

VERNMENT



CANADA

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 51/19 CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS

An address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L.B. Pearson, delivered to the Kiwanis Club at Ottawa, on April 27, 1951.

Over the years, I have often been asked to talk on the subject to which Kiwanis Clubs are paying special attention this week, Canadian-American relations; on the lessons to be drawn from that good relationship, and the ways to keep it an exemplary one. It is a subject which has, of course, a greater interest to and importance for Canada than, for obvious reasons, it has for our neighbour. But this disparity in interest and importance is diminishing as Canada's stature in the world grows, and as this is increasingly realized by our neighbour and by other countries.

This development will, I feel sure, be accompanied by an increasing knowledge of Canada, something which Kiwanis is doing so much to promote. If you could read some of the letters I have received lately, commenting on the press reports and the press interpretation of a speech I made in Toronto recently, you would realize that there is much still to be done in this process of neighbourly education. Many of them were full of such phrases as "you English!". "What is your socialist government in England doing?". It was assumed, apparently, that I must have naturally spoken as an Englishman!

It is perhaps not surprising that some of my correspondents have shown such uncertainty about Canada's constitutional position when so little about Canada is taught in schools in the United States. I have been reading recently the results of an enquiry conducted a year or so ago under the auspices of the Canada-United States Committee on Education. The purpose of this enquiry was to discover how much American high school students knew about Canada and how much Canadian students knew about the United States. I will say no more about the results of the enquiry in Canada than to report that in the words of those conducting the tests "Canadian students know considerably more about the States than the United States students know about Canada." Their knowledge, I should add was not always matched by their understanding.

The students being tested in the United States were in their last year at high school in two cities, one near the Canadian border and one in a western state. I have read typical comments by these students in the United States with interest, with amusement and, at times, with something approaching consternation. Some students made no bones about their ignorance. "Due to my lack of information about Canada, I can express no definite ideas", one wrote. Others, however,

went on to set down their impressions. "I confess to know little about the Canadian people", one student said. "My general impressions are that the people are all Frenchmen or Mounted Police or trappers of some sort. My meagre knowledge comes from a few movies I have seen and a few books I have read." With some firmness another student wrote, "I think Canada would be far better off to adopt our form of government and break free from England." Another declared, "The people are very backward". After receiving that and other body blows, I confess I was rather discouraged. The only light among the gloom came from one student who with pleasant naivety wrote, "Due to the fact that my information and knowledge of Canada is limited, I feel that the class of people are intelligent, well-adjusted and pleasant-going citizens." I hope that this particular student never acquires so much of the wrong kind of knowledge about Canada as to dispel that impression!

This ignorance has not prevented Canadians and Americans getting along wonderfully well together. Our mutual relations have been - and rightly - lauded as an example of the way that free states conduct their relations with each other. That example still stands.

It would of course, be impossible when we are so close together, with so many and complex problems of contact and national interest not to have differences and difficulties; just as it would be unwise not to discuss these differences in a frank and friendly manner when such discussion is desirable. Discussion of such things without misunderstanding is one of the proofs, and one of the tests, of our good relationship. Our boast is that we have accepted on both sides the responsibility of settling whatever differences may arise without the use or threat of force or even unfair pressure. We have the right to disagree, as friends. We also have the obligation to resolve these disagreements, as friends, and with a minimum of fuss and disturbance. This has not always been easy in the past, and is not going to be always easy in the days ahead, but our friendship will, I know, stand the challenge of the trials and turmoil of our time.

Firm and sure though this friendship between our two countries is, it should not, however, be taken for granted. Friendships between countries, like friendships between individuals, must be kept in repair. Never before in the history of relations between the United States and Canada has it been more necessary to keep that principle in mind, since our relations have in recent years entered a new phase. They have become even closer than they were, and their character is changing.

The fundamental reason for the changes which are now taking place in relations between Canada and the United States is the fact that the United States has within a very few years become the greatest power in the world and has become the leader of all the countries which value freedom. This has come about so rapidly that it is hard to remember that only fifteen years ago there was a strong trend in the United States toward isolationism and neutrality, and that policies were put into effect not with the intent of exercising international leadership but of avoiding foreign entanglements. In the face of the grave threat under which we now live, everyone in Canada - everyone in the free world - must be profoundly grateful that the United States has risen to its new responsibilities with such courage and determination.

Our long experience of friendship with the United States has convinced us that our neighbour will use for peaceful ends alone the great power and influence which comes from its commanding position in the world. May I repeat what I said last fall in the United Nations Assembly, when the United States was under bitter and unfair attack by Soviet representatives:

"We in Canada know this country and its people well. We know them as good neighbours who respect the rights of others, who don't ask for or get automatic support from smaller countries through pressure or threats or promises. We know that they accept the fact that co-operation between large and smaller countries can only exist on a basis of mutual confidence and mutual respect."

Also, we have cause for satisfaction and confidence in the knowledge that, in exercising its power, and leadership, the United States has not hesitated to work closely and co-operatively with her friends through international organizations in which all the free countries have an independent voice. One evidence of that is Korea, where military operations have been conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, and where political decisions have been made collectively which govern those operations.

The bulk of the military forces now fighting in Korea are still being provided by the United States: and I pay tribute here to the courage and tenacity which they have shown in terribly difficult conditions. Other countries, however, have also sent contingents to Korea and there are now fourteen countries represented there by military forces. Our own country, Canada, has willingly accepted its duty - as a loyal member of the UN - to participate, on land, on the sea, and in the air, in this momentous test of the value of collective action against aggression.

