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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study has been to address an imbalance existing in the historiography relating to American-Canadian relations in the period between 1919-1924. Relying primarily on American sources, this study has attempted to argue that the Canadian government had a unique opportunity to initiate and execute an independent foreign policy by exploiting her position within the British Empire as well as her close relationship with the United States. In contrast to a number of Canadian studies which have argued that the United States impeded Canada's diplomatic growth in the post World War I period, this work maintains that the United States tried to encourage Canada to assume a more autonomous position because it was in America's interest to do so. Canada's similar attitudes with the United States towards the questions of the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Asian immigration and Article Ten in the League of Nations' Covenant convinced the United States that the Canadian government was potentially useful to the American government in helping to protect its international interests in institutions where it was not represented. The evidence presented in this study maintains that it was the Canadian and British governments that were reluctant to carry out the final steps of appointing a separate Canadian representative to Washington in the early 1920s. As a result, Canada lost her opportunity to establish an independent policy because the United States found alternative methods of protecting its international interests.
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Introduction

The Paris Peace Conference of 1919 was a watershed in the development of twentieth century international relations. It represented a crossroad between traditional diplomacy, which stemmed from the ideas embodied in the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, and the changing political realities and power structures of the early twentieth century. The concept that victorious powers could convene a conference for the purpose of creating a lasting peace was not new. In 1815, the Congress of Vienna had been held to restructure the European balance of power. Two important elements that made the Paris conference significantly different, however, were the emergence of new non-European powers playing prominent roles in the formulation and composition of the world peace, and the active presence of the British self-governing Dominions. Never before had former European colonies received independent diplomatic status while still members of an imperial structure. As a result of these factors, the conference witnessed the development of interesting diplomatic relationships between European powers, used to positions of dominance but now in decline, and reluctant emerging powers unsure of their new role in world affairs. In addition, the conference also presented the new powers with an opportunity to initiate and enhance the growth of diplomatic ties with each other. In this latter category, one of the most interesting relationships to enter a new, more complex stage was that
between two North American neighbours: the United States and the British Dominion of Canada.

Both the United States and Canada attended the peace conference for different reasons. Although the American government had begun to play a more active international role during the 1890s, it was not until the United States participated at Paris that American officials dramatically contributed to the formulation of world peace. World War I had clearly demonstrated that the United States was potentially the world's foremost economic and military power. Woodrow Wilson, the first American President to travel to Europe during his term in office, arrived at the conference determined to exert America's influence and convince conference delegates to compose a peace settlement that would ensure stability and fulfill Wilson's pledge "to bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." Canada's role at the conference was much more ambiguous. Prior to 1919, Canada's foreign relations had been substantially controlled by and conducted through, the offices of the British government. The devastation of the World War, however, had demonstrated to the Canadian government that Canada had to gain control of its own foreign policy in order to avoid becoming entangled in future conflicts that might not directly involve Canada's strategic interests. Emerging in 1919 with an economy that had experienced an enormous expansion during the war, Prime Minister Robert Borden wanted Canada
to receive the recognition and international status which was commensurate with her contribution and sacrifices for the Allied war effort and which would also recognize her growing economic potential. Supported by the other self-governing Dominions in the British Empire, Canada convinced the British government that the Paris conference was an opportunity for Great Britain to demonstrate to the world powers the evolving constitutional position of the Dominions in relation to the Mother Country. Borden was determined to use the conference as a vehicle for establishing a new diplomatic status that would enable Canada to sign the peace treaty on her own behalf and become eligible for membership in the proposed League of Nations.6

It was important to the Dominions that Great Britain convince the United States that they were indeed autonomous nations capable of pursuing independent foreign policies. Certainly, it was assumed by members of the British Empire that recognition from the United States would be tantamount to world recognition.

For Canada, however, American recognition was especially crucial because of the growing complexity of their relationship. Prior to 1914, both nations had voiced their dissatisfaction with the awkward method of conducting relations through the British Embassy in Washington.7 This method of indirect communication had often resulted in issues becoming hopelessly bogged down in confusion and misunderstanding. As well, on a
number of occasions, notably, the Washington Treaty in 1871, the Canadian government was convinced that the British negotiators were prepared to sacrifice Canada's interests in order to ensure that Great Britain's relationship with the United States was not jeopardized. American diplomats and businessmen had also expressed their frustration at the length of time that elapsed before they had a response from Canada on an important issue. All these problems were enhanced by the war when the relations between the two countries were made more complicated by issues such as Canadian recruitment in the United States which required that a more direct, immediate diplomatic structure be established. As late as 1918, representatives from both countries reported to their governments that:

in looking back over the history of some of the questions at issue, it is easy to understand how failure to appreciate or comprehend the viewpoint and aims of the other side, and the lack of sufficiently close personal contact, may have been the reason for the original difficulties and the cause of their perpetuation.

Consequently, Borden hoped that the Paris Peace Conference could also serve both nations as the first step in the process of establishing a separate Canadian presence in Washington. The acceptance by President Wilson of Canada's eventual dual representation at the peace conference as both a small power and a member of the British Imperial delegation seemed to indicate that the United States was prepared to recognize and support Canada's evolving international status. Moreover, the President's acknowledgment that Canadian representatives
could sign the treaty on Canada's behalf and become members in the proposed League of Nation's Assembly, was further proof that the Wilson Administration would react favourably to a more independent Canada.

This conclusion, however, was soon shattered when the American Senate refused to ratify the Versailles Treaty or the Covenant of the League of Nations. Besides having tremendous ramifications for the broader international arena, the Senate's decision also had a detrimental effect on Canadian-American relations. Both the Canadian and British governments interpreted the Senate's action as a repudiation of Canada's new status and concluded that it would severely retard the growth of diplomatic relations between Canada and the United States. Not until 1923 when Canada, for the first time, signed a non-commercial treaty with the United States without the counter signature of a British official, did a formal diplomatic relationship based on the recognition that Canada was achieving diplomatic autonomy begin to develop between the two countries.

An analysis of the historiography relating to Canadian-American relations reveals that an imbalance exists in the literature. Issues have been extensively studied only from the Canadian perspective and, for the most part, scholars have relied almost exclusively on Canadian and British primary sources. An important focus for students of Canadian foreign policy has been the question: can Canada formulate and
execute an independent foreign policy not dominated by the United States? The fact that the Canadian government exhibited signs of wanting to achieve autonomy in foreign affairs following World War I has made this period crucial for Canadian analysts.

The literature relating to Canada's relationship with the United States is voluminous and can be divided into three distinct schools of thought. The first school emerged in the immediate post World War I period. Manifesting an animosity towards the United States because of the latter's late entry into the war, members of this group placed their emphasis on Canada's connection with Great Britain. Stressing the theme of imperial unity, scholars such as Chester Martin, argued that the Empire could only be maintained if there was a single foreign policy supported by all members. Martin believed that a revised imperial structure which allowed all the Dominions to participate in the actual formulation of foreign policy would eliminate the Dominions' complaints that their concerns and strategic interests were not being taken into consideration by British officials.¹² Historians of this school concluded that it was in Canada's best interest to remain within a reformed imperial structure that could act as a defense against aggressive American businessmen who were rapidly expanding their influence and investments in the Canadian economy.¹³ An important theme contained in this school of thought called for the economic policy of imperial
preference to be instituted as a method of offsetting America's tariff legislation. Indeed, the American government's protectionist policies in the early 1920s increased this school's tendency to look to the Empire for economic relief.

If the emphasis of Canadian scholars in the early 1920s was on Canada's imperial connection, by the end of the decade and during the 1930s the mainstream of Canadian research, influenced by Harold Innis' staple thesis and Arthur Lower's concept of a "national community," began to focus on the premise that Canada was a self-appointed "linch-pin" between the United States and Great Britain. Bartlet Brebner, in his 1935 article "Canada, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and the Washington Conference," articulated the argument that Canada's developing special relationship with the United States and legal and emotional ties with Great Britain, afforded the Canadian government the enviable role of a mediator between the two world powers. One of the results of this shift in emphasis was the attempt to analyze more fully the impact that the United States was having on Canada's ability to formulate a foreign policy. One result of this was a focus on the similarities between the two countries' policies. By arguing the "linch pin" theory academics created an international role for Canada that was used to justify the Canadian government's insistence on achieving autonomy in its foreign affairs.

While a majority of Canadian scholars supported this
second school of thought, a third interpretation of Canadian-American relations began to appear in the 1930s and became an important influence in the post World War II era. Initially articulated by Harold Innis and Donald Creighton, this interpretation described Canada's relations with the United States in terms of a new colonial relationship. Rejecting the premise that Canada had some flexibility in its foreign affairs when it acted as a mediator between Britain and the United States, Innis argued that in the early 1920s "Canada moved from colony to nation to colony."17 This interpretation was enhanced when historians, writing in the post-World War II environment of the Cold War and the resulting polarization of the world community, argued that Canada was not capable of executing a foreign policy that was fundamentally different from that of the United States. Scholars advocating this view emphasized that the period from 1919-1924 was only significant because Canada identified its strategic interests with those of the United States.18

Although the various interpretations have disagreed over whether Canada was capable of formulating an independent foreign policy in the early 1920s, a common conclusion shared by all schools of thought, and still being articulated in the latest historical works, contends that during the early 1920s the United States did attempt to impede Canada's diplomatic status.19 Unfortunately, this conclusion has yet to be tested against the American documentation. Certainly, as the
smaller power, the diplomatic relationship was, and remains today, more crucial to Canada than to the United States. This fact, however, does not explain why American scholars have not exhaustively studied their country's policies towards Canada. An accusation that has been consistently levied against the United States by Canadian scholars is that the American government has demonstrated a lack of sensitivity and concern for its northern neighbor. America's position as a superpower has led her policy analysts to focus their research on the East-West relationship and those areas of the world where America's interests seem to be the most at risk. This apparent indifference towards Canada by American scholars has resulted in important issues between the two countries not being fully examined or explained.

The purpose of this thesis is to try and address the imbalance in the historiography by testing some of the conclusions reached by Canadian scholars. To accomplish this it is necessary to determine America's attitude and policies towards Canada in the crucial period from 1919 to the mutual signing of a convention relating to America's policy of prohibition in 1924. How did the United States view and respond to Canada's attempts to develop a more autonomous foreign policy? Did the United States deliberately try to impede Canada's rise to diplomatic status or was it in America's interest to encourage a reluctant Canadian government to not only pursue an independent foreign policy but also, formally break its ties with
Great Britain and become a wholly independent nation existing outside the British Empire?

A second area that needs to be examined more fully is how much did America's domestic political climate affect the American-Canadian relationship? On one level, the historian could answer this question by focussing on bilateral issues. To a great extent, this has been the focus of most of the scholarly research completed thus far. The historian could, however, also examine the larger international issues and determine how America's domestic climate in relation to these larger issues affected the American-Canadian relationship. Did the United States perceive Canada as a useful tool whose policies in relation to Asian immigration, the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, and Article Ten in the League's Covenant so resembled America's position that America could "use" Canada to advance her own interests while publicly appearing to remain diplomatically isolated? Finally, to what extent did the actions of the Canadian government and the debates in the Canadian House of Commons determine America's policies towards Canada? Did the misunderstanding and misconceptions in the period prior to the 1919 peace conference continue to plague the development of bilateral relations because there was a genuine lack of concern on the part of the United States combined with conflicting signs from the Canadian government? After examining these issues from the American perspective, it will be possible to understand more fully the development of America's "special
relationship" with Canada. As well, it will also be possible to shed additional light on the question posed by Canadian scholars as to whether Canada—if the Dominion had exerted itself by forcing Great Britain and the United States to vie for Canada's support—had an opportunity in the early 1920s to formulate and execute an independent foreign policy.
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Chapter One

Before proceeding with an analysis of America's attitude towards Canada it is necessary to put into some historical context the important domestic factors which influenced American foreign policy makers in the immediate post war period. In an article published in 1951, Richard Leopold implored American scholars to begin the process of analyzing America's diplomacy not just in terms of policy formulation but also, in terms of domestic factors. Leopold's challenge was especially pertinent to the study of American-Canadian relations. The literature relating to this field clearly reveals a tendency on the part of scholars such as Bartlet Brebner, to advocate an interpretation of American-Canadian relations which stressed the extent to which American policy making was influenced by elements which were continental rather than national in character. This led to the de-emphasizing of determinants of American foreign policy which were domestic in origin. In particular, the competition between the executive and legislative branches of the American government for control of foreign policy making, the role of public opinion in determining America's policies, and the American concept of isolationism, all of which had an enormous impact on American-Canadian relations in the early 1920s, have not received the attention they should.

The competition between the Senate and the presidency for control of foreign policy making did not begin with the
debate over the Versailles Treaty. In the past, the Senate had exercised its options by rejecting or amending treaties negotiated by the State Department. The 1919-1920 Versailles Treaty debate, however, was the first time that the ambiguity contained in the American Constitution dramatically came to the world's attention. The Senate's refusal to ratify both the treaty and the Covenant of the League of Nations revealed a weakness in the governmental structure and cast serious doubt on America's ability to play an active international role. Writing in 1981, former Senator John G. Tower, addressed this ambiguity when he argued that because senators were elected to represent a specific state with particular interests, domestic issues had priority and senators gave little thought to what impact their decisions would have on their country's foreign policy. Moreover, in the immediate post World War I period, the Senate was also attempting to regain some of the powers it had lost to the executive branch during the wartime crisis. Exerting its independence by rejecting the treaty, despite the international implications, was an opportunity for the Senate to weaken the authority and credibility of the presidency. Consequently, as pointed out in an article in Foreign Affairs in 1923, "never in the history . . . [of the Senate] had it been more convinced of its right to participate in shaping the foreign policy of the country." This attitude was to have serious consequences for the growth of American-Canadian relations.
Closely linked to this structural competition was the role of public opinion in policy formulation. Again, the historiography relating to this issue is extensive. Although the actual impact of public opinion on government policy is very difficult to determine, Thomas Bailey, in his book *Man in the Street*, described Woodrow Wilson's decisions to turn the 1918 Congressional election and his ill-fated speaking tour of 1919 into contests for public support for his foreign policies as two examples where the American people were asked to participate in the competition between the branches of the federal government. In regards to American-Canadian relations, the general public's attitude towards both the British Empire and Woodrow Wilson went a long way in determining how individual senators would respond to Canada's desire for diplomatic recognition from the United States.

The general public had its first opportunity to demonstrate its opinion in the Congressional election of 1918, which Selig Adler described as one of the most crucial in American history. Originally, both national parties, the Democrats and the Republicans, had agreed to run low keyed campaigns that reflected wartime cooperation. In October 1918, however, President Wilson made a fatal political error by asking the American people to elect a Democratic Congress. This opened the way for the Republicans to run their own partisan campaign. The Republican strategy was to unite large business interests with the anti-Wilson, anti-British vote. If successful, the
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Republicans hoped to sweep the Senate and force the President to demand the unconditional surrender of the Central Powers. This policy, the Republicans argued, would prevent a peace conference that could only result in the United States being tied to Europe.⁹

Many of the thirty-seven Senate seats up for election were located in areas of the country, specifically the Mid-West and the North, that traditionally voted Republican but in the previous election had supported Wilson.¹⁰ In both of these areas the Republicans, closely linked with large business interests, used Wilson's wartime economic policies as well as the economic policies of the British Empire, to entice support away from the Democratic Party. In the Mid-West, for example, Wilson's policy of setting fixed grain rates had severely affected the incomes of the farming community. When compared to other sections of the country, in particular Wilson's native South, where the principle commodity, cotton, had been allowed to set its own price on the open market, the farmers of the Mid-West had not shared in the wartime prosperity.¹¹

In the North, the Republican Party used the tactic of appealing to a long standing anti-British bias that was partially the result of ethnic and economic factors. Ethnic Irish and German voters had opposed Wilson's decision to become involved in the war on the side of the British. Both groups could be counted upon to vote against Wilson's peace
proposals. Moreover, Republicans were also able to attract an anti-British vote amongst older, conservative Americans who were bitterly opposed to Great Britain because of that country's wartime economic policies. Prior to the United States' entry into the war, Britain's policies of black listing American companies suspected of trading with the Central Powers, embargoing manufactured items ranging from shoes to farming equipment (which were principally produced in America's industrial North-East), and proposing the policy of imperial preference, were interpreted by many American voters as deliberate attempts by Great Britain to freeze out American exports.\textsuperscript{12} The anger resulting from Britain's policies combined with a third domestic influence, isolationism, to form a formidable threat to Wilson's peace policies.

The American concept of isolationism was clearly a significant factor which policy makers had to take into account. A theme which has run throughout the American experience, isolationism is a difficult concept to define because it has, at various times, assumed different guises and meanings. In his often quoted farewell address, George Washington provided posterity with his definition of isolationism which included a warning to future administrations to avoid entangling alliances and, in particular, involvement in the imperialistic politics of Europe.\textsuperscript{13} For the most part, Washington's advice was heeded. During the nineteenth century, the United States, preoccupied with its physical
expansion across the continent, the development of an industrial economy, and the bitter conflict between North and South over the issue of slavery, was generally successful in staying away from diplomatic controversies and responsibilities. This isolation, however, became harder to maintain during the 1890s because America's emerging economic strength brought with it new, strategic interests beyond the continental shores of the United States. By the first decade of the twentieth century it had become clear to many Americans, including two prominent Republicans, former Secretary of State Elihu Root and former President Theodore Roosevelt, that expanding American interests demanded that the United States play a more active international role. 14

America's intervention in World War I brought the issue of what role the United States should play in the world community to the forefront of the nation's attention. Wilson's decision to announce his vision of world peace prior to both the war's conclusion and the Congressional election of 1918, provided the American electorate with the opportunity to assess Wilson's proposals. It was clear that the President intended that the United States chart a different course and assume new international responsibilities. Wilson's support for the proposed League of Nations aroused fears that he was being naive and was sacrificing America's freedom of action to the concept of collective security. In particular, many Americans feared that the United States growing military and
economic strength would be used by Great Britain to bolster its declining empire. In those states with large anti-British populations, again the North and Mid-West, this fear was especially strong and was exploited by the Republican Party.

