



## STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 47/4

CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Text of an N.B.C.-C.B.C. joint network  
broadcast in the series "Our Foreign  
Policy", February 1, 1947.

Participants: The Right Hon. Louis S. St. Laurent,  
Canadian Secretary of State for External  
Affairs;

The Hon. Brooke Claxton,  
Canadian Minister of National Defence.

Mr. Sterling Fisher,  
Director of the N.B.C. University of  
the Air.

ANNOUNCER: This is Our Foreign Policy and tonight we are going to discuss the Foreign Policy of our neighbour and good friend, Canada. On this broadcast we bring you the Right Hon. Louis S. St. Laurent, Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, and the Hon. Brooke Claxton, Canada's Minister of National Defence. They will discuss with Mr. Sterling Fisher, Director of the N.B.C. University of the Air, Canada's relations with the United States and with the United Nations. This is a joint broadcast carried in Canada over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's network and in the United States by N.B.C. Mr. Fisher.

FISHER: Gentlemen, this is the first time, I think, that we have broadcast in this series from Ottawa. I'm not sure it isn't the first time in Canada. I hope that we shall be able to do more of these programs with you. On this broadcast our topic is our relationship with each other and with the United Nations. There are quite a number of questions I should like to explore with you.

ST. LAURENT: Well, Mr. Fisher, that's what we are here for.

FISHER: For instance where does Canada stand in any attempt to put down totalitarianism in this hemisphere? What is your economic policy? The United States wants Reciprocal trade agreements and freer trade. The United Kingdom is nationalising a number of industries. Where does Canada stand? We in the United States have just seen a move to merge our armed forces. In Canada you have already brought your services under one minister, which reminds me, Mr. Claxton -- you are Minister for Defence -- one of the first things I heard when I got into Ottawa this morning concerned you.

CLAXTON: Is it something I'd like to hear repeated, Mr. Fisher?

FISHER: I don't know. But I'll tell you and let you decide. I was told that you were the sort of man who, once he had a job to do, didn't leave it alone until it was finished. As an illustration -- I understand that you are supposed to have come to the offices of the

Defence Ministry at eight o'clock the morning after your appointment and to have been there ever since. Probably apocryphal, isn't it?

CLAXTON: Quite apocryphal. But I like it.

FISHER: Yes, so do I. Well, Mr. St. Laurent, I'd like to put the first question on this broadcast to you. I touched on it just now. The United States is committed to an economic policy based on free enterprise. The United Kingdom is involved in a form of socialism -- they're trying it. Now, Mr. St. Laurent, you in Canada have very close relations with both of us. How will you shape your economic policy?

ST. LAURENT: Well, Mr. Fisher, Canada, like other nations would, I think, shape her economic foreign policy according to the economic and foreign facts of life.

FISHER: You mean .....

ST. LAURENT: Well, those responsible for framing policy cannot indulge too freely in doctrinaire labels. "Free Enterprise" and "Socialization" as you know are often very carelessly used.

FISHER: I wish you'd go on to explain that.

ST. LAURENT: For example, classic economists would hardly accept, under their definition of "Free Enterprise" the active role played by modern governments in national economies. There is a considerable amount of social control in my country and in yours and I don't believe either of us has been unduly influenced by doctrinaire slogans.

FISHER: By social control, Mr. St. Laurent, do you mean government aid?

ST. LAURENT: Certain important sections of the community will receive government assistance if and when the need arises. To take one example, Mr. Fisher, we recognize that government support may be needed to ensure stability in, for example, agriculture. It is of course necessary that farmers have a reasonable level of income and that this vital element in the national economy be not impoverished. Measures to safeguard a basic industry like agriculture are as fully recognized, I believe, in the United States and in Great Britain as they are in Canada. In a "Free Enterprise" economy, in the classical meaning of that phrase, enterprise however important, while free to succeed, would be equally free to fail.

Perhaps Mr. Claxton would illustrate the same point from his experience in the field of social security.

