

D 22188

that we can claim to share the culture of two old world civilizations. The names of Champlain and Frontenac, Marquette and LaSalle belong scarcely less to you than to us, and no historian has recounted their exploits more vividly than your own Francis Parkman. Likewise, until 1776 the history and heritage of the British Commonwealth, to which I referred a moment ago, belonged as much to the thirteen Colonies, as it does to us.

This common background, however, was not sufficient to ensure our peace. The Seven Years war, the war of the American Revolution, the war of 1812, the Canadian Rebellion of 1837-38, all turned the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes into an area of significant conflict. The ancestors of those who to-day are here assembled to rejoice that another link has been forged which serves to further their common interests, and to cement their friendship were, in those turbulent periods of our history, at enmity one with the other in either civil or international strife.

Human nature is much the same wherever it exists. Our populations, after all, do not, in origin, differ greatly from those of Europe. Indeed, the European countries have contributed most to their composition. Each of our countries has its problems of race and creed and class; each has its full measure of political controversy. Nevertheless we seem to have found the better way to secure and maintain our peace.

The art of international bridge building

This international highway speaks of that better way. In itself it is one vast undertaking, but it is made up of pieces of solid ground and a series of bridges. Where solid ground has been lacking, and the way, in consequence, made impassable, bridges have been built. Imposing structures they are, ingeniously combining utility and beauty.

In the realm of international relations we, too, have learned to bridge our differences. We have practised the art of building

D 22189

bridges. There is indeed no more striking symbol of unity, of intercourse, and of friendship than a bridge. From antiquity to the present, bridges have been built to span the spaces of separation. Their very appearance suggests the surmounting of difficulties, the overcoming of barriers, the broadening of the path of progress and peace. The peoples of this continent, whether concerned with steel and stone, or with the invisible realities of mind and spirit, have, for the most part, been bridge-builders worthy of the name. In politics, as in road-making, it is a great thing, Mr. President, to know how to build bridges.

In the art of international bridge-building there are two structures, each with its association with the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, of which I should like to say just a word. They stand out as monuments of international co-operation and good-will. Each has its message for the world of to-day. The one is the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817; the other, the International Joint Commission created in 1909.

The Rush-Bagot Agreement: a means of escape from competitive arming

Before the War of 1812 and while it was being waged, citadels and arsenals came into being. Naval yards were set up and armed craft appeared on the waters of the St. Lawrence and the Lakes. Hostile forts frowned at each other from opposite shores. An armament race had begun; and had it been permitted to continue, we should have been looking back on a century of suspicion, enmity and hatred, instead of rejoicing, as we are, in a century of peace. In the course of the War of 1812, as many as 20 armed vessels were constructed in the Naval Yards at Kingston. One of these, the *St. Lawrence*, was actually larger in size, and carried more guns, than Nelson's *Victory* at the Battle of Trafalgar. Within three years of the conclusion of the war, we, happily, had determined to place our reliance upon Reason instead of upon Force, and to substitute for