In 1918, the Republican strategy was to use all these domestic factors to defeat the Democrats at the polls and gain a majority in both Houses of Congress. The strategy worked because the election results gave the Republicans a Senate majority of two. Although it was not as large a win as prominent Republicans wanted, the victory was significant because it meant that they would be able to wrestle control of the important Senate committees away from the Democrats. Of these committees, the Republicans were especially eager to dominate the Foreign Relations Committee because its members would review the treaty and present a report, at a time of the Committee's choosing, containing their recommendations to the whole Senate. In short, the election had the result of turning Wilson into a "lame duck" President despite the fact that he still had two years to serve.

The significance of this changing domestic political climate for American-Canadian relations must be made explicit. Clearly when Wilson left the United States for the peace conference he did not have the political support necessary to get his peace proposals unconditionally accepted by the Senate. Moreover, his refusal to include prominent Republicans amongst the American delegation was an additional insult that
assured the President that he would not receive the cooperation of Republican Senators. It was in the midst of this volatile, bipartisan political atmosphere that Canada and her sister Dominions hoped to obtain diplomatic recognition from both the Wilson Administration and the American Senate. President Wilson's position at Paris and the ensuing Senate treaty debate clearly revealed, however, Canada's desires as well as the practicality and benefit that the United States could derive from a closer relationship with the Canadian government, were of minor importance in the final determination of America's policy towards Canada in the post war period.

Upon Wilson's arrival at the peace conference, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George officially informed the President of the Dominions' desire to have some form of independent status at the conference. Lloyd George told Wilson that "the British government could not have induced them to send a single [military] unit without their own consent."¹⁵ In addition, the British Prime Minister tried to make it clear that there were many instances when an individual Dominion had policies and attitudes that differed significantly from that of the whole Empire and these views had to not only be respected, but the Dominion had to be given an opportunity to explain its position. Finally, Lloyd George pointed out that the enormous sacrifices and contributions the Dominions had made towards the war effort gave them as much right to participate in the conference as other non-European nations.¹⁶
Initially, Wilson was adamantly opposed to the concept of the Dominions being granted the status and rights of a small power. State Department records indicate that Wilson realized that if the Dominions were granted separate voting privileges it would be used by the anti-British faction in the Senate to discredit his entire peace plan with the argument that the British were dominating the conference. As well, Wilson rejected the claim that the Dominions had specific concerns that needed to be protected. In his view, "Canada had no special interests." Finally, in his arguments against granting the Dominions status Wilson stated that the other small powers present at the conference would not have the backing of a large power like Great Britain. "It would be open to misconception," he argued, "if the British Government insisted, in addition, on two representatives of each of the Dominions."

Despite his stated opposition to the concept of Dominion status, Wilson's genuine lack of substantial interest in the issue revealed that he did not consider the question to be important. The President did not display the stubborn, unyielding attitude on this question that would later characterize his behavior towards issues which he deemed vital to the success of his peace proposals. In early January 1919, Wilson began to demonstrate a more conciliatory attitude towards Dominion status when he commented that "he himself was quite willing to concede one" representative for each
Dominion. Significantly, this statement was an attempt to demonstrate some flexibility not because he believed that the Dominions should be represented but because he wanted to gain support for his more entrenched ideas relating to the League's Covenant and the terms of the Versailles Treaty. Wilson was not prepared to risk the conference's cancellation over the issue. Consequently, on January 13, 1919, at the meeting of the Council of Ten, the President agreed to support the Dominions' request for separate representation.

In making his decision, Wilson did not attempt to appreciate or try to understand the changing status of the Dominions within the British Empire. Although the Paris conference guaranteed the Dominions an independent vote, it is clear from Wilson's subsequent actions that at no time did he see the Dominions as representing distinct autonomous nations. While, for example, he recognized Belgium's status as a small power by offering to make the American consulate in Brussels a full embassy, the same offer was not made to Canada or her sister Dominions. In short, Wilson's reason for changing his stand on Canada's status was not motivated by conviction but by diplomatic necessity. This fact was to have serious implications for American-Canadian relations. When substantial opposition to Canada's new status was voiced both in the Senate and in the American public at large, Wilson waivered and attempted to repair the domestic political damage by down playing the significance of the Dominion's new status.
When the President arrived back in the United States he was met by a hostile Senate that had already begun, before it had seen the actual documents, its battle against the treaty and the accompanying League Covenant. Launching a three pronged attack, sixteen irreconcilable senators, united by their deep suspicion of Great Britain as well as their desire to keep the United States diplomatically isolated, specifically opposed Britain's economic policies, Britain's role in Ireland, and the diplomatic recognition accorded the Dominions at Paris. Although Canada was intimately involved in all three issues, it was the question of international status that clearly revealed how American senators viewed Canada. Because of the Senate's focus, the American government, including elected officials and the public service, was forced to clarify and define America's relationship with her northern neighbor.

The initial criticisms against Canada's status were made while the treaty was still being negotiated. Resentful at not being included in the American delegation, leading Republicans criticized the conference's decision to close the council meeting to the public. They accused Wilson of giving in to the European powers by permitting them to continue their tradition of negotiating diplomatic settlements in secret. And when word reached the United States that the Dominions had been granted diplomatic status Wilson's opponents seized the opportunity to accuse the President of being naive because
he had permitted Great Britain to dominate the conference.23

The senators opposed to Canada's status, like Wilson himself, made no attempt to assess whether the Canadian government's demands were reasonable on the grounds that Canada had emerged as an autonomous nation deserving of the rights accorded a small power. The motivating factor behind the Senate alignment was domestic political expediency. In a letter to his wife, dated April 14, 1919, two months before the peace treaty was presented to Germany, a leading advocate of the irreconcilable position and an outspoken critic of Canada's new status, Wisconsin Senator Robert La Follette, commented that the public was suspicious of the Senate's opposition to Wilson's plans and consequently, had to be made aware that democracy was at risk because the President had grown too powerful and was sacrificing America's security.24

In his home state, La Follette's most powerful appeal for manipulating public opinion was his anti-British position. Using a strategy that combined filibuster tactics in the Senate with a massive, aggressive newspaper campaign, La Follette and his supporters set out to defeat the Treaty of Versailles without any regard to the diplomatic implications.

In the crucial period prior to the treaty's being presented to the Senate the irreconcilables outlined their arguments to defeat Wilson's policies. An important element in their opposition which directly affected America's attitude towards Canada, was the British Empire's policy of imperial prefer-
ence.25 Under this umbrella policy, the irreconcilables argued that Canada could not be considered an autonomous nation because the Canadian government did not control its own economic policies. La Follette maintained that British commissioners still made recommendations to the Canadian government on how Canada's economy could best benefit the entire Empire. He concluded that Canada could only be considered an autonomous nation with a right to participate in international forums when the Canadian government gave up its "special ties" with the British Empire.26

The question of just how independent the Dominions were and how they had achieved this altered state was the focus of the irreconcilables' second important argument against Canada's status. The differences between the American and British constitutions played an important role in the irreconcilables' perception of Canada's international status. The American Constitution, they argued, was a self contained document that could only be amended with the approval of both the federal and state governments. The British North America Act, on the other hand, was a British statute which could be amended only by the British Parliament. Moreover, neither it nor any other authority gave Canada the power to conduct its own foreign policy. Indeed, the irreconcilables maintained that Canada did not even possess the extensive resources and governmental structure necessary for pursuing an independent foreign policy.27
Finally, the irreconcilables appealed to the powerful combination of anti-British sentiment and isolationism. Focussing on the theory that if the United States became a member of a League whose covenant permitted each British Dominion to have a separate vote in the Assembly, the irreconcilables assumed that this would put the British government into a position of possibly controlling American policy because Britain would have six votes compared to America's one. The irreconcilables argued that this could obligate the United States to become involved in disputes where America had no strategic interests. To illustrate their point, the irreconcilables often argued that the United States might be called upon to assist the British in militarily preventing a rebellion in Ireland or indeed, in Canada.28

The Irish question, which had long been a source of antagonism between the United States and Britain, had, by 1919, become an emotional issue that had lost all touch with political reality. Fueled by an organized, well funded public campaign, the irreconcilables used this issue to help focus the treaty debate on the question of whether the Dominions were, in reality, little more than "oppressed peoples ripe for revolt."29 Consequently, the irreconcilables made it clear that they had no intention of granting diplomatic recognition to the Dominions if it would assist Great Britain in her attempt to hold her Empire together.

Working closely with the irreconcilables but not offi-
cially associated with this group was the majority leader in the Senate and the new chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts. Lodge had been considered one of the Republican Party's most likely candidates to become part of the American delegation attending the peace conference. His exclusion only intensified his personal feud with Wilson. As early as December 1918, Lodge publicly stated his regret that the Senate had not been included in the negotiating process and clearly warned the President that the Senate would examine the treaty carefully and, if necessary, make recommendations and changes. Lodge consistently demonstrated in his speeches, both in the Senate and in public, that he was prepared to permit his personal dislike for Wilson to affect his actions in the Senate.

In addition to his personal motivations, Lodge was also very aware of the large Irish constituency in his home state of Massachusetts. Although not as distrustful of the British as La Follette, Lodge did demonstrate on a number of occasions his profound fear of the United States' becoming entangled in European, and, in particular, Irish-British controversies.

In the past, Lodge had also shown some interest in America's relationship with Canada. Massachusetts' close ties with the Canadian Maritime provinces and special interests in the fishing treaties that regulated the rich resources of the North Atlantic made Lodge more aware of Canada's interests that most of this senatorial colleagues. At the time of the
treaty debate, however, Lodge's interest in the concept of Dominion status was limited to adding a reservation to the League's Covenant which would prevent the Dominions from casting their votes when any part of the British Empire was embroiled in a dispute with the United States. Clearly, Lodge could see the advantage of possessing closer ties with Canada. At the same time, however, he was not prepared to risk America's diplomatic freedom nor was he prepared to alienate his Irish constituency.

His role and influence in both the Foreign Relations Committee and his leadership of the Republicans in the Senate, placed him in a particularly strong position to effect the final outcome of the treaty and Canada's status.

Wilson gave Lodge and the Senate their first opportunity to examine the treaty and the accompanying League of Nations' Covenant on July 10, 1919. It is doubtful whether Wilson realized the extent of the opposition facing him in the Senate. The President had only just returned from Europe and had not been kept well informed of the changing domestic political climate. In his address before the Senate, the President discussed in general terms the need for all nations to safeguard peace by actively participating in the League. Wilson argued that recent world events had proven that it was no longer possible for the United States to support a policy of isolationism.

On July 31, 1919, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee opened its hearings on the treaty. Senator Lodge quickly
revealed his strategy to drag out the committee process in order to allow the irreconcilables valuable time to continue their anti-treaty newspaper campaign. During the 45 days of committee hearings, senators listened to a number of expert witnesses give their analysis of specific parts of the treaty. In addition, individuals representing interest groups were also allowed an opportunity to present their views.

In terms of the overall hearings, the discussion pertaining to Dominion status was very limited and deemed of only minor importance. The lack of indepth discussion was an indication that the Committee members, like the President, did not really view the issue as significant. When, however, Canada's status was discussed it became clear that the examining senators were not so much interested in gaining an understanding of what was meant by Dominion status as they were interested in determining how they could best use the issue to help defeat the treaty. The testimony of David Hunter Miller, a legal advisor to the President, made this particularly clear. When Senator Frank B. Brandegee of Connecticut questioned Miller on how many votes the British Empire would have in the League of Nations Assembly, Miller attempted to make the crucial distinction between the colonial Empire and the Dominions. His qualification was, however, brushed aside and he was forced to concede that, technically, if all parts of the Empire were included, the British would have six votes in the Assembly.33
In response to further questioning from Senator Warren Harding, Miller again attempted to inform the Committee of the meaning of Dominion status as clarified by the League's Covenant. In reference to the Dominion of Australia, as an example, "the Covenant has gone," Miller argued,

very far in the direction of making Australia a separate entity internationally, I do not say that it has reached that point, but I do say that it has gone very far in that direction in my opinion.34

Miller's comment was not, however, pursued by the Committee and the questions of the Dominions' status and voting rights in the League were left to the individual members to interpret according to their own attitudes towards the treaty and, in particular, President Wilson's policies.

The pro-treaty faction in the Senate looked to Wilson to lead the defense of the treaty. As one of the principal architects of the peace settlement, it was assumed that Wilson was in the strongest position to interpret and defend the specific articles that were under attack. On August 29, 1919, the President met with members of the Foreign Relations Committee at the White House. The implications of this meeting for American-Canadian relations were enormous. As mentioned, in Paris Wilson had not displayed any real conviction towards Dominion status. In May 1919, however, Wilson did tell the Dominion prime ministers, at the insistence of Canada's Robert Borden, that their status as determined by the peace settlement and in the League of Nations' Covenant
would be as independent small powers. Once Wilson returned to the United States and realized that the question of Dominion status seriously jeopardized his entire peace settlement, the President backed away from his previous statements by re-defining what he had meant in Paris. Significantly, the questions asked of the President relating to Dominion status did not probe areas of American-Canadian relations but, instead, concentrated on the issue of voting rights in the League. In response to a question, again from Senator Brandegee, Wilson argued that in any dispute between the United States and the British Empire the Dominions would not be able to cast a vote. "Disputes can arise only through the Governments which have international representation. In other words," Wilson reasoned:

    diplomatically speaking, there is only one 'British Empire' . . . . The dispute, therefore, . . . would be between the United States as a diplomatic unit and the British Empire as a diplomatic unit. That is the only ground on which the two nations could deal with one another, whether by way of dispute or agreement.35

Although in 1919, no one seriously anticipated the Dominions to use their votes against Great Britain, Wilson's response did clearly compromise his earlier commitment to the Dominion prime ministers. In effect, the President removed even the possibility of the Dominions independently casting their votes. Clearly, Wilson made the decision that America's relations with the Dominions—with Canada—were insignificant enough to risk offending them and the British government.
Interestingly enough, at the same meeting Senator Philander C. Knox, a member of the irreconcilable group, felt moved enough to clarify his understanding of Canada's diplomatic relationship with the United States. "The fact is that it is technically true," Knox argued,

that the British self governing colonies deal diplomatically through the British Foreign Office, it is only true in a most technical sense. They are absolutely autonomous, even in their diplomatic dealings, as to matters that affect them.\(^{36}\)

Wilson's and Knox's differing assessments of the same reality is another indication that Canada's international status was not the principal concern. Instead, the Dominion's status was only the issue being used for the larger purpose of carrying on a feud between elements in the Senate and the Wilson Administration. Consequently, no positive progress towards getting the treaty approved by the Foreign Relations Committee was achieved at this meeting. In fact, the only results were negative. Wilson's decision not to defend the Dominions' status led to confusion and bitterness not only amongst his own supporters in the Senate who agreed with the concept of Dominion's status: his new position was also resented by the Dominions themselves.\(^{37}\)

When the treaty was finally released by the Foreign Relations Committee and presented to the full Senate on September 20, 1919, fifteen reservations had been attached to the original document. These reservations were designed to "Americanize" the treaty by lessening the influence of Great
Britain. Three directly affected Canada and its international status. One reservation called for the United States to receive the same number of votes in the League of Nations as the British Empire. A second implied that the Dominions were mere puppets of Great Britain and therefore, when a dispute arose between the United States and any part of the British Empire the Dominions would not be allowed to cast their votes. The third maintained that the United States would not be bound by Article Ten of the League's Covenant which called for united action against aggression. In justifying its opposition to Article Ten, the Committee argued that they wanted to prevent the possibility of American military power being used to subject Ireland or any of the Dominions to British rule.38

The actual treaty debate lasted from September 20, 1919, to March 19, 1920. The important difference between this phase of the debate and the arguments that had been presented prior to the treaty's being laid before the Senate was that the speeches now dealt with specific issues instead of abstract ideas. In respect to the Dominions' diplomatic position the main arguments continued to centre on the definition of the term Dominion status and the role of the Dominions in the League of Nations.

The debate against the treaty continued to be led by the irreconcilables. In the period between September 20 and November 19, 1919, when the treaty was rejected by Senate for
the first time, Senators George W. Norris, William S. Kenyon, and Hiram Johnson made repeated attempts to denounce the treaty and the League's Covenant principally because of the status these documents accorded the Dominions. "I would be glad to see Canada," Norris argued:

an independent nation, but if Canada wants to be a full fledged member of this [L]eague, if she wants to have a full vote in the [C]ouncil or in the [A]sembly, then let her throw off the shackles of the British Empire and be independent like any other nation.39

Norris' speech focussed on the number of votes he felt the British Empire would be able to command in the League's Assembly. This issue was also the primary concern of Kenyon who argued that "if we must be partners, [the United States and Britain] certainly we ought to be equal ones, . . ."40 As with Norris, Kenyon made it clear that he was not signalling the Dominions out for unfair treatment. Instead, "in standing for reservations . . . [he was] not standing against any plan to carry out the terms of the Paris Conference, . . ."41 The Senator's primary desire was to "Americanize" the League by giving the United States the same number of votes as Britain. The fact that this meant, in the final analysis, a denunciation of the Dominions' independent status was irrelevant.