FISHER: Yes. Would you do that, Mr. Claxton?

CLAXTON: Well, Mr. Fisher, while in Canada we believe that the maximum responsibility for improving his position should be left in the hands of the individual, we are fully aware that the state is now held responsible in all civilized countries for ensuring certain minimum standards for the protection of its citizens.

ST. LAURENT: I cannot see that government aid of this kind limits the scope for individual ingenuity in developing new enterprises. I do not think that in our continuing attack on our national problems Canada's difficulties will in any way be rendered insuperable by the character of the respective economic policies of the United Kingdom and the United States. A large area of agreement was reached at the Preparatory Commission on Trade and Employment held in London in the fall of 1946, and we do not find ourselves in any serious disagreement with

the principles regarded as fundamental to trade and employment in any country.

CLAXTON: Of course, while there may be agreement in principle, this does not dispose of practical and detailed differences that may exist, Mr. Fisher.

ST. LAURENT: Of course not. Our three countries inevitably have different views on various aspects of economic policy. But these differences arise from the different conditions prevailing in our respective economies, not from opposed ideologies. Canada can be expected to frame its economic policy, as I indicated before, in the light of conditions which we in this country are called upon to deal with, at the same time taking into proper account the United Kingdom economic policy, insofar as it is apt to affect us, and the United States policy in the same way.

FISHER: In other words, generally you take your stand on practical considerations rather than on theoretical or ideological concepts.

CLAXTON: That is the sensible thing to do.

FISHER: Quite so; and now if I may, Mr. St. Laurent, I should like to switch to your political policy. What course do you follow in Foreign Policy?

ST. LAURENT: We believe that security for all countries of the world rests in the development of effective international organization, Mr. Fisher. Political reconstruction cannot be carried out apart from economic reconstruction. Economic revival is of the utmost concern to us as it is to you; and foreign trade is a particularly vital factor in our own economy. After all, despite it's only having twelve million people Canada is the third trading nation in the world. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that we give strong support to the United Nations and every international organization which contributes to the economic and political stability of the world.

FISHER: There would seem to be a very close correlation between your Foreign Policy and ours in the United States, Mr. St. Laurent.

ST. LAURENT: That is so, but in the case of Canada we must, of course, take a realistic view of our influence in the international sphere. There is little point in a country of our stature clinging to a particular international position if nations possessing the major share of the world's military and economic power cannot be persuaded to consider it for Canada. The war began in 1939. Since the day we entered the conflict we have demonstrated, I think, in a very practical way, our readiness to play our part to the full whenever we were convinced that significant and effective action was contemplated. That has been, and I hope will continue to be, the guiding principle of our participation in international life.

FISHER: That leads me to a question that is also international. But I should like to have Mr. Claxton's views on it too. Like yourselves, we in the United States have set our faces against any form of totalitarianism in this hemisphere. If we should be threatened again at any time what support might be expected from you in Canada?

CLAXTON: (laugh) That is an odd question, Mr. Fisher. If it is necessary, the best answer is the record of my country in two wars. We joined forces with those who withstood the militarist and totalitarian enemy because we recognized ourselves to be threatened, and you won't mind my adding that in each case we were aware of the issues involved at a relatively early date. The Nazi menace was recognized as a menace to Canada and to the Canadian way of life. In September 1939 the Canadian

Parliament took the very serious decision of declaring war on Germany, in order to help stop the spread of totalitarianism. Like the United States, Canada paid her own way throughout the war and sent aid to twenty-four other countries. We signed an agreement with the United States to join with you to protect ourselves and to that agreement we have adhered. I hope that this record makes clear our anti-totalitarian attitude.

FISHER: It does indeed. Now I want to turn for a moment from looking with you outside your border, Gentlemen, to an action you have taken inside them that has aroused great interest in the United States.

CLAXTON: I can see that question coming. It's Canadian citizenship.

