chains; and to free herself entirely denounced all her existing treaties.

But here, honourable gentlemen, a new necessity arose, and in this regard I do not blame the Government for what they did. We had to get more money, and it was only reasonable to impose heavier taxes upon objects of luxury. France exports to this country mainly objects of luxury. But that is not all. Whatever commercial treaty advantage is granted to France is now automatically extended by the most favoured nation clause to twelve other nations. We therefore had to denounce the French treaty. Notice was given, and the French Treaty was cancelled on the 19th of this month.

Now, honourable gentlemen, how is it that we are not free to trade separately with every nation? How is it that when we give an advantage to France we have to give it to twelve other nations? How is it that when we grant a concession to a country that benefits us to the extent of \$52,000,000, we have at the same time to extend it to a country that costs us several millions a year? It seems to me that if you, as good business men, were dealing with a company, you would be extremely curious to find out the reason for such a state of affairs. Let me tell you how it is.

We were all proud indeed, during the negotiations of the Treaty of Peace, to see Canada so well represented by our Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet. Let me say here, looking towards my honourable friends opposite—and I feel that in a large measure they will share my opinion—that Canada has left in France a very deep and loving impression. This impression is due not only to the valour of our soldiers, which was unsurpassed, not only to their conduct as good, kind-hearted, generous men, who after fighting without food for a whole day to capture Mons, forgot the pangs of hunger and turned their kits over to the famished population—this

impression is due also to the stand Canada has taken as a nation and to the manner in which she was represented by her statesmen. I can tell you without exaggeration that no country in the world stands closer to the heart of France than our dear country of Canada.

One thing has struck the French people, as it has struck you, nonhonourable gentlemen, it was the sudden realization that Canada had gotten out of her swaddling clothes. We have been men of full virility in the trenches; we have been men of full maturity in the negotiations for the Treaty of Peace. Very often, indeed, the opinion of our Prime Minister has been accepted and is now reflected in the writings of the Treaty of Peace. Our Prime Minister and the other members of the Cabinet have insisted upon one thing—that Canada should stand by itself. England had magnificent men to represent her; she had men of talent and men of experience—men who came from a long lineage of diplomats; men who have been brought up generation after generation to be statesmen. Still Canada insisted that she should be represented by her own sons, the sons of the land. Therefore, gentlemen, we were bound by the signatures of our own peers.

Now, honourable gentlemen, if we were not willing to be held by the signature of Lloyd George or that of Balfour, what do you say to being bound by that of Lord Aberdeen? Or by that of Lord Beaconsfield? Or that of Lord Liverpool? Are you willing to be pledged by the signature of Charles the Second? Nay, are you willing to be bound by the signature of Queen Anne? What is your answer? Canada, at this hour, is obligated to extend the most favoured nation clause to twelve countries, as follows: Argentine, under a treaty made with Great Britain on the 2nd February, 1825; Colombia, under a treaty made with Great Britain on the 16th day of February, 1866—I believe it was then Robert Peel who had the rare privilege of tying us up long before a great many of the honourable gentlemen in this House were born; I shall not mention Japan, because we have seen fit to denounce the old treaty, and to make one ourselves, in 1913; Norway, under treaty with Great Britain, dated 18th March, 1826; Russia, under treaty with Great Britain dated 12th January, 1859; Spain, under treaty dated September 9th, 1713, which was confirmed by another treaty dated the 17th of August, 1814; Sweden, under treaty made with Great Britain on the 18th March, 1826; Switzerland, under