Not all senators were prepared to support the arguments of the irreconcilables or of the Foreign Relations Committee. Shortly after Lodge's submission of the majority report from the Committee, Senator Porter J. McCumber of North Dakota
issued a minority statement in which he steadfastly maintained that the Dominions had a right to diplomatic status and the United States should welcome the opportunity to develop a closer relationship with her northern neighbor. Throughout the treaty debate, McCumber was to consistently maintain that there were many small nations in the League's Assembly that contributed little to the Allied war effort. "Canada on the other hand, ..." McCumber stated:

with a population of nearly 8.5 million people, and which fought valiantly through all the long years of the war ... asks that she be given a vote in the Assembly not in the Council, carrying the same power that you give to black Liberia, or Haiti, ... The Senator summed up his speech with a critical denunciation of the Foreign Relations Committee for not attempting to explore the meaning of Dominion status or the ramifications this status could have on American-Canadian relations. "While Canada is part of the British Empire ..." he argued, "the tie is one of friendly good will and interest rather than dependency."McCumber's strong stand in favor of Dominion status was met with ridicule from the irreconcilables who accused the North Dakotan of blindly tying the United States to a League that was virtually controlled by Great Britain. Although he did receive some support, notably from Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock of Nebraska, the minority leader in charge of seeing the Versailles Treaty safely through the Senate,
McCumber's arguments were not persuasive because he could not point to a legal precedent where a former colony had risen to the status of a small power while still remaining in the imperial structure. While, then, most senators opposed to the treaty would not have argued with McCumber's references to Canada's war contribution or, indeed, his claim that she had a right to actively participate in the peace, they differed from him in their insistence that Canada had to break all ties with the British Empire, if she were going to function independently. 45

It was clear by early November that Wilson's supporters would not be able to muster the necessary two-thirds vote required to ratify the treaty. Diplomatic advisors in both the Wilson Administration and the State Department began to seek alternatives in order to defuse the arguments of the irreconcilables and gain the support of a large group of moderate senators.

Until early November, 1919, both the British and Canadian governments had elected to remain silent, preferring to let the Wilson Administration defend the treaty and the League Covenant. After the President became ill, however, senior British officials began privately to consult with the State Department while refuting or denouncing some of the irreconcilables' arguments in the newspapers. In particular, Lord Grey, a special envoy to the United States in 1919-1920, published a series of commentaries in major American and
British newspapers. Grey petitioned the British government to publish a statement clarifying the Dominions' voting status when an issue involving the Empire and the United States came before the League Assembly. Specifically, Grey wanted Lloyd George to agree with Wilson's statements before the Foreign Relations Committee that the Dominions were not separate diplomatic entities.46

Although Lord Grey was one of the most respected British officials in the United States, his arguments did not have the desired effect. Grey was accused by the irreconcilables of attempting to interfere in American domestic politics. During the second half of the Senate treaty debate, February 10, 1920 to March 19, 1920, the irreconcilables reinforced their earlier arguments by pointing out that Grey's interference was only one example of what the United States could expect if it joined the League.47

Lord Grey also received a negative response from the Dominions. Canada and South Africa reacted by pressuring Lloyd George not to accept Wilson's re-definition of Dominion status.48 Robert Borden insisted that Canada must be granted the rights of a small power. Although the Canadian government determined that the best policy was to make as few public statements as possible on the debate, Borden did attempt to affect the Senate's arguments by his aggressive actions in the Canadian House of Commons. In forcing Great Britain to acknowledge that the supremacy of the Canadian Parliament
allowed it to debate and ratify the peace treaty for Canada, Borden's government sent a clear signal to the United States that Canada was prepared to assume the responsibility of a small power. In his speech before the House on September 2, 1919, Borden tried to bring to the attention of the American Senate the significance of this action by insisting that Americans must make the effort to try and understand the constitutional changes that were taking place within the British Imperial structure.49

Clearly, the Senate had to be aware of the importance both the Canadian and British governments attached to the Dominion Parliament's separate treaty ratification. The State Department was kept fully informed of the debate in the Canadian House of Commons and this information was passed on to Wilson's supporters in the Senate. As well, the publication of Senate Document 26 in 1919 also provided a clear statement of the Dominions' evolving role in the process of treaty ratification.50 The Senate document incorporated an important paragraph from Sir C. Hibbert Tupper's article in which he pointed out that the Dominions' "steady growth and increasing strength call[ed for] . . . some system of representation [to] be devised . . . ."51 During the second part of the treaty debate pro-Wilson supporters did use Canada's ratification as a symbol of the Dominion's becoming a small power. Again, however, the anti-treaty forces chose not to explore this issue. The irreconcilables did not deny or condemn the
significance of the Canadian action; instead, they simply chose to ignore the separate ratification despite the diplomatic damage it would do to American-Canadian relations.

A second action designed to enhance Canada's international status was Borden's decision to announce his government's intention to establish a separate representation in Washington. Newton W. Rowell, Canada's acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, commented that:

while the several British ambassadors at Washington have rendered admirable service to Canada, our business with the United States is now on so large a scale that the government is convinced that our interests can only be adequately protected by a Canadian representative resident in Washington.52

This not only indicated to the British and Canadian publics Canada's intentions but also was intended to refute the irreconcilables' claim that Canada did not possess the governmental structure to pursue her own foreign policy. These comments were also used by supporters of the treaty to defend the concept of Dominion status. In a long speech advocating Canada's position, Senator Hitchcock stated:

I know very well, however, that the people of these Dominions . . . have set their hearts upon that independent representation . . . . I understand that Canada is also taking steps for representation with the United States and with other important nations of the world upon an independent basis; . . . [but] in the United States, instead of lending encouragement to that determined effort to obtain diplomatic independence, the Senate of the United States proposes to slam the door of opportunity in the faces of these people, our neighbours here to the north.53
Hitchcock concluded that the actions of the Senate amounted to little more than:

refusing to our neighbour . . . the right to independent representation. We are saying to them, in effect: you have got to be represented by London. We will not consent to your independent representation.54

As with the previous arguments, however, Hitchcock's speech did little to convince the Senate to support the treaty. Senator Irvine L. Lenroot of Wisconsin quickly pointed out to Hitchcock that as of February 1920, the Canadian government had not taken any definite action towards securing a permanent representative in Washington. As well, Lenroot also pointed to the debate raging in the Canadian House of Commons in which some parliamentarians expressed opposition to the plan for Canada having dual status in Washington. "She [Canada] asks [for] equality with the United States," argued Lenroot:

at the same time she is enjoying the privileges and protection of the British Empire. Whenever Canada wants to bind the United States will full powers that the United States exercises, the United States will be very glad to welcome Canada when she declares her independence and assumes the full rights and perogatives of a nation.55

Clearly, the argument against Dominion status again boiled down to the issue of the Dominions' continued ties with Great Britain, and the fact that from the American point of view the Dominions wanted to have it both ways: they wanted independence but also a continuing and active association with the Empire.
An interesting element introduced into the latter stages of the Senate debate revolved around Canada's potential usefulness as a spokesman and supporter of many key United States policies. Although the irreconcilables argued in support of American isolationism, even they had to admit that there were important issues beyond America's borders that required the United States to take some form of action. In particular, Hiram Johnson of California, a member of the irreconcilable group, was interested in the question of Asian immigration to the United States. Johnson's concern was spurred by his constituents who were upset by the number of Asians who were making California their new home. The State of California, along with other Western states, had a long history of attempting to limit the number of Asians living within its borders. Johnson realized that the white Dominions, who shared a similar attitude, could prove to be useful in the League if they used their voting power to offset any charges of discrimination from Asian nations, in particular, Japan. Senator McCumber, on February 16, 1920, tried to make the most of Johnson's waiving position by pointing out that if "the United States had a dispute with Japan, I think that we could count on Canada being with us." McCumber went on to argue that even Lord Grey had admitted that on the issue of Asian immigration "Canada would generally be found on the side of the United States." It was this line of argument that was the most effective in trying to convince senators to
support the Dominions' status in the League.

The irreconcilables could not deny that there were a number of policies that Canada shared with the United States. For this reason, the irreconcilables were always careful to point out in their statements that they were not particularly opposed to Canada's achieving status so much as they opposed Canada's connection with the British Empire. The irreconcilables reasoned that if Canada was completely independent of Great Britain then she would be much more useful to the United States because the Canadian government would not have to be concerned about accommodating British imperial policies. There is no doubt that this situation did create a dilemma for many senators who could see the value to the United States of Canada's achieving diplomatic status. Many concluded, however, that the dilemma was more apparent than real, for if the United States rejected the treaty and the League's Covenant and retained her policy of isolationism the American government would not have to deal with the votes of the Dominions at all. For them, the desire to defeat President Wilson's policies became more important than Canada's potential usefulness as a diplomatic ally in the League.

Another factor that also played a role in the Senate's debate was the increased need for the American government to have a more immediate and direct link with the Canadian government. During the treaty debate a series of disputes between Canada and the United States made this point clear to
both countries. A boundary dispute between Maine and New Brunswick, America's desire to improve the hydro-electric capacity of the St. Lawrence river, and a series of trade issues required the close cooperation of both countries if the disputes were to be settled. Again, senators publicly opposed to the concept of Dominion status were faced with a dilemma. To support the treaty and the League's Covenant would ensure closer cooperation between Canada and the United States. As with the previous arguments, however, domestic politics took priority and many senators deliberately chose to postpone the problem of finding a solution to America's lack of direct communication with Canada.

The rigid positions of the irreconcilables in the Senate combined with their publicity campaign, led to the final defeat of the Treaty of Versailles on March 19, 1920. For Canada, the Senate's rejection meant that the Canadian government had no independent status as far as the United States was concerned. The fact that both the Wilson Administration and the Senate had demonstrated little concern for Canada's interests or objectives was a graphic example of a larger nation showing a lack of sensitivity to a less powerful neighbor.

In the wake of the Senate's decision, a wave of anti-American feeling swept Canada. Partially caused by the treaty's rejection but also stimulated by American patriotism that tended to overestimate the United States contribution to
the Allied war effort, this anti-Americanism was, in the opinion of Hugh Keenleyside, one of the detrimental effects of the war and contributed to preventing the growth of a closer relationship.60

At the official level, America's repeated rejection of the League of Nations was a great disappointment to the Canadian government because it seemed to be a repudiation of what Canada had come to term "North Americanism". Prominent Canadians felt that the League offered Canada and the United States a forum in which to demonstrate to the world the "North American model for peace."61 Using such American-Canadian institutions as the International Joint Commission as an example of what was possible between nations, Canadian politicians, including Robert Borden and later Mackenzie King, thought they could convince the world powers to establish similar commissions that would mediate disputes and eliminate the need for wars. When the United States rejected the League Canada was left to espouse the North American model, tarnished by the United States non-involvement, to the rest of the world.62

More importantly, America's rejection of the treaty was a disappointment because it was unclear what effect the Senate's action would have on the Canadian government's objective of establishing a separate representation in Washington. As mentioned, during the treaty debate Canada had announced its intention of securing permission from the British government to open a more direct link with the United States. On February
27, 1920, the State Department was officially notified by the British Charge d'Affaires in Washington, Ronald Charles Lindsey, that Canada would soon announce the appointment of a representative with the rank of Minister of Plenipotent. Lindsey informed the American government:

that while the new minister will rank in the [British] Embassy immediately after the Ambassador and will take charge in the latter's absence, he should at all times be the ordinary channel of communication with the United States Government in matters which concern Canadian interests alone.63

Initially, the American response to the Canadian position was cautious. In addition to the Wilson Administration's being preoccupied with the passage of the treaty in the Senate, Administration officials also had to contend with the recent resignation of Secretary of State Robert Lansing and the President's slow recovery from a debilitating stroke. Until Wilson appointed a new Secretary of State the State Department was reluctant to take any action that might establish a precedent. Consequently, State Department officials informed the British government that the United States had a number of concerns that needed to be addressed. The State Department was worried that the other Dominions would also want to send representatives to Washington and would expect the United States to reciprocate. As well, Wilson's advisors were also concerned about the domestic pressure that would be brought to bear on the government to establish a diplomatic link with Ireland, a country that had not yet attained the status of a
Dominion. Administration officials feared that this issue could lead to a break-down in Anglo-American relations. Finally, the United States was quick to point out the continued dual status that Canada would have if the proposed representation plan went ahead. The Canadian official's link with the British Embassy created doubt as to which government he would ultimately be responsible. Formulating an argument composed of all these factors, the United States, although not completely rejecting the idea, did at first attempt to delay any public announcement of its position.64

By late April 1920, however, after having consulted with Americans stationed in the Dominions, the United States agreed to the British-Canadian plan. Indeed, the official announcement of Canada's changing status was first made in Washington on April 26, fourteen days before the British and Canadian governments made their statements.65 In accounting for this dramatic change in the State Department's attitude it must be pointed out that Wilson was attempting to minimize some of the diplomatic damage caused by America's rejection of the treaty. A Canadian representative in Washington provided the President with the opportunity to demonstrate to the American people the evolving position of the Dominions on the international stage and that the United States was willing to acknowledge and to some extent, assist in this development.66 More importantly, however, Wilson wanted to encourage the appointment of a Canadian because it was in America's best interest to have a
closer relationship with Canada. The similarities in Canada's international outlook with the United States offered Wilson's government an ally that could be trusted. In bilateral relations, the expansion of American investment in Canada and the growing number of outstanding issues between the two countries made it absolutely necessary that direct communication be established.  

The American announcement appeared to clear the way for the Canadian government to appoint its representative. Despite the urgency that Canada initially attached to the issue, however, no representative was appointed. Instead, the question of Canadian representation in Washington became a political issue. In the Canadian House of Commons questions were raised by the opposition, in particular by William S. Fielding, member for Shelburne and Queen's, concerning the status of Canada's representative. The dual role of serving as the British representative when the Ambassador was absent was criticized. Publicly, Arthur Meighen, who had become Canada's Prime Minister in 1920, argued that the government had not been able to locate an individual with suitable qualifications who was willing to assume the post. As well, the government also maintained that the lack of office space in Washington and the need to hire a trained staff were also preventing an appointment from being made.  

Certainly, the lack of trained personnel did play a role in Canada's decision to delay an appointment. In an editorial
entitled "Plan For Minister Dropped", however, the Washington Post stated:

It [was] ... understood in Washington that the decision recently reached not to allow the appointment of a Canadian Minister in Washington was due to the fear that it would result in closer relations between Canada and the United States than would be good for the Empire as a whole, ... The whole program was called off with the explanation that the Prince of Wales ... and Sir Auckland Geddes had so pleased the Canadians that direct representation at Washington was no longer regarded as necessary.70

The Post's article was very astute. Clearly, once the wartime crisis had diminished, Great Britain was reluctant to carry out earlier commitments made when she needed the support of the Dominions. The attitude displayed by Lord Grey during the treaty debate was only one example of Great Britain's attempting to resurrect her position as the sole authority for formulating the Empire's foreign policy. The possibility of the Empire's becoming divided over foreign policy issues was a very real threat and the United States was potentially one of the most obvious sources for causing confrontation within the imperial structure. This attitude does explain why the British government was so insistent that if a Canadian representative was appointed he must be connected with the British Embassy and act in the Ambassador's stead when he was absent.71 In an article written in 1922, former Canadian Prime Minister Robert Borden concluded that Canadian representation in Washington could have been perceived as a "lessening of the ties which
connected Canada with Great Britain and her sister nations," and was therefore, in British eyes, to be avoided.72

Many historians have used the theme of imperial unity to explain why Canada did not carry out its plan to appoint a representative.73 Undoubtedly, imperial unity was a factor that the Canadian government had to take into consideration. By itself, however, it does not fully explain Canada's reluctance to appoint a minister. After all, successive Conservative and Liberal governments gave every indication that they were attempting to fill the post. Yearly allocations of money were provided for in the federal budgets and each year the government defended in the House of Commons this appropriation of funds. Moreover, during the first session of the League of Nations Assembly both Canada and the Dominion of South Africa wasted no time in establishing their separate voting rights by casting their ballot in opposition to Great Britain. Clearly, this precedent established that there was a limit to the Dominions' concern for imperial unity.74

When the historian begins to analyze the official correspondence between Canada, Great Britain and the United States a systematic pattern begins to emerge. It become evident that an important reason why Canada did not appoint a separate representative in Washington was because the Canadian government was trying to preserve its freedom of action from American officials who wanted to manipulate Canada's new international position in the League, and her enhanced status within the
British Empire, to protect American interests. In addition, Canada's importance in the imperial structure contributed to Great Britain's desire to restrict Canada's involvement in the international community. Consequently, when Canada's request for separate diplomatic representation in Washington is examined from the perspective of American interests and goals it becomes clear that it was the British and Canadian governments who were more of a hindrance to Canada's rise in international status than the United States. By examining first the broader international issues and then the bilateral concerns between the United States and Canada it becomes evident that it was in the United States best interest to have a more independent northern neighbor. In the early 1920s, the immediate problem that American officials had to contend with was how to repair the damage caused by the Senate treaty debate and the rejection of Canada's international status.
Endnotes Chapter I


11. Ibid., p. 450.

12. Ibid., pp. 460-61.

14Ibid., p. 385.