In the North Atlantic area as well, the United States has chosen to work within an organization of friends and allies. The North Atlantic Alliance, which is designed to deter any attack on the North Atlantic area by building balanced collective forces adequate to prevent the conquest of any of its members by an aggressor, has as its chief buttress the great economic and military power of the United States. But the other allies are all making important contributions to the joint defence and they all have a voice in the North Atlantic Council where the policies of the alliance are decided. General Eisenhower, who is the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in Europe, said in a happy phrase when he was in Ottawa that he now considered himself one-twelfth Canadian. In the same way he is one-twelfth French and one-twelfth Italian and one-twelfth American. So are we - or so we should be.

For many years, then, Canada and the United States have been good neighbours. Now, however, we are not only continental neighbours but allies in a larger group. That is perhaps the simplest way to indicate the change which has come over the relations between our two countries.

As a result, the questions of common concern which we will have to settle will in many cases be different in kind from any that have arisen previously. Such direct differences as we have had in the past have usually been

over border questions or over trade and commercial matters. They were the kind of disputes that neighbours have over a line fence or an exchange of produce, and in both countries we have developed the habit of settling such disputes without consulting the magistrate or the village constable.

We must show the same spirit in considering the new problems which will confront us now as allies. These problems will often be of a far more serious kind, since they will be concerned with the policies of an alliance of which the United States is the acknowledged leader but in which Canada also has an important role to play. Those policies will concern nothing less than our very survival as free peoples. We will not experience much difficulty, I imagine, in agreeing on objectives. However, it is inevitable that from time to time we should differ on how those objectives can best be achieved. We must expect that Canadian policies will sometimes be under criticism in the United States and that United States policies will be criticized in Canada. In the United States there may be a temptation to feel that any criticism of that country by Canadians is inappropriate, since the United States is bearing heavier responsibilities than any other country for the defence of the free world. I hope that this temptation will be held in check by an awareness that the policies pursued by the North Atlantic Alliance are as much a matter of life and death for Canadians as they are for Americans. In Canada, on the other hand, there may be a temptation to resent criticism from the United States on the ground that it overlooks the fact that, although Canada is contributing men and arms, its voice can never be decisive in deciding how those resources should be employed. I hope that this temptation in Canada will be curbed by recognizing that the weight our representations will have in the North Atlantic Council and in other bodies where the policies of the free world are being decided will be in large part determined by the part we are willing and able to play in increasing the strength of the alliance.

We will then not be able to avoid some differences over the policies to be followed. Nor may we be able entirely to avoid, I am afraid, invidious comparisons about the sacrifices and contributions of the various allies. After all we are free and democratic peoples and we are not going to forego the right to talk and even to wrangle. But let us do our best in our talks to keep a sense of responsibility, a sense of proportion and even a sense of humour.

History shows that the task of maintaining a military alliance in peace-time is always extremely difficult, especially when one member is so much stronger than the other members of the alliance. It calls for great restraint as well as great exertions on the part of all the partners in the alliance. Responsible politicians in democratic countries have always had in the back of their minds, I think, a sense of their duty to civilization as well as to their own countries. That sense of duty to civilized values and the cause of freedom must now be brought into the forefront of our minds. It must colour our words and our decisions. For the present, our association in the North Atlantic area is merely an alliance and not a federation. But increasingly we must try to show as much concern for the interests of every member of the alliance as would be necessary in a North Atlantic federation. We must examine our actions and statements in the light of that broad responsibility and we must consider the effect of national decisions not only on

our own citizens but on the citizens of the other members of the alliance.

As the character of the political relations between the United States and Canada has been changing, so also are the economies of the two countries in various ways; being drawn more closely together. There is one important field, however, in which progress in this direction has been long delayed. In 1941 the Governments of Canada and the United States signed an agreement for the combined development of the power and navigation facilities of the St. Lawrence waterways. That agreement has not yet been ratified by Congress, although once again Congressional committees are this year examining it. It is the strong hope and indeed the expectation of the Canadian Government that favourable action may at last be taken on this project. The Canadian Government is firmly convinced that the development of the St. Lawrence would be equally in the interests of the United States and Canada, particularly in present circumstances when it is necessary to mobilize and expand the whole of North America's industrial capacity. The development of the power and navigation facilities of the St. Lawrence system, in our view, would mean an immense accretion of strength to the industrial complex in the United States and Canada.

In many ways, then, Canada and the United States are drawing closer together. I hope that this process will continue and increase, as part of a wider and even more important process towards closer co-operation in the whole North Atlantic area. There is, I think, in Canada a widespread willingness to move towards this closer association with as many of the nations of the free world as possible. It may take a long time to achieve that wider objective of unity; but it should constantly inspire the efforts which are necessary now to protect free societies from being overwhelmed. Canadians will not be behind any people in readiness to pool their sovereignty with that of other free nations, so that it can work more effectively for our security, and our welfare. But if we are all to move towards that distant goal, it is necessary that we should first maintain and strengthen the special bonds of friendship which already exist between countries in the free world. Of these, there are none closer or more significant than the ties between the people of Canada and the United States. In working through Canada-United States Goodwill week and in so many other ways, to promote good relations between our two countries, Kiwanis is therefore working, it seems to me, towards a purpose which transcends even the destiny of those two countries. You are helping to lay the foundation of a great, new community of free peoples, and, above all, to protect and ensure peace.

S/C