FISHER: Right, Mr. Claxton. Many, even in my country, have been most interested in your recent legislation on this subject. I wish you would tell us something about it!

CLAXTON: The Canadian Citizenship Act, Mr. Fisher, came into effect on the 1st of January of this year, and gives legal definition to a long-standing recognized fact.

FISHER: Well now, just what does that mean?

ST. LAURENT: Simply, Mr. Fisher, it creates for Canadians the same legal status in their own country as the citizens of the United States have in theirs. Before the Act was passed, the formal legal description of Canadian was "British Subject". That is what appeared on their passports and other official documents.

CLAXTON: The average person, I imagine, doesn't worry much about these legal distinctions and definitions until he needs to. Most Canadians have always simply thought of themselves as Canadians - just that - and proud to be so.

ST. LAURENT: That is true. But it was felt that the time had come to give a legal form and basis to these common-sense ideas - to bring legal definitions in this matter up-to-date with constitutional and political development.

FISHER: There is just one other point, Mr. St. Laurent, which I should like to have cleared up. Does all this mean that Canadians now have a dual citizenship?

ST. LAURENT: The situation is, I think, easy to understand, Mr. Fisher. Canadians are citizens of Canada. But because members of the British Commonwealth have a common King, Canadians are also subjects of that King and termed British subjects. Being British subjects does not mean that we are subject to any other government but our own. It only means that the King of Great Britain is the King of Canada as well.

CLAXTON: I would like to add two more titles to which Canadians can, and do, lay claim. Canadians are not only citizens of Canada and British subjects, but they are, like yourselves, good North Americans and very active and interested members of the United Nations. Now, Mr. Fisher, it has never seemed to me that any confusion need arise over the status of the citizens of the United States simply because the United States itself is a member of a Pan American Union and a leading member of the United Nations. Similarly, I do not think that any confusion need arise because Canadian citizens can call themselves by other names. They remain Canadian citizens first and foremost. There is a very old saying in the part of Canada that Mr. St. Laurent and I come from: "Moi je suis Canadien".

ST. LAURENT: The sentiment, Mr. Claxton, is admirable and even the accent is good.

FISHER: Well, that seems to clear the matter up, but I noticed that you made mention of your ties to the United Kingdom. Could you, Mr. St. Laurent, tell me what is the nature of your ties to the United Kingdom, other than the ties of friendship and kinship?

ST. LAURENT: Our ties are not to the United Kingdom, Mr. Fisher, but rather with the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom and Canada are on equal footing as members of the British Commonwealth of nations. We share a common sovereign, His Majesty, King George VI.

CLAXTON: And besides the constitutional link -- that George VI is King of Canada as well as King of the United Kingdom -- we share certain common beliefs with the British people. I am sure that Mr. St. Laurent will agree with me in this. We have a common tradition of belief in consultation and compromise as a means of reaching workable solutions to common problems.

ST. LAURENT: I do agree with that point, Mr. Claxton. The belief in free and full discussion is fundamental to an understanding of the Commonwealth relationship. I sometimes think that a strong element in our very satisfactory relationship is our predisposition to talk things over with one another -- though that practice is by no means exclusive to the Commonwealth. For example, very full discussions of problems which concern Canada and the United States are constantly being carried on, at many different levels and in many different ways.

FISHER: Well, where does the Governor General fit into your constitutional picture? We are particularly interested because I understand that the Governor General, Field Marshal Alexander, is coming down to Washington and New York to pay us his first official visit next week.

ST. LAURENT: I mentioned that King George VI is the King of Canada as well as of other parts of the British Commonwealth. Since he obviously cannot reside in Canada at all times, the Governor General acts as the King's personal representative. He is appointed on the recommendation of the Prime Minister of Canada.

FISHER: In other words, he is not a link between the British and Canadian Governments, but rather between the Canadian Government and the King.

ST. LAURENT: Exactly. The British Government is represented in Canada, as we are in the United Kingdom by a High Commissioner. These men have much the same status as an ambassador and perform essentially the same functions. Now the other important constitutional link .....

