

go into committee on the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient that parliament do approve of the trade agreement entered into at Washington on the 17th day of November, 1938, between Canada and the United States of America, and that this house do approve of the same, subject to the legislation required in order to give effect to the provisions thereof.

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is not in his place to-night because I have a few statements which I should like to make in his hearing; but I trust some of his colleagues will bring them to his attention in *Hansard*. During the address made by the Prime Minister on Tuesday, February 14, referring to myself he said:

What was the nature of the remarks of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George respecting a trade agreement with the United States, when he spoke in a previous debate of the present session? The hon. member has a number of pet aversions. I believe perhaps one of the strongest is his dislike of the United States, and particularly in those matters which relate to trade. He said in the house, and has said repeatedly outside of it, that there is no use in Canada trading with the United States, because we will always get the worst of it; in some way or another there is, he believes, an influence at work in Washington which makes it impossible for Canadians to protect themselves in the matter of their own interests.

These statements are without excuse. The last statement made can have an application only to one statement which I made in this house and one which I made outside the house, to the effect that the statutory restrictions placed upon the president by the congress of the United States in the matter of the negotiation of trade agreements rendered it impossible for the negotiators of the United States to concede fair and equitable terms to the negotiators of any other country when negotiating trade arrangements with the United States. That is the only reference which I have made upon which that interpretation could possibly be placed, and it is entirely incorrect.

I assume the Prime Minister has recently taken sufficient interest in me to read some of the speeches which I have made on former occasions. There is no doubt that I have aversions. There are few men in public life who are utterly devoid of them. One of my aversions is the conduct of the Prime Minister when he prepares for a general election. In private life and in public life, when there are no elections, he is undoubtedly personally worthy of high esteem and is usually an honourable political opponent. But in an election campaign, or in preparation for one, his imagination is unrestrained, and the

creative faculty of his mind is engaged chiefly in drawing erroneous inferences and in presenting biased and mischievous interpretations of the public utterances of his political opponents. Until recently I was not convinced that an early election was pending, but the Prime Minister's address on Tuesday last has served to convince me that he is now eagerly preparing for another political campaign of passionate propaganda.

I have no hostility to or dislike of the people who compose the great nation known as the United States of America and, so far as I can remember, I have never expressed one word of hostility to them or to their educational, cultural or political institutions. I do not believe that the Prime Minister can cite any such expression of mine. But during the past sixty years I have had occasion to discuss with some fervour the pronouncements and propaganda of some of the Washington politicians and the tactics they have pursued, not only toward Canada but toward the British commonwealth of which Canada is a member. On two occasions only, so far as my memory goes, I have in courteous but emphatic terms criticized the efforts of two presidents of the United States, one Democratic and the other Republican, to draw the boundary lines of British territory and to maintain those boundaries by threatened military and naval force.

The right hon. gentleman was perhaps a college student at Toronto when the Venezuelan boundary controversy arose and was not as deeply stirred by the events of that time as were Canadians of my age and older. I was in British Guiana for several months in each of the three years in which that controversy raged. It arose over the British claim to ownership of Barima point, at the eastern bank of the mouth of the Orinoco river. If one bank at the mouth of the river was British and the other bank was, as all admitted, Venezuelan territory, then under international law the navigation of the Orinoco river was free to the traffic of vessels of all nations. The issue was of special interest to the republic of Colombia, because if the British contention prevailed the vessels of Colombia could steam without permission from Venezuela up the Orinoco river and then up the Meta river, which was a branch of the Orinoco, to a river port from which there was in that time an old Spanish road to Bogota, the capital of Colombia, less than ninety miles away. Venezuela claimed both banks of the Orinoco and the right to close that river to commercial navigation and transport.

In December, 1895, President Cleveland in a message to congress declared that it was