16Ibid., p. 483.

17Ibid.

18Ibid., p. 484.

19Ibid., pp. 486-87.

20Ibid.

21Congressional Record, June 20, 1919, p. 1428.


23Congressional Record, June 25, 1919, p. 1723.


26Congressional Record, September 3, 1919, p. 4652.

27Ibid., p. 4652.

28Ibid., p. 4660.

29Ibid., p. 4723.

31 Ibid., October 25, 1919, pp. 7488-7489.

32 Ibid., July 19, 1919, pp. 2336-2339.


34 Ibid., p. 417.

35 United States, Congress, Senate, Meeting at the White House Between President Wilson and the Foreign Relations Committee, Treaty of Peace with Germany. Senate Document No. 76, 66th Congress, 1st Session, 1919, p. 44.

36 Ibid., p. 422.

37 President Wilson's comments raised serious questions in the Dominions' pertaining to their status in the League. In the Canadian House of Commons, the Honourable Henri Severin Beland (MP for Belauce) stated, "Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that Canada is gradually assuming more and more international obligations without any corresponding international status." Canada, House of Commons, Debates, September 8, 1919, p. 89.

38 Congressional Record, September 10, 1919, p. 5114.

39 Ibid., October 29, 1919, p. 7689.

40 Ibid., September 10, 1919, pp. 5154-55.

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid., September 15, 1919, p. 5356.

43 Ibid., p. 5357.

44 Ibid.


47 *Congressional Record*, February 2, 1920, pp. 2356-57.


49 Canada, House of Commons, *Debates*, September 2, 1919, p. 22.


51 Ibid., p. 37.


53 *Congressional Record*, March 8, 1920, pp. 4010-11.

54 Ibid., p. 4011.

55 Ibid., February 16, 1920, p. 2955.

56 Ibid., November 18, 1920, p. 8733.

57 Ibid., February 16, 1919, p. 2954.

58 Ibid.


62 Ibid., p. 37.


64 Ibid., p. 16.


67 Ibid., p. 15.


69 Ibid., April 21, 1921, pp. 2397-99.


73 For more information see: Wigley, *Canada and the Transition to Commonwealth*; Galbraith, *The Establishment of a Canadian Diplomatic Status at Washington*.

74 Wigley, *Canada and the Transition to Commonwealth*, p. 115.
The final defeat of the Treaty of Versailles came as a welcome relief to the American public. Regardless of the individual's feelings towards the treaty, most Americans, not used to foreign policy issues dominating the newspapers or absorbing the time of their elected representatives, were anxious to return to what Republican presidential nominee Warren Harding, referred to as "normalcy." As the war receded into memory, and the hysteria surrounding the "Red Scare" of 1919-1920 subsided, Americans began to exhibit signs of the creative energy, individuality and materialism that were later to contribute to the image of the 1920s as a decade of social upheaval. The pent-up frustrations that had been stored during the war were released and America became pre-occupied with her internal interests and development. Warren Harding's 1920 presidential victory seemed to be an indication that Americans were determined to put the stress and obligations of the war years behind them.

On the surface, the 1920 presidential election results provided proof that the irreconcilable senators had won their public opinion battle and had convinced the majority of Americans that the United States should reject the treaty and the League of Nations. At the time, both political parties interpreted the Republican victory, which included majorities in both Houses of Congress, as a sign that "they [the American public] wished to keep out of European complications and in
particular not to join the League of Nations.⁴ This attitude combined with the Republican Party's staunch stand in the Senate against foreign involvement, had the ultimate effect of limiting the options of the Harding Administration. It was soon evident to the Republican hierarchy that their aggressive, bipartisan actions prior to assuming the presidency had effectively blocked their access to international organizations and had thus seriously curtailed their ability to protect America's international interests.

Amongst the world's diplomatic community, Harding's election caused some confusion as to what type of foreign policy the United States could be expected to pursue. While in the Senate, Harding had established a modest record as an internationalist especially on issues relating to trade. He had not, however, aggressively asserted his own opinions on a wide spectrum of foreign policy issues. Although Harding had been a member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee during the treaty debate, his actual participation in the controversy had been minimal. He was a loyal supporter of Lodge's majority report and had consistently voted for a treaty which contained the reservations designed to "Americanize" the document.⁶ Yet, his lack of public comment, a deliberate policy to avoid becoming controversial and thus placing his presidential aspirations in jeopardy, left his actual opinions on America's international involvement ambiguous.
Moreover, Harding's nomination on the tenth ballot at the Republican Convention raised questions as to how much personal support he could muster within his own party. Viewed as a compromise candidate, Harding's relatively weak political position meant that he had very little input in the composition of the party's foreign policy platform. Primarily written by Elihu Root, a prominent internationalist, the platform was designed to be wordy and ambiguous in order to create some flexibility for the party. Root wanted to appeal to both internationalists and isolationists. By refusing to be specific, he hoped to satisfy the irreconcilables while not ruling out the possibility of the United States one day joining the League of Nations if the covenant was changed to address American concerns. Meeting the demands of the Senate was especially important to Root because the Republican Convention had revealed the extent of the influence and control which leading senators exerted over the Party. In his keynote address, Senator Lodge made it very clear that regardless of which political party the next President represented, the Senate would insists on maintaining a strong influence on America's foreign policy.

The conflict within the Republican Party made the selection of a Secretary of State one of Harding's most difficult cabinet posts to fill. On March 5, 1921, Charles E. Hughes was appointed. Hughes brought to his position a record which advocated American involvement in a revised League. His
family background (he was from New York where he was well connected with the Eastern elites) and interest in foreign affairs led Hughes to the conclusion that with the military protection previously afforded by the British Navy in decline, the United States had to become more aggressive in guarding its strategic interests. The fact that Hughes had not been a member of the Senate during the treaty debate made him much more willing than Harding to challenge the authority of that body. For this reason, the President allowed his Secretary of State to be primarily responsible for formulating America's foreign policy.

One foreign policy criterion that Harding did establish, however, was his insistence that his Administration would not lead the United States to membership in the League "by the side door, back door, or cellar door." Motivated by political expediency, this policy put Hughes in the awkward position of having to make elaborate attempts to avoid acknowledging the authority of the League and indeed, its very existence. During his first months in office, Hughes refused to allow State Department officials to respond to correspondence received from the various offices of the League. The Secretary of State's lack of direct cooperation continued until 1923, when he was severely criticised by the American press, and, in particular, the New York Times.

Hughes' policy of non-cooperation soon proved to be pointless. The Secretary of State's desire to protect America's
interests made it necessary that he find some method of informing the League of America's policies and attitudes towards specific issues. Nagging problems remaining from the war still needed to be resolved by the League and Hughes wanted to ensure that America's position was presented.\textsuperscript{14} The dilemma that he had to face was to find a communication link that did not appear to be too cooperative nor jeopardized America's policy of isolation. At first, the United States resorted to communicating with the League through the diplomatic offices of third parties, for example, the Dutch government.\textsuperscript{15} This method, however, was not satisfactory because the assisting governments often did not share the same concerns or interests as the United States. Consequently, the State Department began to search for a country that was a member of the League and with whom it shared similar interests and policies. With this intention, State Department officials began to explore the possibility of using Canada as a "front man" for American interests in the League. In short, America's need to actively participate in the world community while still publicly appearing to be isolated, was the stimulus for establishing a direct, close, unique relationship with the Dominion of Canada.

When the sixty-seventh Congress assembled for the first time on March 4, 1921, both the House and the Senate initially wanted to address a number of domestic issues that had been temporarily set aside by the treaty debate. The tone of the legislation that Congress would deal with had been established
by Harding's campaign promise to lower taxes. This policy of fiscal restraint resulted in budgetary cuts to public works projects, veterans allowances, and a proposal to make drastic cuts in the Naval Appropriations Bill. It was this last issue which sparked the most controversy in the Senate and served as an indication to the American public of how drastically the war had altered America's international position. During the course of the debate senators began to realize that any cuts made in the naval expenditures for domestic political reasons would have serious implications for America's foreign policy. It became clear that America's relations with Great Britain, Japan, and China would be affected by any cuts that appeared to weaken the United States' military presence in the Pacific. As well, America's attitude towards the question of world disarmament would also have to be revised if the size of the navy was downgraded. In short, the Naval Appropriations Bill clearly revealed that one of the lasting effects of the war was that domestic political expediency and foreign policy issues had become so inter-related that they could no longer be dealt with as separate entities.

The foreign policy issue that was most frequently discussed in connection with the Naval Appropriations Bill was the proposed renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. This alliance, signed between Great Britain and Japan in 1902, had long been a concern of successive American administrations. Designed by Great Britain to be a method of preserving her declining
role in the Pacific, the alliance served the dual purpose of protecting Britain's Far East possessions from Imperial Russia while also preventing a possible conflict with expansionist Japan. In essence, the alliance, prior to World War One, allowed Great Britain to withdraw some of her naval strength in the Pacific in order to meet the growing threat posed by Germany in the Atlantic.

In the United States, however, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was viewed by many officials, notably Secretary of State Hughes, as a threat to both America's Pacific possessions and to her policy of an Open Door in China. As mentioned, the widespread anti-British sentiment in the United States caused American policy makers to be suspicious of the British government's motives in the Pacific. As well, the State Department was equally concerned with Japan's intentions. That country's victory in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) had convinced many Western observers of the potential military strength of Japan. With the collapse of Tsarist Russia in 1917, and the conclusion of World War One in 1918, Japan clearly emerged as the foremost power in the Far East. Consequently, when the alliance came up for renewal in 1920, American officials intended to make their strenuous objections known to both governments.

The State Department maintained that the decline of Imperial Russia had eliminated the original purpose for the alliance. If renewed, the United States would interpret
this action as an attempt by Great Britain and Japan to counter American strength in the Pacific. For this reason, the Naval Appropriations Bill was especially pertinent because some senators, in particular, Hiram Johnson of California, argued that the United States could not afford to make any cuts that would weaken her position in the Pacific. Johnson's attitude was ironic. A vocal member of the irreconcilables, he admitted during the naval appropriations debate that indeed, the United States could no longer afford to ignore the policies of other nations. In effect, Johnson lobbied the State Department to take whatever action was necessary to inform the British government that the United States considered the alliance detrimental to the development of a close Anglo-American relationship.

During the Senate debate Johnson received support for his position from his colleague James D. Phelan, also from California, in opposing the naval cuts. Phelan was especially concerned by the proposed renewal of the alliance because both Japan and Britain were members of the League and seemed to be benefitting from that body's authority. The League's decision to award the Pacific island of Yap to the Japanese irritated American officials who wanted the United States to control the strategic island. "The menace of Japan," Phelan stated in the Senate:

[was] so manifest that he who runs may read, especially in these later months when Japan, a member of the League of Nations, has cast off all disguise, allied
herself with the powers of Europe, where we are not represented, and has apparently assumed an unfriendly position. Phelan then went on to argue that the United States was not alone in its concern over Japan's perceived aggressiveness. At this point in his speech the Senator noted that:

there is an instinctive fear throughout the Pacific among the native tribes, as well as among the Caucasians in California, in Washington, Oregon, New Zealand, Canada and Australia that their very life [was] threatened.

Phelan maintained that this fear could only be eliminated if the United States preserved a strong presence in the Pacific and prevented the renewal of the alliance. His identification with the Pacific Dominions was a clear indication that the Senate was becoming aware of the controversy existing within the Empire over the question of the alliance's renewal. This awareness was made even more explicit by Senator James A. Reed of Missouri. Referring to the tense atmosphere which existed in British Columbia between the Asian and Caucasian communities, Reed argued that:

if an unprovoked war were to be made upon us by Japan and if Great Britain were to call upon Canada to help a brown race to attack the United States of America, Canada would be in a flame of revolt and would take her position beside the Christian civilization of North America as against the paganism of the Orient.

The common attitude which Western senators shared with the Pacific Dominions and in particular Canada, also extended into the thorny questions of Asian immigration and racial
equality. At the time of the Paris Peace Conference, President Wilson, recognizing that Asian racial equality was an important issue in California, Oregon and Washington, refused to include in the League of Nation's Covenant a statement guaranteeing racial equality. During the Anglo-Japanese Alliance debate in the Senate, racial equality again became a contentious issue in the Western states and reached new heights of hysteria when the Hearst newspaper chain published a number of editorials opposed to Asian immigration. Again, Senators Phelan, Lodge and Oscar Underwood from Alabama, recognized that America's policies and attitudes were supported by the Pacific Dominions. Senator Hitchcock, referring to an editorial in the Montreal Gazette, make it clear to his senatorial colleagues that the Canadian government considered the questions of Asian immigration and racial equality priority issues that had to be on the agenda of the next Imperial Conference to be held in 1921. The Democratic Senator concluded that "Canada holds exactly the same views that the United States holds," and therefore, America should encourage the Canadian government to take a strong position.

An important factor contributing to the Senate's knowledge of Canadian policy was the close relationship that was developing between leading Republicans and Loring Christie, an intimate advisor of Canadian Prime Ministers Robert Borden and Arthur Meighen. Born in Nova Scotia, Christie's family heritage and his own temporary employment in Washington when a
young man, caused him to be very sensitive and concerned about issues confronting both Canada and the United States. His policy papers to Borden and Meighen contained sophisticated analyses of America's position on a number of important topics affecting the British Empire and Canada in particular. In his article, "Loring Christie and the Genesis of the Washington Conference," Canadian historian Arthur Lower maintained that it was Christie's influence that was the determining factor in Canada's attitude towards the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Moreover, in February 1921, Christie was instrumental in setting up meetings in Washington between Newton Rowell and leading American officials. During these discussions, the State Department made its attitude towards the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Asian immigration and racial equality very clear to the Canadian government. American officials went to great lengths to outline the frustration they felt at not being able to receive a definitive response from the British government.

An examination of State Department records indicates that the United States tried to make its position on not only the renewal of the alliance but all issues relating to the Pacific known to the British government as early as 1919. Through its ambassador in London, the American government made repeated attempts to ascertain the details of Britain's Pacific policy. On May 10, 1920, the State Department went so far as to send a dispatch to London which outlined American
objections to the renewal of the present alliance and the changes the United States deemed necessary if the British government should decide to sign a revised treaty and still wanted to maintain a growing relationship with the United States. Although the British attempted to placate the United States, enough suspicion of British motives remained in American circles to cause the State Department concern. As a result, the United States changed its tactic of dealing solely with the British government and began to exploit its unofficial connections with Canada. Through Loring Christie, American officials encouraged the efforts of the Canadian government in convincing the British not to renew the alliance.

Canada's reaction to the proposed renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance and the Asian immigration question was, to some extent, formulated in response to the attitude of the United States. The two issues served to demonstrate to both countries the many similarities existing in their policies. Robert Borden had made it clear that Canada would not support a policy which was opposed or deemed harmful by the United States. Moreover, the monetary cost of an adequate Pacific defense, which so pre-occupied American Senators, was also a primary concern of the Canadian government. In a letter to the Secretary of State, the American Consul in Montreal informed his government that Canada had decided that "in the matter of naval defense, it [was] perfectly obvious that Canada [was] in no position now, nor will be for years to
come, to undertake more that is already being done. . . ."38

This statement was an indication to the State Department that Canada was beginning to identify its Pacific defense with the United States. This explains why Canada was much more prepared to advocate ending the Anglo-Japanese alliance than her sister Pacific Dominions. Both New Zealand and Australia looked to Great Britain for protection, and consequently, wanted to keep the powerful Japanese Navy as an ally instead of a potential foe.39

The actual part that Canada played in the debate over the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance has been the source of controversy amongst Canadian and Commonwealth historians.40 Although the historiography is extensive, a detailed analysis of the American perspective has yet to be complete. An interesting question which needs to be explored is: What role, if any, did the United States envision Canada playing?

An examination of the American documentation reveals that American policy makers believed that the Canadian government had the will and the flexibility to pursue an independent diplomatic course. Aware of Britain's desire to preserve imperial unity, American officials believed that if Canada made a strong stand against the alliance Britain would be forced to adjust its policies. Consequently, in addition to the voices already heard in the Senate, the State Department, using indirect means, attempted to encourage Canada to be more assertive with her sister Dominions and Great Britain.41
This situation should have afforded Canada an unprecedented diplomatic opportunity not only to foster her own independent foreign policy, but also to enhance the Canadian government's international status by exploring the possibilities of having Great Britain and the United States vie for Canada's support. Keeping in mind the British government's concern for maintaining imperial unity and the United States desire to gain a reliable ally both in the League and the British Empire, the situation should have been ripe for Canadian officials to exploit. In order to understand why Canada did not use her unique position to full advantage it is necessary to analyze the stance the Canadian government did take on the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and then examine how Great Britain and the United States reacted to Canada's position.

