

Mr. CAHAN: The fact also became known, Mr. Speaker, at that time that the president of the United States had established in the district of Alaska a special force which could have been used for that purpose. The Prime Minister may have retained in his scrap-books some of the speeches which I made regarding the two events I have mentioned, but I said nothing which, with later knowledge of the facts, I now wish to withdraw, and nothing that reflected upon the people of the United States whom, in making any criticisms, I have always distinguished from some of their political leaders and their political representatives.

There was another incident—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before my hon. friend leaves this one, may I ask, does he approve of Lord Alverstone's action in the matter?

Mr. CAHAN: I am not approving or disapproving, but I certainly am disapproving, as I did then, of the intimidation attempted by the President of the United States. The Prime Minister knows as well as I do that a great deal of feeling was aroused in Canada by the action of Lord Alverstone.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, against Lord Alverstone.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, but when the fuller facts became known there was a great deal of feeling in Canada with respect to the intimidation which the President of the United States had, in a covert manner, attempted to exercise upon the British government.

Mr. SLAGHT: Shame.

Mr. CAHAN: I was going to give another incident, but in view of the objections of my hon. friend, who apparently needs a little information with regard to the political history of this country, I shall simply say that I returned from London to Mexico in November, 1903, when the secession of Panama from Colombia occurred. I shall not enter upon a discussion of the events connected therewith save to state that subsequently, during the administration of President Wilson, when a treaty was drawn up for the payment of \$25,000,000 damages to Colombia out of the Washington treasury, Mr. Roosevelt himself published an article in which he said:

The proposed treaty is a crime against the United States. It is an attack upon the honour of the United States, which, if justified, would convict the United States of infamy.

The Prime Minister in his address on the 14th instant, stated that the late Conservative government were divided in opinion as to the merits of the trade treaty which was

offered by Mr. Cordell Hull in 1935. I certainly know of no such division. We were all in favour of a fair and equitable agreement. We were unanimous in our opinion that the terms offered by the government of the United States were not fair and equitable and not satisfactory to the Canadian public, and those terms, I submit, have not since then proven satisfactory, as we have clearly disclosed to this house, although a desperate effort is now being made to create the illusion in the minds of the Canadian people that grave sacrifices by our domestic producers of their markets in Great Britain will serve to appease competitive producers in the United States, and in some mysterious way make for world peace.

The covert criticism which the Prime Minister makes of my attitude with respect to trade treaties with the United States is really of no personal concern to me, because I think, in the constituency which I represent at least, my views have been clearly stated and are well understood. But I remind the Prime Minister that personally I consistently hold with certain leaders of the Liberal party to whose opinions my right hon. friend in former days gave due weight. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking in this house on July 31, 1903, said:

The best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them.

And on May 7, 1907, at the imperial conference, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was quoted as saying:

There was a time when we wanted reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negated.

And again in 1910, the late Right Hon. W. S. Fielding, then Minister of Finance, in his budget speech used these words:

We had had negotiations from time to time with our American friends in relation to better trade conditions, and they had not turned out very successfully. We had, after repeated efforts, taken the ground that we should not again approach the United States with proposals for betterment of our trade relations, and that, if the matter was to be reopened again, it should be reopened, not upon the initiative of Canada, but upon the initiative of the United States.

When, in 1911, it was proposed that each country should make corresponding reductions of duty of a temporary nature, a letter was written on January 21, 1911, by Messrs. Fielding and Paterson, the Canadian representatives, to Secretary of State Knox, in which they say:

It is agreed that the desired tariff changes shall not take the formal shape of a treaty, but that the governments of the two countries will