In early 1921, the question of the alliance's renewal reached the stage where the British government had to make a decision. In an attempt to force British officials to listen to his government's arguments, Canada's Prime Minister, Arthur Meighen, informed London of his desire to assign a special Canadian representative, presumably Robert Borden, to Washington in order to "get in touch with the new President of the United States and his Secretary of State . . . and discover, through informed and confidential conversations . . ." their reaction if the alliance was renewed.42 Paraphrasing the telegram sent by Meighen to the British government, Miles W. Lampson, an official in the British Foreign Office argued
that:

the Canadian government considered this method of procedure the most appropriate because the Pacific Dominions were in reality more vitally affected than other parts of the Empire, and also because the proposal, if it came from Canada, seemed best calculated to attract the government at Washington. 43

"The Canadian people . . ." continued Lampson,

would expect every effort to be made towards the policy of cooperation; as it involved the first definite step of primary significance in British-American relations since the cessation of the war they would attach great importance to the present question. . . . Canadians had special opportunities to understand and to deal with Americans through long association and intercourse. 44

It was clear to Lampson that Canada was attempting to fulfill its desired role of acting as a mediator between the two world powers. Implicit in Meighen's request was the underlying threat that if Canada was not granted permission to send a representative to Washington the Canadian government would be prepared to consider acting independently. Lampson was well aware that this could mean the end of having only one foreign policy for the whole Empire. "Unless prompt action [was] taken, . . ." Lampson warned:

We may see an immediate move, independently of His Majesty's Government, between Canada and the United States on the problems of the Pacific and Japanese policy in that region. . . . 45

Lampson concluded his summary of Meighen's position by arguing that if Canada pursued a course independent of the Empire the
Canadian government would be playing into the waiting hands of the United States. Senator Lodge, in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had already expressed his opinion that it would be acceptable to the United States if the Canadian government sent a representative to Washington.  

Lampson was not the only British official to be concerned about American motives for encouraging Canada to appoint a representative. "If Canada insists on moving, ..." wrote Sir W. Tyrrell,

at Washington by the dispatch of Sir Robert Borden without having come to an agreement with us, she will be playing into the hands of Senator Lodge and his party who hope to utilize the question of Japanese alliance for the purpose of detaching her and possibly Australia with a view to shift the centre of the English speaking communities from London to Washington . . .  

Lord George Nathaniel Curzon, Great Britain's Foreign Secretary, was also worried about the implications to the Empire's policies if Canada should take independent action. Curzon wanted his office to retain maximum flexibility without being hindered by the attitudes and positions of the Dominions. In a telegram, carefully worded so as not to offend Canada and cause the Canadian government to react by working with the United States, Winston Churchill, the British Secretary of Colonies, informed the Canadian Governor General that the British "Strongly urge[d] that the Canadian Government should not approach the Washington government independently."
This comment, combined with the British government's previous attempts to limit the independent actions of the Dominions, was a further indication that Great Britain was attempting to renege on the commitments it had made to the Dominions during the war and regain full control of the Empire's foreign policy. Although Churchill's telegram opposed the Canadian plan, Canada still had the option of acting independently and sending its representative to Washington. Clearly, this was an opportunity for Canada to gain more control over its foreign policy. By ignoring the British objections and sending a representative to the United States it was conceivable that this would force the British government to recognize the special concerns and interests of Canada. The British government would be placed in the awkward position of either recognizing Canada's independent role as a policy maker and adapting its imperial policies to suit Canada's new position or, Great Britain could have risked a constitutional and imperial crisis by attempting to prevent Canada's international growth.

While British and Canadian officials were discussing the question of sending a special Canadian envoy to Washington, the United States was kept fully informed by its diplomatic corps. The information being received by the American government, however, tended to be inconsistent making it very difficult for the State Department to formulate a policy toward Canada. As mentioned, the State Department was
fully aware of the 1921 debates in the Canadian House of Commons pertaining to Canada's permanent representation in Washington. The fact that there was very little opposition in Canada to the concept of independent representation and that the political debate was actually over the question of whether the Canadian representative should be tied to the British Embassy, was interpreted by American officials as meaning that a Canadian appointment would be made in the near future. Moreover, the State Department was also encouraged by the tone of the debate. Newton Rowell's argument that Canadian representation in Washington "would not impair but would tend to improve the relations not only between Canada and the Mother Country, but also between Canada and the United States," coincided with the attitudes possessed by American diplomats and politicians. The combination of the House of Commons' debates and the confrontation between Canada and Great Britain over the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance convinced the United States that Canada was preparing to sever its ties with the Empire.

Less than a month after the Canadian House of Commons demonstrated its commitment to separate representation in Washington, by allocating funds in the federal budget, American consulates in Canada began sending a different signal to the State Department. Citing an editorial printed in the Montreal Gazette on May 7, 1921, the American consulate in Montreal informed Washington that Arthur Meighen had apparently decided
to heed the warnings of the British government and publicly announced that Canada would not vigorously pursue clarification of its international status. Moreover, Meighen also stated that the 1917 decision to hold an imperial constitutional conference at the conclusion of the war was "outside the realm of practical things, and indeed, directly counter to the principle upon which the prosperity and even the existence of our commonwealth . . ." was established and therefore, was delayed indefinitely. "The people of the Empire," Meighen went on to state:

have disclosed no liking for abrupt constitutional changes, and seem unlikely to embark in the near future upon complicated invention in such a field.

Meighen's comments left American policy makers confused as to how to respond to the Canadian government's changed position. In the Senate, individual senators, such as William Borah of Idaho, concluded that Canada was not prepared to assume the responsibilities of an autonomous nation and would not send an independent representative to the United States.

In attempting to account for the Canadian government's apparent hesitancy historians have pointed to a number of factors. Certainly, the British government's opposition to Canada's request to send an independent representative to the United States forms part of the answer. The Canadian government was well aware of the implications for Canada and the Empire as a whole, if it had chosen to break with the concept of imperial unity and follow an independent course. For Canada
to have advocated this policy it would have needed the support of a vast majority of Canadians. Not unlike the American public, however, Canadians had lost interest in foreign affairs and were anxious to have their political leaders address many of the pressing domestic issues.57

A second factor contributing to Canada's lack of independent action was a strong indication from the United States that it was prepared to call a conference for the purpose of discussing, among other things, the outstanding issues threatening world peace, and in particular, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. On April 13, 1921, Senator Borah introduced into the Senate a resolution calling upon the President to host a conference of the major powers to discuss world disarmament.58

Borah, attempting to enhance the Senate's tarnished image, hoped that his resolution would stem the tide of public criticism against his stand on the League by providing the United States with an alternative to permanent international obligations. The Senator's motivation for calling the conference was an outgrowth of his concept of North American isolationism. Borah hoped the conference would ensure world peace without the United States' making a commitment to the concept of collective security or necessitating a fortress mentality that would have required enormous expenditures on the military, and the navy in particular.59

The Canadian government could certainly identify with Borah's motivation and goals. Canada's attitude towards world
peace was very similar to that of the United States. Moreover, if the President called for a conference, America's active participation would remove the need for Canada to make a decision as to whether it should act independently of the Empire.

A third factor contributing to Canada's decision not to send a representative to Washington was the June 1921 Imperial Conference. This conference afforded the Canadian government an opportunity to air its views and grievances without taking the drastic step of acting independently. In regards to Canada's position on the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, the conference provided Meighen with an opportunity to present the American and Canadian viewpoints. Canadian representatives wasted no time in making it clear to the Imperial delegations why Canada felt it had a special right to be heard and its attitudes taken into account when the Empire was discussing its relationship with the United States. "Canada does not claim," Meighen stated in his opening address:

that in the general question of the renewal or the non-renewal of the Treaty her voice must be especially heard. Not at all. The Empire is concerned as an Empire, ... But regards this aspect, its effects on British-American relations, we do feel that we have a special right to be heard. ... We know, or ought to know, the United States best, and because in the continuance and improvement of our relationship with them we have a vital concern.

Within this statement, the underlying concern which the Canadian Prime Minister had for Canada's relationship with the
United States is revealed.

Two days prior to his address before the Imperial Conference, Meighen had elaborated on his fear that American-Canadian relations were becoming too intertwined. "The course of the United States policy, . . ." Meighen maintained:

in every field affects Canada. Their numbers are many times the numbers of the Dominion in population. Their decisions, their lines of policy constantly affect us in a profound degree. We live in constant and vital touch with this problem from day to day. . . . 61

Within this comment lies the fundamental reason why Canada declined to assert itself in foreign affairs. The Canadian government feared the pressure coming from the United States would, in the final analysis, lead Canada into a situation where she would become a tool for the United States to manipulate for its own purposes. Meighen's government felt that it had the choice of either becoming the American "front man" or remaining committed to the Empire and working within that structure to present North America's concerns and attitudes. Meighen's government chose the latter course because it felt that policy had the better chance of succeeding while still preserving for Canada some freedom of action.

Canada's decision not to play an independent role in bringing America's attitudes to the attention of the British government was disappointing both to the United States and to independently minded Canadians. Still, American policy makers realized that in threatening imperial unity by forcing Canada
to identify its interests with the United States, they had discovered a tool that could be used to their advantage in the future.62

In the Canadian historiography, Bartlet Brebner described Meighen's role throughout the Anglo-Japanese Treaty dispute as helping:

- to create a favorable opportunity for Charles Evans Hughes, . . . to invite the powers to a conference at Washington for naval disarmament and for redressing the balance of power in the Pacific. . . .63

This is a very substantial claim that is only partially verified in the American documentation. Certainly, Canada's identification with American policies provided the United States with access to the imperial council. The Canadian government's reluctance to assert itself, however, by forcing the issue and establishing a direct communication link with the United States meant that Canada did not play as substantial a role as the opportunity presented. By not seizing the initiative Canada established a precedent that would characterize her response to future crises. Consequently, the conflicting view of Canada's status that was presented to the United States government between February and June 1921, did more to hinder than help the development of a close American-Canadian relationship.64

The next opportunity for Canada and the United States to establish a close relationship was presented by the Washington Naval Conference scheduled for November 1921. With the
concept of a world disarmament conference finally accepted by all the major powers, the State Department had to formally issue invitations to participating nations. The question was soon raised as to whether the Dominions should receive a separate status as established at the Paris Peace Conference, or should be included in one invitation to the British Empire. The United States chose the latter course thus making it Great Britain's responsibility to handle the demands and policy positions of her Dominions. In making this decision, the United States sparked an historical controversy.

The standard interpretation of Canada's lack of a separate invitation to the Washington Conference was first put forward by Robert MacGregor Dawson in *The Development of Dominion Status, 1900-1936*. 65 Although Dawson was not completely unsympathetic to the American position, he did point out that the United States justified ignoring the Dominions by arguing that their rejection of the Treaty of Versailles meant that the United States was not obligated to recognize the international status accorded the British Dominions by that document. 66 This historical interpretation continues to be accepted, in a modified form, by current studies. In their recent work *An Introduction to Canadian-American Relations*, Edelgard Mahant and Graeme Mount concluded that "the United States was slow and rather unwilling to recognize . . ." the Dominions' new status and therefore, did not issue them separate invitations. 67
Certainly, once the conference had been called the American government did demonstrate an ambivalence towards the British Dominions. State Department records indicate that American policy makers were well aware that editorials in Canadian newspapers maintained that Canada had reached the status of an equal partner with Great Britain. In addition, in the immediate aftermath of the Imperial Conference, July 11, 1921, in a letter from their London Ambassador, the American government was advised that the Dominion Premiers must be allowed to play some role at the conference if the United States wished to avoid causing a resurgence of anti-American feeling within the Empire. This letter was reinforced four days later by a communication from Lord Curzon strongly urging that the United States extend some form of diplomatic recognition to the Dominions. At this point in the correspondence it appears that Dawson's interpretation was correct and that it was the American government, which had been informed of the Dominions' changing international role, that was unwilling to grant any recognition to the Dominions.

Further examination of the State Department records suggests, however, that the thesis that the United States refused to acknowledge the Dominions' status is not completely accurate. Many historians, especially John Galbraith, have pointed out that the Harding Administration did have some options in the question of whether the Dominions could receive a separate invitation. In 1911, the Republican Administration
of William Howard Taft had established a precedent by inviting Canada to attend a conference convened to update an international convention relating to the protection of industrial property. Harding, if he had so chosen, could have used Taft's example, which had been established at a time when the Dominions' were not demanding international status, as a reason for sending the Dominions a separate invitation. Based on the Taft precedence, Harding could have argued that the Dominions were included because of their special interests in disarmament and the invitation in no way committed the United States to recognizing a new status for the Dominions.

A second factor that also undermines the traditional historical interpretation stems from Harding's relationship with the Senate. As a former senator, Harding was aware of the mistakes made by Wilson in not consulting the leading members of Congress. The President realized that the Senate was experiencing some public disfavour because of its bipartisan actions during the treaty debate and consequently, would not be in a strong position to dispute which countries should be in attendance at the conference. Moreover, Harding's decision to include Senators Lodge and Underwood in the American delegation helped to ensure the Senate's cooperation. All these factors contributed to providing the Harding Administration with a flexibility that Wilson had not possessed or indeed, attempted to create. This flexibility could have been used to gain support in the Senate for extending an
invitation to the Dominions.

Significantly, State Department records indicate that President Harding did attempt to explore some of his options. In a letter dated August 23, 1921, the State Department asked its London Ambassador to determine how many commissioners the British government felt each delegation should include. "Presumably [the] British Government will desire, . . ." wrote Secretary of State Hughes:

> to include Dominion representatives and of course this would be very acceptable to the United States. . . . We do not desire to attempt to impose restrictions upon representation of other Governments but we consider that the Governments will desire a substantial equality of representation and with this in view it would be desirable to limit each commission to five or six. We assume that in the case of the British Government six would give full opportunity for Dominion representations which the United States does not desire to make difficult.\footnote{74}

Certainly, this letter does imply that the United States was not prepared to accept the dual representation Canada and her sister Dominions had enjoyed at the Paris Peace Conference. At the same time, however, Hughes' letter does demonstrate a willingness on the part of the United States to recognize that a change in the Dominions' status had taken place within the imperial structure and should be acknowledged at the international level.

America's London Ambassador, George Harvey, response to the Secretary of State's inquiry revealed his impression of the British government's attitude towards its Dominions. In a
telegram sent on August 26, 1921, after the Ambassador had received Hughes letter of the 23rd, Harvey informed the State Department that he had "had a long and most friendly talk yesterday with Curzon." Harvey went on to state that on the issue of delegation size, Curzon:

strongly recommended that official representation in actual membership of conference be limited to two or at most three. . . . Although Curzon did not say so I gather that he expects Lloyd George and himself will thus represent the British Empire, . . . They consider . . . [dominion representation] a family affair and feel quite competent and authorized to speak for the whole Empire. . . . they are so sensitive upon this point that I feel sure Curzon would have been disposed to resent a suggestion from me. . . .

Harvey explained to the State Department that he had tried to make it clear to the British government that Dominion representation was acceptable to the United States and the Ambassador did:

present [Hughes'] tentative suggestion of five to six delegates to avoid [the] possibility of future criticism from Dominions that might be based upon the assumption that they were barred out of adequate participation through any plan or act of yours.

Harvey concluded his telegram with his personal assessment of the British government's attitude towards its Dominions' demand for status. "Confidentially I feel," Harvey wrote:

satisfied that Curzon and Lloyd George do not care to have [the] Dominions directly represented by their own delegates upon [the] same plane of authority as themselves.
This telegram became the basis from which the American government later determined the size of the delegations and the procedural methods the conference would adopt. On August 29, 1921, Secretary of State Hughes asked his Ambassador to make clear to the British government "that [the] idea should not get abroad that we have limited [the] size of delegation and thus made impractical Dominions' representation. Our willingness to have larger delegations should accordingly be apparent."79

The correspondence between London and Washington provides an indication that the United States was prepared to exercise some of its options by being flexible on the issue of Dominion status. There are a number of factors which help to explain America's sudden willingness to grant the Dominions some diplomatic recognition. Certainly, it can be argued that the American government's attitude was an extension of its original policy of using the Dominions, especially Canada, to induce Great Britain to adopt policies advantageous to the United States. A major reason why the United States was prepared to accept the Dominions at the conference was that America could have used the Dominions' support on the issue of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. The State Department had been informed that it was unlikely that New Zealand or Australia would attend.80 American diplomats assumed, however, that Canada would avail herself of the opportunity to demonstrate her diplomatic status at the conference by continuing to lobby
against the renewal of the alliance.

As well, it can also be argued that Hughes' proposed that the Dominions should be represented as part of the British delegation because it would provide the United States with the opportunity to appoint a number of prominent individuals, both Republican and Democrat, to their delegation.81 This tactic would have helped to ensure that any agreement(s) resulting from the conference would gain support from both political parties and receive speedy passage in the Senate.

A third factor contributing to Hughes' desire to have the Dominions present at the conference was the changing status of Ireland. In his August 26, 1921 telegram, Ambassador Harvey warned the State Department that the Irish situation, which had continued to cause friction in Anglo-American relations, could be substantially changed before the naval conference.82 Harvey was referring to the ongoing negotiations between British officials and representatives for Ireland. In the United States, powerful lobbies and prominent senators were anxious to see the United States immediately recognize any change in Ireland's status.83 For this reason, American officials had to be careful when handling the question of Dominion status. The State Department would not have been able to justify granting status to Ireland without extending the same recognition to the other Dominions.

Despite all these factors, the United States decided to acquiesce in the British desire to keep Dominion representation
a "family affair," and did not issue invitations to the Dominions. American officials were reluctant to hinder the growth of the Anglo-American relationship. The appearance of the United States interfering in the internal affairs of the Empire would certainly have put a strain on any future relations with Great Britain.

More importantly, however, the obvious backtracking of the Canadian government in the events leading up to and including the June Imperial Conference, created an impression in Washington that Canada was not serious in its public demands for diplomatic autonomy. The fact that Canada did not strongly oppose the diplomatic arrangement laid out for the Washington conference further convinced the American government that Canada was not, at that time, anticipating an active role. Evidence of Canada's hesitancy was later revealed in the Canadian House of Commons when William Lyon Mackenzie King pointed out that any status the Dominions may have acquired at the Washington conference was due to the strident efforts of the South African government which had insisted that Great Britain take steps to ensure the Dominions access to the conference. King accused the Meighen government of losing its resolve to make Canada diplomatically autonomous. He reasoned that by accepting a back seat at the conference the Canadian government had demonstrated, once again, its willingness to accept British control of its foreign policy.

While Canada did not play a prominent role at the con-
ference, which was held between November 12, 1921 and February 6, 1922, the Dominion did insist on signing the resulting agreements on its own behalf. In addition, Canada, using the Treaty of Versailles as a precedent, insisted on the right of its Parliament to ratify any agreement before it became binding on the Canadian government. Under pressure, especially from South Africa, the British government lobbied the Conference on the Dominions' behalf. Both these provisions were accepted by the United States. This was another indication that the American government was not opposed to the Dominions' gaining some form of international recognition. By permitting the Dominions to sign America's executive branch of government extended its recognition to a status that had originally been established at Paris.

At the conclusion of the Washington Conference the task facing the Harding Administration was to get the naval agreements accepted by two-thirds of the Senate. As with the Versailles Treaty debate, there still remained a small group of vocal senators who were opposed to any agreement that infringed on the American government's ability to formulate an independent foreign policy. Resurrecting some of the arguments that had been used to defeat the Treaty of Versailles, the irreconcilables focussed their arguments on the abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and the signing of the naval agreements by the Dominions. Senator Robert La Follette clearly indicated to his colleagues that his position on the
question of the Dominions' status had not changed. "I do not know," he commented:

whether the British Government would control, if this proposed treaty went into effect, that these Dominions should each have a separate vote under the treaty, as they have under the League of Nations .... At all events, we do know that the Anglo-Jap[anese] policy of aggression and imperialism which made the British Empire and the Jap[anese] Empire close allies in the past, and which makes them close allies today, will cause them to stand as a unit in opposition to the policies of any power in the Pacific which dares to insist that the rights of the weaker people there shall be recognized and protected.  

La Follette's mistrust of the British was mirrored by his colleague Senator Thomas Watson of Georgia. Watson argued that the naval treaties threatened to destroy America's natural advantage of having two oceans separating the United States from her potential enemies. Watson maintained that an additional natural advantage ensuring America's safety was the ability of the United States to "hold ... Canada as a hostage for the good behavior of England." Although both La Follette and Watson represented a minority view, their comments demonstrated that there was still significant opposition and a genuine lack of understanding relating to Canada's international status.

For the most part, however, the Senate debate pertaining to the naval agreements did demonstrate that the majority of senators had a different view of both Canada's and America's roles in the world community. Certainly, the irreconcilables
were able to prevent any "Association of Nations" that would have resembled a long term commitment by the United States.\textsuperscript{91}

Yet, the tone of the debates on the naval agreements was significantly different from that of the Treaty of Versailles. Instead of emphasizing how Canada differed from the United States, advocates of the agreements focused on the similarities between the two nations. Symbolizing the changing attitude in the Senate, Senator Lodge, in his speech defending the agreement on the abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, maintained "that the alliance was a breeder of suspicion in North America, both in Canada and the United States."\textsuperscript{92}

How does the historian account for the change in attitude demonstrated by a number of American senators in the short period between the defeat of the Versailles Treaty and the ratification of the Washington Naval Agreements? Certainly, the long term commitment by the United States was not the same in the Naval Agreements as compared with the Treaty of Versailles. As mentioned, there was no attachment to a forum such as the League of Nations, and staunch isolationists could, and did argue, that by limiting the size of the world's navies the United States could live in isolation without fearing the other world powers. Senator Borah referred to this as a policy of strength through the combination of disarmament and isolationism.\textsuperscript{93}

The Senate debate also revealed, however, that there was a growing realization amongst all levels of the American
governmental structure that the isolationist policies of the previous century could no longer be applied. During the three years between the armistice in Europe and the Washington Conference questions relating to nations indebtedness to the United States, international trade barriers, and America's concern for her overseas possessions required the State Department to initiate a more international outlook. This realization had contributed to America's desire to hold the Washington Conference and was also to have a lasting effect on the American-Canadian relationship.

The Senate's ratification of the Naval Agreements was, by extension, a ratification of Canada's right to sign diplomatic agreements and present them to its Parliament. Moreover, despite the Canadian government's apparent unwillingness to aggressively pursue a separate and distinct foreign policy, Canada had proven to be a useful "front man" in presenting to an international forum ideas, issues, and concerns that reflected a distinctly North American perspective. Finally, the American government was aware that Prime Minister Meighen had made it clear at the Imperial Conference of 1921, that in affairs "affecting the United States and Canada, the Dominion should have full and final authority." This type of forceful statement demonstrated that by encouraging the autonomy of Canada the United States was protecting its interests and gaining a loyal ally. In the wake of the Washington Conference, American officials became even more convinced of the Canadian
government's potential usefulness. This becomes clear when the role and policy positions of Canada's representatives in the League of Nations are analyzed.

As mentioned, the American government had initially tried to ignore the existence of the League but when this proved detrimental to America's interests, the United States began, at an unofficial level, to deal informally with the League's organizations and councils. At a number of conferences sponsored by the League, the United States sent observers who, although not permitted by their own government to play an active role, used informal opportunities to make known their government's position on key issues. Even this method, however, proved to be an inefficient way of protecting America's interests. Many countries resented what they viewed to be the United States abrogating its responsibilities while attempting to enjoy some of the benefits the League offered. Aware of both this resentment and the futility of trying to convince the American public that the United States should join the League, the Harding Administration initiated a policy of privately supporting and encouraging those countries whose policies most closely resembled those of the United States.

Canada was the most logical and convenient nation most closely suited to American purposes.

One of the objections the irreconcilables had levied against Canada's involvement in the League had been the argument that the Dominion would simply be the puppet of Great
Britain. Canada, in conjunction with South Africa, however, wasted no time in proving those senators wrong. As mentioned, at the first meeting of the League's Assembly, Canada voted against the position of Great Britain over the issue of world trade in raw materials. This incident demonstrated that Canada was prepared not only to exercise its vote in the League assembly but also to differ with Great Britain when it was in Canada's interest to do so. "Apparently one of the surprises of the assembly was the independent attitude of the representatives from the Dominions of the British Empire," reported Rowell to the House of Commons upon his return from the Assembly meetings. He went on to state:

the representatives from the majority of the states apparently went to Geneva believing that the views of the Dominions and their votes would necessarily follow the views and votes of Great Britain, and when they found this view did not prevail there was very great surprise.

The Canadian government also made it clear during the first Assembly that Canada's policies were going to be guided by its sensibilities to the United States.

What caught the attention of American officials was Canada's consistent adherence to North American idealism and in particular, peace through isolationism. During the 1920s, Canada established an extensive record of protecting its vital interests, while tending to avoid many of the responsibilities membership in the League implied. Canada's main reason for joining the League had been to demonstrate and enhance her
international status. Canada quickly made it known, however, that there were limits to how far she was willing to cooperate with the League. The Canadian government's actions clearly indicated that it was not prepared to surrender any of its autonomy, not even to the world court. Speaking before the Assembly, Raoul Dandurand, a member of the Canadian delegation, argued that there was little point in Canada adhering to the world court because "nine-tenths, if not all, of the questions of difference that might arise between Canada and the outside world would be questions concerning the neighbouring Republic, and their Southern neighbour had not yet adhered to the Court of Justice .... Consequently, there was no pressing need for Canada to join." In this instance, the United States was a convenient scapegoat used to explain Canada's own reluctance at surrendering some of its sovereignty to a world organization.

Where the Canadian government did show an aggressive stance at the League was in its opposition to the concept of collective security and in particular, Article Ten of the League's Covenant. Canadian historians have been quick to point out that Robert Borden opposed Article Ten when it was first proposed at the Paris Peace Conference. In this regard, Borden was more aware of the widespread popularity amongst North Americans of the concept of isolationism than was Woodrow Wilson. When the Treaty of Versailles was ratified by the Canadian Parliament in September 1919, questions were raised in the House of Commons concerning Article Ten and the
obligations it would impose upon Canada.\textsuperscript{107} Having just emerged from one war, Canadians were not prepared to accept the prospect of being obliged to participate in future wars that may or may not involve immediate Canadian interests.

Following the League's official establishment, Canada submitted to the Committee on Amendments to the League Covenant a memorandum outlining Canadian objections to Article Ten.\textsuperscript{108} Amongst its arguments, the Canadian government maintained that it had only joined the League because it was under the impression that the covenant would be altered in such a way as to remove the arbitrary or compulsory articles.\textsuperscript{109} In justifying his government's position, the Canadian representative stated that it was his belief that once Article Ten was removed from the covenant the United States would join the League.\textsuperscript{110} It was this last argument, combined with Canada's desire to remove any articles which might be used to oppose the Canadian government's position on such questions as Asian immigration, that constituted Canada's major activities in the League. Although Canadian representatives made repeated attempts throughout the early 1920s to have Article Ten removed from the covenant, they were not able to secure enough support from other nations.

American officials watched the Canadian activities against the League's Covenant with interest. Not only did Canada's actions provide the United States with the opportunity to see some of its concerns brought to the floor of the
League's Assembly; the Canadian government's opposition to Article Ten also helped to convince many members of the American Senate of Canada's usefulness and commitment to North American idealism. In addition, Canada's stated desire to avoid becoming involved in future conflicts in Europe led a few senators to believe that Canada could be convinced to break all its ties with Great Britain. The Senate's new interest in Canada was best expressed by Senator John S. Williams of Mississippi in a speech he delivered in Memphis in June 1922. In, said Senator Williams,

consider[ing] Canada and ourselves, ...

... [we see that] Nothing but a map line divides us .... We are two nations, for Canada is a nation in all but name, ...

... but in all essential things one people, with the same New World spirit .... Shall we permit ourselves to 'be nagged' into antagonism to one another? And yet that is just what is being accomplished toward us in Canada by this hypocritical complaint about Canada having a voice and a vote in an assembly where Haiti and Nicaragua and Cuba virtually controlled by us, each has one.

Senator Williams' comments were just one more indication that some influential Americans were beginning to see little point in alienating a like-minded ally with diplomatic status in the League.

As with the Washington Conference, the League of Nations offered the Canadian government an opportunity to enhance Canada's own interests by forcing Great Britain and the United States to compete for Canadian support. Great Britain still wanted to maintain Canada's support in the League because the
British government was still trying to present to the rest of the world a unified Empire with one foreign policy. The United States, on the other hand, wanted Canada to pursue a foreign policy which was distinct from that of the Empire and reflected the North American view of the world. As with previous opportunities, however, Canada did not seize the initiative. The Canadian government did not use its position in the League to full advantage and, consequently, made no significant gains in its quest to achieve autonomy in its foreign affairs.

By late 1921 to early 1922, Canada had established enough of a precedent from its independent actions in the League to insist that Great Britain allow the Canadian government to appoint a representative to Washington who was not connected with the British Embassy. Certainly, the attitude of leading American officials was such that they would have welcomed the arrival of a Canadian in their capital. Still the Canadian government delayed. As previously stated, Meighen and later King, argued that the lack of trained personnel and a suitable representative were responsible for this delay.

In reality, however, the delay can be primarily attributed to Canada's efforts to maintain some of its manoeuvrability in the face of possible manipulation by the United States. The Canadian government's reluctance to appoint a representative to Washington stemmed from Canada's fear that once an appoint-
ment was made Canada would not be able to prevent American officials from dominating Canadian policy decisions. As it stood in 1921, Canadian officials were aware of the pressure coming from the United States to pursue an independent foreign policy that reflected North American interests. The Canadian government was able, however, to offset some of this pressure by forcing the United States to conduct its relations with Canada through the British government. Canada's concern to find ways of protecting itself from American influence can even be seen in the Canadian government's decision to join the League of Nations. Canada's involvement in the League was due, in no small measure, to the fear of becoming dominated by her southern neighbor. Not unlike many Latin and South American nations, who joined the League despite American objections, in order to minimize the effects of the Monroe Doctrine, Canada also became a member anticipating that this would prevent the United States from using its doctrine as an excuse for interfering in Canada's domestic politics.

Canada's concern not to become a tool of American diplomats resulted in the Canadian government, for the most part, taking the safer route of reconfirming its ties with Great Britain and working within the imperial structure to protect its interests. The fact that Canada's statements at the 1921 Imperial Conference and in the League of Nations led to confusion in the United States as to what the Canadian government was actually trying to accomplish did little to enhance
Canada's diplomatic status amongst American diplomats. For this reason, the defeat of Meighen's Conservative government in 1921 by King's Liberals was viewed as a positive development in Washington.

American officials had been kept well informed on the debates in the Canadian House of Commons where the Liberals had demanded that the Conservative government take some action on the issue of a Canadian representation in Washington. The State Department anticipated that with King's victory, his government would take swift action to appoint a representative. Moreover, the adamant attitude displayed by members of King's cabinet, in particular W.S. Fielding who had consistently opposed any Canadian representative's connection with the British Embassy, led American officials to conclude that King's election would give the State Department another opportunity to encourage Canada to break away from its European connection. The development of the Chanak Crisis early in King's mandate, the Fall of 1922, increased the State Department's optimism and was to prove a pivotal event in the development of a closer American-Canadian relationship.

The Chanak Crisis erupted in September 1922, when the British government, unable to reach a suitable peace settlement with Turkey, following World War I, asked its Dominions for military assistance if it should become necessary to impose a settlement. Almost immediately, New Zealand and Australia responded positively to the British request. Canada,
followed by South Africa, decided to use the crisis as a test of the constitutional development of the right of the Dominion parliaments to gain control over their own foreign affairs. Consequently, King's response to the British government was that Canadian troops would not be committed until the Canadian Parliament had debated the issue. "It is neither right nor proper," stated Prime Minister King during the parliamentary debate on the government's handling of the crisis,

for any individual or for any group of individuals to take any step which in any way might limit the rights of Parliament in a matter which is of such great concern to all the people of our country.

King asserted that the Canadian government had not been an active participant in the events leading up to the crisis and so did not feel that Canada should automatically become involved. In essence, King was declaring the supremacy of the Canadian Parliament in establishing whether Canada would, or would not, become involved in the crisis. "The Liberal government of Canada's purpose," wrote W.K. Hancock:

was to extend the old doctrine of responsible government further into the field of foreign affairs, and to disentangle Canadian policy from the imperial policy pursued by the British Foreign Office.

American policy makers were kept well informed of the events surrounding the Chanak Crisis. The diplomatic ramifications of the positions assumed by Canada and South Africa, both in the imperial structure and in the world community, were made clear to the State Department by American representatives.
stationed in both countries. In the February 1923 House of Commons debates, Mackenzie King defended his government's position that Canada had the competence to decide for itself what kind of commitment it would make to imperial policies that it did not control. In the United States, King's statements were interpreted as meaning that the new Liberal regime was prepared to assume more responsibility for its international affairs.125

The signals that the state Department was receiving from Canada were confirmed by American officials posted in other Dominions, and in particular, South Africa. Quoting an editorial published in the Cape Times on January 16, 1923, Charles J. Pisar, a member of the American Consulate, concluded that the crisis had enormously affected the role the Dominions would play in Britain's future foreign policy objectives. Pisar informed Washington that the South African government believed "that the Canadian government intend[ed] to demand a more definite understanding in Imperial relations, especially foreign affairs."126 The editorial went on to state that Canada was within its rights to have its position and amount of influence within the imperial structure clarified. The information Pisar provided warned the State Department that Canada's demands meant that America's relations with the Dominions was about to enter a new phase of complexity.127

The Canadian government's position during the Chanak Crisis was consistent with the attitude it had demonstrated in
the League of Nations. King was primarily concerned with avoiding any disputes that could possibly lead to Canadian involvement in a conflict where Canada's interests were not directly at stake. The Prime Minister's apparent commitment to North Americanism indicated that Canada was drifting away from the Empire and its entanglements. In an article in *Foreign Affairs* published in 1923, Philip Kerr argued that after the Chanak Crisis the emerging role of the Dominions in relation to Great Britain was similar to the American President "whose foreign policy, to be effective, required the consent and cooperation of the Senate—in our case, the Dominions." Thus, in February 1923, the State Department was once again reaching the conclusion that Canada was preparing to assert itself diplomatically and establish a separate representation in Washington.

Less than six months later, the American consul in Montreal once again informed his government that Canada had backed away from its more assertive foreign policy positions. In a dispatch dated July 1923, American officials in Canada told the State Department that the Canadian government had decided to postpone indefinitely any further discussion with Britain pertaining to a reformed imperial structure that would resemble a federation and thus guarantee a greater voice for the Dominions in policy formulation. This decision not to pursue a remodelling of the imperial structure was another example of Canada failing to carry out its public policy
statements. The Canadian government's inability to turn words into reality resulted in the State Department's viewing Canada's steps towards diplomatic autonomy with skepticism. The Chanak Crisis had demonstrated that Canada would not allow itself to be dragged into a dispute without first receiving the sanction of the Canadian Parliament. Clearly, this was a significant step in Canada's quest for diplomatic autonomy. Yet, in the areas of initiating and carrying out separate diplomatic policy objectives, the Canadian government's lack of aggression—in this case, forcing Great Britain to take tangible steps to ensure her Dominions a greater voice in policy making—led Americans to conclude that Canada was not particularly anxious to pursue an active, independent foreign policy of its own. Indeed, senior American officials began to doubt that Canada would even carry out its objective of establishing a separate representation in Washington.130

The United States continued to watch the evolving nature of the Empire and encouraged Canada's activities in the League but American officials, disappointed at Canada's apparent inability to follow through on its stated desire for diplomatic autonomy, became more dependent on dealing directly, if informally, with these organizations.131 In short, the net result of the Chanak Crisis was that Canada demonstrated that she would not necessarily be obligated to participate in issues not deemed to be in Canada's interests but also, that she was not prepared to determine and carry out her own policy
While these international disputes and events had been taking place, a number of bilateral issues between the United States and Canada had clearly demonstrated to both nations that they had to develop a more direct relationship. Canada not only feared American domination on international issues; it becomes clear when the historian analyzes the trade, fishing and prohibition disputes between 1919-1924, that the Canadian government was searching for a way of achieving some of its diplomatic objectives without conceding too much to her powerful southern neighbour in purely bilateral matters. Clearly, Canada realized that by using the imperial structure and having the support of Great Britain, it had a much greater chance of protecting its interests.

This was the dilemma that Canadians had to face. On the one hand, Canada could, and did, confront Great Britain and demand more diplomatic autonomy. This policy was especially effective when the Canadian government threatened Britain's policy of imperial unity by moving closer to the United States. On the other hand, in its bilateral relations with the United States, Canada had to come to grips with the fact that she was at a distinct disadvantage when negotiating with her more powerful neighbor. Consequently, Canada, in the early 1920's wanted, on bilateral issues, the diplomatic resources and support which Great Britain possessed. An analysis of the relations and issues that developed between
the United States and Canada in the early 1920s reveals that because of Canada's dilemma it was the Canadian government that was reluctant to take tangible steps towards establishing a separate presence in Washington.
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Chapter Three

The vast majority of historical studies analyzing Canada's special relationship with the United States have focused almost exclusively on bilateral issues. Even a cursory examination of both Canadian and American records during and after World War I reveals how complex and intertwined relations between the two countries had become in consequence of these issues. Matters ranging from economic concerns to immigration policies had to be swiftly resolved and it was becoming increasingly difficult for both nations to expeditiously handle these problems through Great Britain. As stated, Canadian historians have argued that it was the United States whose policies hindered the growth of a direct relationship between the two countries because Americans did not understand or recognize Canada's evolving diplomatic status. Yet, in examining a number of key bilateral issues between 1920-1924, one can see American officials actually encouraging Canada to take steps that would make the relationship closer and more direct. This becomes especially evident when the historian analyzes these bilateral concerns in comparison with America's attitude towards Canada on more international disputes involving other nations.

An analysis of America's view of the manner in which it thought its relations with Canada should be conducted makes it easier to understand why the Canadian government would at times demand that Great Britain recognize Canada's status as
an independent policy maker and then retreat from this position and be content with working behind the scenes. Canada's apparent inconsistency was in response to the pressure from the United States. The American government wanted to eliminate the British government from its dealings with Canada not only because this would increase the efficiency of the relationship but also, because the State Department felt that it could more readily manipulate Canada if the British were not part of the proceedings.\textsuperscript{3} On bilateral issues, it soon became evident to the Canadian government that having the support of Great Britain at or behind the conference table gave Canada advantages that she would not have on her own. American interest in Canada's status, Canadians soon learned, grew directly out of the sense American officials had of what kind of Canada could best serve their national interest.

In the post-war period, one of the first major issues to be brought to the attention of the American Senate was Canada's restrictive laws pertaining to the export of pulpwood. The issue came before the Senate in February 1920, when the Versailles Treaty debate was entering its last phase. Although the discussion on the pulpwood issue was a mere sideshow when compared with the treaty debate, the dispute did present an interesting dilemma for some senators who, in terms of the treaty, opposed the diplomatic status Canada had acquired at Paris yet, on specific bilateral concerns, were frustrated by their inability to deal directly with the Canadian government.\textsuperscript{4}
The dispute arose when the Canadian provinces of Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick introduced laws which restricted the amount of pulpwood that could be exported from crown lands. The provinces were attempting to conserve their timber resources and encourage Canadian companies to create jobs in Canada by producing finished products instead of exporting raw resources. During the decade between 1910-1920, the amount of pulpwood exported to the United States had rapidly increased. By 1920, the depletion of America's forests combined with the need for larger amounts of newsprint, especially in the North-East, resulted in various domestic lobbying groups putting pressure on the Senate to have the Canadian restrictions removed so that American newspapers could be assured of a steady supply of newsprint. When the State Department informally discussed the issue with Canada, the Canadian government maintained that the provinces were within their jurisdiction.

In an attempt to deal with this situation, Senator Oscar Underwood sponsored a resolution to have a presidential commission composed of five representatives appointed to discuss the pulpwood issue directly with the Canadian government. The debate on this resolution was interesting because it revealed that many senators, such as Asie S. Gronna of North Dakota, an outspoken critic of Canada's status at the Paris Peace Conference, had no real understanding of how diplomatic relations with America's northern neighbour were conducted or indeed, how varied and complex had become the
ties which linked the two countries. In defending his resolution Senator Underwood attempted to outline the major problems the State Department had to overcome when dealing with the Canadian government. In particular, Underwood noted that the cumbersome system of using the official diplomatic channel, the British Embassy, had proven to be fruitless.

"Efforts have been made," Underwood argued in the Senate:

\begin{quote}
in the past to work out an understanding with the Dominion government of Canada through diplomatic channels and they failed, because when it goes through diplomatic channels it must go through the Court of St. James and back to the Canadian government.\end{quote}

Underwood emphasized that the:

\begin{quote}
real purpose of this joint resolution ... [was] to make a direct effort with the Canadian government to secure the appointment of a commission to deal with this industrial question that will not become involved in the intricacies of a diplomatic negotiation ... It ... [was] to appoint a commission to deal with the Canadian government.\end{quote}

Underwood's arguments were reinforced by Senator Hitchcock who added an additional dimension to the debate by maintaining that the Senate had to deal directly with the Canadian government so the latter would realize how anxious the United States was to have the pulpwood issue settled. Moreover, referring to the Canadian government's publicly stated objective of establishing a representative in Washington, Hitchcock argued that the resolution was an opportunity for the United States to initiate a new relationship with Canada. "At this time,"
Hitchcock stated:

Canada is desirous of taking to a large extent the control of her foreign relations and foreign affairs, and is even contemplating, as I understand, at the present time establishing in the United States her own diplomatic representative.\textsuperscript{12}

Hitchcock's comments, expressed at a time when the Senate was divided over the treaty debate, forced those senators who opposed Canada's diplomatic status for reasons of political expediency to reconsider their positions. This was especially true for those politicians representing Northern and North-Eastern states. The pulpwood issue created the situation where particular members of the Senate were embarrassed by their attitudes on the Versailles Treaty. Many, such as Robert La Follette, went to extreme lengths to justify their positions against the Canadian government being granted diplomatic status despite the fact, that diplomatic recognition would have made it easier for the United States to pursue bilateral issues with that country.\textsuperscript{13}

At a time when the Senate was becoming preoccupied with fiscal restraint, the most influential arguments against the Underwood resolution maintained that a special presidential commission was simply too expensive to be justified. Senator Gronna maintained that the projected cost of $50,000 was not warranted when American officials could express to the British Embassy the United States opposition to Canada's restrictive pulpwood laws.\textsuperscript{14} Gronna rejected Underwood's argument that the "official route" for diplomatic correspondence with Canada
was either too slow or ineffective. He believed that the system had worked well in the past and would continue to meet the diplomatic needs of both the United States and Canada.¹⁵

Building upon Gronna's economic argument, Senator William H. King of Utah, suggested that a presidential commission was redundant because the apparatus to discuss the pulpwood issue directly with the Canadian government already existed.¹⁶ Senator King was referring to the International Joint Commission which had been established by the United States and Canada in 1909. King believed that this commission was perfectly capable of handling any dispute that might arise between the two countries. In his view, the pulpwood issue presented an opportunity for the United States and Canada to prove to the world the effectiveness of the joint commission structure.¹⁷ While King's arguments were persuasive and seemed to fit in well with the concept of "the North American model for peace,"¹⁸ the Senator demonstrated both an inadequate knowledge of just how complex the American-Canadian relations had become as well as a lack of understanding about the purpose or the extent of the mandate that had been granted to the Joint Commission.

Putting the controversy surrounding the Underwood Resolution into the context of both the Senate's Versailles Treaty debate and the larger international disputes, it is clear that certain senators allowed domestic politics to intrude and determine their response to the pulpwood issue. Having measured the political damage that would have resulted from
reversing their position on Canada's diplomatic status at the Paris Peace Conference, many senators, in particular, the irreconcilables, chose to ignore the opportunity to establish a presidential commission that might have set a precedent for encouraging a more direct relationship with Canada. Very few American officials disputed the point that a more efficient communication system was needed with the Canadian government. Clearly, however, the Senate debate revealed that the United States did not possess a consistent diplomatic policy towards Canada. Both the State Department and the Senate tended to respond to disputes with Canada on a day to day basis. Consequently, at this time, there was an inconsistency in America's attitude towards Canada. On the one level, the Versailles Treaty debate, the American Senate was not prepared to accept Canada's status as established by the Paris Conference. On another level, bilateral issues, the United States wanted a closer more direct relationship but American officials were prevented from doing so because of the Senate's rejection of the Versailles Treaty.

The debate on the pulpwood issue also had some positive elements that would eventually affect the American-Canadian relationship. A few members of the Senate, especially Porter S. McCumber, had taken the time to try and assess Canada's constitutional position in relation to Great Britain.19 Aware that during the first two decades of the twentieth century Canada had been acquiring more autonomy in her commercial
relations with other nations, Senators Underwood and Hitchcock reasoned that by encouraging Canada's independence in economic issues this could be extended into other facets of the American-Canadian relationship. Undoubtedly, Underwood and Hitchcock were partially motivated by their desire to use the pulpwood issue to change the minds of moderate senators who opposed the Versailles Treaty solely on the grounds of the Dominions' status and proposed roles in the League of Nations. Yet, the Resolution was a positive indication that there was a group within the Senate that was at least partially aware of Canada's changing status within the Empire.

Although the Underwood Resolution did receive passage in the Senate in 1920, the proposed commission was not established because it was vetoed by President Wilson. The pulpwood issue, however, continued to irritate the United States and in 1921, the dispute was once again brought before the Senate. The arguments that had been presented in 1920 were reiterated. For the purpose of this paper, an interesting aspect of this second phase of the pulpwood debate was that many senators were much more aware of Canada's objective of securing independent representation in Washington. This awareness led some American officials to believe that the pulpwood issue could be used as leverage to force the Canadian and British governments to stop merely discussing Canada's diplomatic position and actually take some tangible steps towards achieving separate Canadian representation. In
short, Americans hoped that the complexity and importance of this bilateral issue to the overall relationship between the United States and Canada would encourage the Canadian government to establish more direct communication with the State Department.

When the historian analyzes the official correspondence between the State Department and the British and Canadian governments, it becomes apparent that Canadian officials quickly realized that the cumbersome system of using the British Embassy in dealings with the American government could be used to Canada's advantage. At its simplest it meant that Canada did not have to confront American representatives. This, of course, was only useful to Canada when it was the American government that was demanding satisfaction on a particular issue. When it was the Canadian government that was desirous of discussing a dispute with the United States the official diplomatic structure was clearly a disadvantage. In the case of the pulpwood issue, however, Canada was able to fend off American anger by hiding behind the British Imperial representatives.

In its official response to the American government's inquiries into the pulpwood issue, the Canadian government made it very clear in 1920 and again in 1921 that direct talks on the issue, such as Underwood's proposed presidential commission, would not result in any significant change in Canada's policies. This statement had the effect of creating
confusion amongst those senators and American officials who supported Canada's demand for recognition by the United States. It appeared that the Canadian government was not seizing the opportunity to establish its diplomatic autonomy. This incident, combined with Canada's lack of aggressive action on the more international issues, specifically, the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, confirmed the arguments of those senators opposing Canada's claim for status. The irreconcilables maintained that Canada's reluctance to discuss the pulpwood issue was proof that the Canadian government was neither prepared nor willing to assume the responsibilities of an independent foreign policy.25

Throughout the 1920s, the pulpwood issue continued to be a problem in American-Canadian relations. In 1923, Secretary of State Hughes tried to circumvent both the arguments of those few senators who were opposed to a special presidential commission and the Canadian government's reluctance to deal directly with the United States, by informally using the American consulate in Ottawa to present to the Canadian government the Harding Administration's position.26 Through this method and the more formal diplomatic channels, Hughes was able to establish a form of direct contact that was used to help settle the dispute.

The pulpwood question was only one aspect of American-Canadian trade relations that sparked confusion and misunderstanding between the two nations in the early 1920s.
As the decade progressed many American legislators became more aware of the fact that when the United States passed tariff legislation it drastically affected the Canadian economy. In the past, American legislators had established a number of precedents by recognizing that the Canadian economy had a special relationship with that of the United States. Consequently, they had taken this factor into consideration when designing their tariff legislation. In his book Canada and the United States, Some Aspects of the History of the Republic and the Dominion, Hugh Keenleyside pointed out that the Underwood Tariff of 1913 granted special concessions and exemptions to Canada in order to minimize the amount of damage to that country's economy. In the post war period, however, a resurgent Republican Congress revised America's tariff laws with the passage of the Fordney Emergency Tariff in 1921 which, when combined with the McCumber Tariff of 1922, removed most of the loopholes that had been favorable to Canada. The farming sector, in particular the wheat and vegetable farmers in western Canada, was especially hard hit by the new legislation.

An analysis of the Senate debates on the tariff legislation reveals that there was very little concern about the effects the revised laws would have on the Canadian economy. Moreover, the senators supporting the higher tariffs made no attempt to assess the effect the legislation would have on the overall American-Canadian relationship. Primarily concerned with
their local state economies, the strongest support for the protective tariffs came from those senators whose constituencies would benefit the most from the revised laws. Many of these states were located in the Northern tier and their representatives should have been more sensitive to the impact these laws would have on Canada.

During the debate on the Fordney Emergency Tariff, in February 1921, Senator F.M. Simmons of North Carolina, extended the scope of the arguments by raising the question of what effect the proposed high tariff policy would have on American-Canadian relations. Simmons pointed out to his colleagues that Canada bought more goods in the United States that it sold and that the Canadian government could retaliate by supporting the policy of imperial preference and buy more goods from nations in the Empire. "Could Senators expect Canada to receive this blow," Simmons maintained in a speech in the Senate:

> for it will be a severe blow to her if the bill has the effect its proponents contend that it will have, ... I do really apprehend that the effect of this bill, largely aimed at Canada, is going to make trouble between this country and Canada and disturb the relations of the two countries, which have not only been harmonious, but which have caused Canada to become our very best customer in all the world except Great Britain.

Despite Simmons' arguments, the tariff revisions did become law. The incident was just one more example of the United States responding to an isolated issue without taking
the time to assess the overall impact that particular policies would have on their foreign relations.

The higher American tariffs also sparked a heated debate in the Canadian House of Commons. Alfred Stork, Member of Parliament for Skeena, angrily denounced the Canadian government for its lack of action in appointing a permanent representative in Washington. Stork maintained that Canada's reluctance to appoint a representative had contributed to the American misunderstanding of how severely their tariff policies would affect the Canadian economy. In Stork's opinion, only a separate Canadian representative in the United States, with close ties to the American Senate, could have anticipated and lobbied against the tariff legislation.33

Certainly, Canada's economic interests in the United States had long been a major factor for the Canadian government wanting its own representative in Washington. The primary reasons for the establishment of the Canadian War Mission in Washington in 1918, had been the government's desire to assist Canadian businessmen in securing American military contracts and encouraging American financiers to invest in Canada.34

When examining Canada's economic interests, however, an argument can also be made which helps to explain why the Canadian government was reluctant to take the final step and select a representative. Clearly, Canada was not in a strong position to protect herself from American policies. The Canadian government did not possess the resources necessary to
both inform and pressure the American Congress to reassess policies that were deemed detrimental to Canadian interests. Consequently, Canada needed the support and the diplomatic resources and options offered by Great Britain and the Empire in fending off America's economic policies.

Significantly, the enacting of the Fordney Emergency Tariff coincided with the pressure American officials were putting on the Canadian government to play an active role in forcing Great Britain and Japan to abrogate their alliance. The combination of this diplomatic pressure and America's demonstrated lack of concern and understanding for Canada's domestic interests convinced many Canadians that they should continue to have the Empire's diplomatic structure officially represent Canada. Thus, America's inability to develop a logical and consistent policy towards Canada in both international and bilateral issues resulted in the defeat of its own objective: to encourage the Canadian government to break its ties with Great Britain.

A third important bilateral issue to effect the American-Canadian relationship in the early 1920s was the perpetual problem of the offshore fisheries on both coasts. As mentioned, the United States, as early as 1918, wanted to negotiate the fishing issues directly with the Canadian government. As with other important bilateral issues, however, Canada sought refuge in the official diplomatic channels because it offered the Canadian officials the best
opportunity to protect Canada's interests. Consequently, the problems relating to the fisheries were allowed to grow. Although attempts were made to reach partial agreements, these tentative settlements were nullified, for a number of reasons, by one side or the other. Finally, the United States and Canada agreed to establish a joint commission that would hold public hearings in both countries and make a series of recommendations that could be incorporated into an agreement. Although Canada had been actively participating in the fishing negotiations since 1871, what made the negotiations of the early 1920s different was Canada's insistence that a British representative's signature was not necessary on any agreement. The State Department's acceptance of this condition, after some hesitation, was an important sign from the United States that they were prepared to acknowledge Canada's changing diplomatic status and independent authority on bilateral issues.

The negotiation and signing of the Halibut Treaty must be analyzed in conjunction with the diplomatic developments occurring on the world stage. As mentioned, by 1923, the United States had been provided with a conflicting interpretation from its own representatives on whether the Canadian government was, or was not, preparing to assume a more active foreign policy. Certainly, American officials were confused by Canada's inconsistency. The American government would have felt much more confident in dealing directly with Canada.
if the latter had been more forceful in formulating an independent policy instead of bowing to British pressure and conforming to the imperial policy at the last minute. Yet, the American goal of encouraging Canada to break its imperial ties remained the same and the prospect of Canada negotiating and signing a fishing agreement, without the co-signature of Great Britain, was an opportunity for the United States to begin the process of fulfilling its objective. The United States, of course, would not acknowledge the agreement with Canada's signature until Great Britain had accepted this new arrangement. In light of the Chanak Crisis and the strain that that incident had placed on Canadian-Imperial relations, American officials assumed that the British government was not in a strong position to vigorously oppose the proposed treaty. The State Department did, however, leave the clarification of this legal point up to the Canadian and British governments.

In February 1923, the Canadian Prime Minister sent a message to the British Ambassador in Washington in which he maintained that:

my ministers are of the opinion that as regards Canada the signature of Mr. Lapointe, Minister of Fisheries will be sufficient, and that it will not be necessary for you to sign as well.43

This telegram sparked a controversy within imperial circles. Again, in contrast to those historians who have described the United States as attempting to limit Canada's diplomatic growth, it was the British Ambassador Auckland Geddes, not an
American official, who insisted that a British representative's signature had to appear on the treaty.\textsuperscript{44} Geddes informed the Canadian government that he had "been instructed by His Majesty's Government to sign the Treaty in association with Mr. Lapointe."\textsuperscript{45} This confrontation was finally resolved when the Canadian government made the point that the treaty solely concerned the United States and Canada. British officials reasoned that it was preferable to agree to Canadian independence on bilateral issues and still maintain the policy of imperial unity on world issues than risk a constitutional crisis over the issue of the Dominions' diplomatic status.\textsuperscript{46} Consequently, on March 2, 1923, the Halibut Treaty was signed by a Canadian and American official.

Canadian and Commonwealth historians have often cited the signing of the Halibut Treaty as a significant step in the evolution of Canada's diplomatic autonomy.\textsuperscript{47} Certainly, the agreement's importance should not be understated. The fact that the Canadian government negotiated and was prepared to accept full responsibility for its part in the agreement, was an important development in Canada's quest to achieve full diplomatic autonomy. This principle was recognized at the 1923 Imperial Conference when the Dominions' right to sign a bilateral agreement that did not affect the Empire as a unit, was established.\textsuperscript{48}

The United States was aware that the Dominions' treaty powers had been clarified at the Imperial Conference. Alfred
Nutting, a clerk in the American Consulate in London, kept the State Department fully informed of the Dominions' constitutional status. Nutting went to great lengths to provide as much information as possible and went so far as to warn his government that in the future America's relations with all the Dominions would be more complicated because the United States, on bilateral issues, would have to deal with them as separate entities. 49

The fact that the Harding Administration was prepared to accept Canada's signature on the Halibut Treaty did not, however, guarantee that the mandatory two-thirds of the Senate would also accept the new arrangement. The Senate's debate on the treaty was not extensive and in March 1923, the Senate did approve the agreement with the provision attached by Senator Wesley L. Jones of Washington State, that its terms be applied to all parts of the Empire. 50 This action has been interpreted by Canadian historians as an attempt to deny Canada diplomatic status by forcing the British government, representing the whole Empire, to become involved. 51 Certainly, the Canadian government interpreted the Senate's action as a rejection of Canada's diplomatic status. The Senate's conditional ratification was considered an insult. Both Canada and her sister Dominions, who did not wish to be bound by a treaty they had neither negotiated or signed, insisted that the document be interpreted as only applying to Canada. 52
Clearly, the traditional historical interpretation of the Senate's action is relevant. The United States did consistently refer to the fishing agreement as being contracted between the United States and Great Britain representing Canada. Yet, to accuse the United States of trying to prevent Canada's diplomatic growth does not fully explain the American attitude or position. As with so many treaties in the past, the Halibut Treaty was not exempt from being affected by America's domestic politics. Senator Jones' introduction of the provision was primarily designed to enhance his position in his home state of Washington where fishermen were concerned about the number of foreign fishing vessels depleting the Westcoast stocks.\textsuperscript{53} Although it was very unlikely that any fishermen from the British Empire outside of Canada would be in the North Pacific, Jones' resolution helped to create for the Senator the image of aggressively protecting his state's fishing resources.

A second factor affecting the Senate's decision to support the Jones' provision was that it presented another opportunity to force the Canadian government to choose between accepting Great Britain's signature on the treaty, or finally breaking away from the Empire and assuming the responsibilities of full sovereignty. The arguments presented by some members of the Senate during the Versailles Treaty debate that Canada could only be considered an autonomous nation when she denounced her membership in the Empire, had changed little over the ensuing three years.\textsuperscript{54} In this regard, the provision was clearly
consistent with the American government's previous attempts to force Canada to assume diplomatic independence by ending its European connection.

The negative reaction by both Canada and the Empire to the Senate's provision was quickly made clear to the State Department. American representatives stationed throughout the Empire sent back to Washington reports which maintained that those Dominions that had not been part of the negotiating process would not consider themselves bound by the Halibut Treaty despite the Jones' provision. The most detailed analysis of the Dominions' reactions was sent to the State Department by Charles M. Hathoway, Jr., the American consulate General in Dublin. Hathoway stated that after extensive discussions with Irish officials concerning the Halibut Treaty he was convinced that they:

> did not regard the Treaty as binding on the Irish Free State and that if, by chance, it should happen that any Irish interest should be concerned the Government of the Irish Free State would hold that the Treaty did not apply to them, ...

The Irish attitude was an important bonus for Canada's position. After passing numerous Joint Resolutions calling upon Great Britain to resolve the Irish situation, it was unlikely that the American Senate would place itself in the position of undercutting the new authority of the Irish Free State government. To deny Canada's right to negotiate and sign a bilateral agreement would, in effect, deny the Free State similar rights.

The Empire's reaction helped to convince American officials
that the Halibut Treaty had to be considered a bilateral agreement that only included themselves and Canada. Consequently, the treaty did establish Canada's right to negotiate and sign a diplomatic agreement without the co-signature of a British official. To this extent, the treaty represents a significant development in American-Canadian relations. Both countries realized the value of a special relationship that included the use of appointed commissions. Moreover, the Halibut Treaty helped to convince the Canadian government that it could deal directly with the United States and still protect Canadian interests without the active support of Great Britain. Although the Jones' provision forced a two year delay in the final ratification of the Halibut Treaty, the precedent established in 1923 helped to create a new environment for closer diplomatic ties that would be expanded upon in 1924 with the signing of the Prohibition Convention.57

The American decision to enact prohibition in January 1920, was to cause a series of disputes between the United States and Canada. Prohibition became a significant issue between the two countries when "rum running" became a lucrative business in Canada. The vast extent of the American-Canadian border and the numerous coves and inlets along both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts provided ample opportunity for smugglers to ply their trade.

Initially, the American government's commitment to enforce prohibition was very limited. Neither Congress nor the
Harding Administration were prepared to allocate the necessary funds to provide for the bureaucratic structure and massive law enforcement that would have been necessary to prevent or at least limit, the amount of alcohol smuggled into the United States. As a result, the State Department assumed the position that it was the responsibility of the Canadian government to prevent liquor from being smuggled into the United States from Canadian ports and border crossings. When it became clear to American officials that Canada was not prepared to take aggressive action against the smugglers, the United States sought a direct meeting with the Canadian government in order to put pressure on Canada to take action. As with the previous bilateral issues, the Canadian government resisted a meeting with American officials by insisting that the State Department use the official channel through the British Embassy in Washington.

While Canada was reluctant to become involved in aggressively preventing smuggling, Canadian officials did want to demonstrate to the United States a cooperative attitude. The Canadian government reasoned that if they were receptive to American concerns the United States would reciprocate by discussing Canada's opposition to American policies. In November 1923, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, McKenzie Moss, travelled to Ottawa where he met with Canadian officials. This meeting eventually led to direct discussions that resulted in the signing of an agreement between the United States and
The significance of this convention was not so much that it helped to eliminate some of the tension that had developed over the smuggling issue. Its importance grew rather out of the fact that it represented a watershed in American-Canadian relations because the treaty was achieved through direct negotiation without the British government's playing an important role. The agreement was recognition by the United States that Canada had attained a form of diplomatic independence. Although the Prohibition Convention came after the signing of the Halibut Treaty in 1923, this Convention was in some ways more significant because the United States did not question Canada's right to represent itself or sign the agreement. Unlike the Halibut Treaty, the Senate ratified the agreement without adding a provision that it applied to the British Empire as a whole. The negotiations took place in the wake of Canada's strong position during the Chanak Crisis which must have contributed to America's changed attitude. In addition, this treaty convinced both nations that mutually satisfying agreements could be negotiated much more successfully if official, permanent diplomatic avenues were established.

By 1924, the State Department correspondence clearly indicates that the American government was increasingly dealing directly with Canadian departments and agencies. The correspondence, on a wide variety of issues, between Prime Minister King and the Secretary of State Hughes became exten-
sive. As well, lesser American and Canadian officials also capitalized on this new atmosphere by dealing directly with their counterparts across the border. The Prohibition Convention became a pivotal part of this new diplomatic relationship because it built upon the precedent that had been established by the Halibut Treaty in 1923. Although Canada and the United States did not exchange representatives until 1927, by late 1924, both nations had established, on bilateral issues, a close working relationship that excluded Great Britain from the negotiating process. In contrast to the arguments presented from the Canadian perspective, this new relationship had, in no small measure, been established at the initiative of the American government.
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Conclusion

This brief analysis of the American-Canadian relationship between 1919-1924, has attempted to prove that the United States did not, in the post war period, deliberately set out to impede the development of Canada's diplomatic status. After examining the relationship from the American perspective, it becomes evident that the thesis advocated by scholars such as Mahant and Mount, that the United States refused to accept the concept that Canada could formulate an autonomous foreign policy, needs to be qualified. Instead, the evidence presented suggests that American officials wanted Canada to achieve more independence in its foreign affairs and then aggressively use its positions in the League of Nations and in the British Empire to promote North American ideals.

Certainly, the American Senate's rejection of the Versailles Treaty was, on one level, a repudiation of the status Canada had been granted at the Paris Peace Conference. Yet, while senators were rejecting the treaty, they went to great lengths to maintain that this was not an attack specifically aimed at Canada. Many senators, including members of the irreconcilable group, willingly acknowledged that they would welcome Canada as a separate member of the international community when the Canadian government clarified not only its view of Canada's diplomatic status but also, defined the evolving nature of the British Commonwealth. The fact that Canadian Ministers, upon being questioned in the House of
Commons, were not able to describe the legal process through which the Dominions achieved their new status in relation to Great Britain, reinforced the American attitude of waiting to see how the Dominions evolved before granting them diplomatic status.

Moreover, the Senate's rejection of the Versailles Treaty, also provided Canadian officials with a clear indication of just how much America's domestic political environment affected her foreign policy. The Dominions were caught in the midst of a structural battle between the Senate and President Wilson over the right to control foreign policy making. As well, there is no doubt that the election tactics pursued by the Republican Party in 1918 and in 1920, had a detrimental effect on the American-Canadian relationship. The concern of individual senators to support polices that were politically expedient for their own regional and personal interests did result in the United States developing an inconsistent attitude towards Canada. The lack of a concise, coherent policy towards their northern neighbor helped to enhance the Canadian government's belief that the United States was preventing Canada's diplomatic growth.

America's domestic political climate did, however, also offer Canada a unique opportunity. Prime Minister Borden's desire to see Canada act as a mediator between Great Britain and the United States could have become a reality because of the American Senate's refusal to commit their government to
the League of Nations. The similarities that did exist in Canadian and American policies led officials in the State Department to envision that Canada could be used by the United States as a tool for gaining access to the League and the councils of the British Empire while still preserving, at the public level, America's policy of isolationism. This American attitude conflicted with Great Britain's desire to maintain imperial unity with one foreign policy. Consequently, a competition for Canadian support developed and afforded the Canadian government an unprecedented opportunity to formulate and execute a foreign policy that was suited to Canadian needs. By adopting American policy attitudes which closely mirrored Canada's position while still adhering to those imperial policies that did not conflict with Canadian objectives, the Canadian government could have established its own policy positions.

Certainly, this argument needs to be qualified. As a young nation just emerging into the world of international diplomacy Canada did not possess the extensive resources and bureaucratic structure necessary to develop an extensive, consistent foreign policy. Yet, the early 1920s did present Canadian officials with a unique opportunity to establish the precedent that Canada would use its potential role as a mediator between Great Britain and the United States to develop a foreign policy that was particularly suited to Canada's needs. In short, successive Canadian governments
This fact becomes clear when America's attitude towards Canada's public attempts to assert its diplomatic views and influence the Empire's foreign policy is determined. For example, Canada's role in the debate surrounding the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was seen as a positive development in the United States. As well, Canada's consistent stand against Article Ten in the League's Covenant convinced many American officials that the Canadian government was a loyal ally that could be depended upon. Writing in 1927, former Secretary of State Hughes maintained that "the relation of Canada to the League gives an opportunity for the presentation and protection of Canada's interests, ... It is these interests and our interests which will promote the most friendly relations between Canada and the United States." Clearly, Canada's position in the League was viewed as an important way of protecting America's diplomatic interests.

This policy, however, was shattered by Canada's inability to confront Great Britain and adamantly demand the right to formulate and execute a foreign policy that was significantly different from the Empire. The Meighen Government's decisions not to forthrightly protest Canada's lack of status at the Washington Naval Conference or, challenge the British government's advice not to send a special envoy to Washington for the purpose of discussing the Anglo-Japanese Treaty with American officials, resulted in the United States becoming
confused about the objectives and the seriousness of the Canadian government's desire for diplomatic autonomy.

This lack of assertiveness on international issues was made worse by Canada's apparent reluctance to initiate a closer bilateral relationship. The Canadian government's inability to appoint a permanent representative to Washington and, Canada's unwillingness to deal directly with the United States on the pulpwood issue, are two examples of Canada's hesitancy and helped to create the impression in Washington that Canadian officials were not planning to embark on an active diplomatic policy. In short, it was Canada's inability to turn its public statements into tangible results which led American officials to doubt Canada's diplomatic status.

Clearly, the signing of the Halibut Treaty and the Prohibition Convention ushered in a new period of cooperation between the two nations. Even on this point, however, the American evidence suggests that the closer relationship was at the instigation of the American government. Canada was reluctant to negotiate directly with American officials. Instead, the Canadian government took full advantage of the official diplomatic channel through the British Embassy and thus avoided facing State Department officials. It was this type of action which contributed to America's misunderstanding of Canada's diplomatic status.

By 1924, the United States still did not possess a clear understanding of what were the Canadian government's real
diplomatic objectives. The conflicting signals from the British and Canadian governments combined with the inconsistent reports from State Department officials posted in the Dominions, contributed to the American government's inability to formulate a cohesive policy towards Canada. Consequently, by the mid 1920s, the United States gradually began to actively deal with international forums, specifically, the League of Nations, on its own. This slow thawing of America's official isolationism had the effect of removing America's immediate need to use Canada as a diplomatic tool. This, in effect, meant that Canada had lost her opportunity to exercise an independent foreign policy because the United States no longer needed Canada to help protect her interests.

The net result of focussing this paper on the American perspective has revealed that it was in the interests of the United States to encourage Canada's autonomy in foreign affairs. Writing in 1925, Canadian historian Hugh Keenleyside, commented that Canada's inability to appoint a representative to Washington in the early 1920s had never been adequately explained. This lack of a full explanation is primarily due to the imbalance in the historiography. By examining American goals and objectives and determining the American government's vision of what international role Canada could play, it becomes much easier to explain and understand why Canada was reluctant to take the first steps and appoint a minister to Washington. Clearly, the Canadian government took refuge in
the imperial structure to offset the enormous pressure coming from the United States to act as a "front man" for American interests. The fact that an official exchange of representatives did not take place until 1927, was, to a large extent, due to the British government's desire not to surrender its role as the primary formulator of imperial policy and to Canada's reluctance to aggressively seize its opportunities and turn its desire for an independent foreign policy into reality. The Canadian government had to choose between the pressure from the United States to pursue a separate policy or remain in the imperial structure and work towards its reform. The Canadian government chose the latter course and in so doing, convinced the United States that Canada was not prepared to develop and exercise an independent foreign policy.
Endnotes Conclusion

1 Mahant and Mount, *An Introduction to Canadian-American Relations*, p. 113.
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