FISHER: Besides the King?

ST. LAURENT: ... besides the King ... is the fact that the constitution of Canada is an act passed in 1867 by the Parliament of Great Britain. This means that it is necessary for every proposed change in the Canadian constitution to come before the British Parliament and be passed by it as an amendment to the original act.

FISHER: That seems rather a curious way to amend your constitution, if I may be forgiven for saying so, Mr. St. Laurent.

ST. LAURENT: I agree with you. It is curious. But it has been retained hitherto at the request of Canada because we have not yet been able to agree amongst ourselves on some other way to substitute for it. We want to be sure that minority rights will be fully respected and it is

not easy to draw the dividing line between what it should be possible for a majority to do, because it is the majority, and what a minority should have the right to prevent because it would deprive it of some essential element of its minority rights. We are all conscious that we are growing up and this is a problem we will have to face, but despite several conferences about it, we have not yet been able to agree upon a satisfactory solution.

FISHER: Does this mean that in legal matters, too, you must refer to the United Kingdom?

ST. LAURENT: It's similar. The final court of appeal for Canadians is not the Supreme Court of Canada but the judicial committee of the Privy Council of the United Kingdom.

FISHER: I thought you had introduced a bill in your Parliament, Mr. St. Laurent, to make the Canadian Supreme Court the final court?

ST. LAURENT: We did. An appeal was taken to the Privy Council in London. But it was delayed by the war.

FISHER: And, I understand, it's opinion has just come down?

ST. LAURENT: Yes. And the opinion, in effect, rules that it would be entirely legal for the Canadian Parliament to make our Supreme Court the final court of appeal.

FISHER: What does that mean? That your bill abolishing appeal to the Privy Council will have to go through your Parliament again?

ST. LAURENT: Yes. When we decide we do finally want to abolish that appeal.

FISHER: I take it, Mr. St. Laurent, that decision has not yet been taken?

ST. LAURENT: No. We have not yet decided whether or not the bill shall be introduced in this Session. As you know, Mr. Fisher our Parliament reconvened only the day before yesterday.

FISHER: Summing up, then, the question of your constitutional ties, Mr. St. Laurent?

ST. LAURENT: I can say that the effective ties are first, the form of our constitution is that of a constitutional monarchy which works in a manner similar to that of the other constitutional monarchies of the Commonwealth and which has tradition and experience behind it and with which our people are well satisfied; those constitutional monarchies all have the same King and if with all due respect I may put it this way, we are all very well satisfied with him; then there is the practice of intimate consultation between the several autonomous governments of the Commonwealth and the consciousness of the real mutual benefits we have all derived from this practice. It is difficult to put a good way of living into words but when it is a good way you don't have to have precise formulae to realize its worth.

FISHER: Next on my list of questions, Mr. Claxton, is one which concerns you personally as Minister of National Defence. I think I said earlier that I wanted to ask you about unification of the armed forces under one Minister. I would like to learn the reasons which led Canada to take this step. As you know, it has been the subject of much discussion in the United States.

CLAXTON: Well, in the first place, Mr. Fisher, it seems to us plain commonsense to achieve the maximum co-ordination between the services. They fought together in war: we thought they should work together in

peace. The services themselves have not been unified, as your question would seem to suggest. What has happened is that a single department of government has been established under one Minister to effect the maximum in co-ordination. To date, we are moving towards merging all technical and administrative services.

FISHER: What exactly do you mean by technical and administrative services?

CLAXTON: I mean such services as medical services, for example, or public relations. It is felt to be administratively more efficient to have these two branches of the department attending to the needs of all three services in a unified form, rather than having one branch for each service. We feel that this unification of common services has the advantages of efficiency and economy.

FISHER: Have you had enough time to make any analysis of the way the co-ordination is working out?

CLAXTON: To date it has been very satisfactory but the process is a continuing one, Mr. Fisher. It is a logical step in cutting out duplication in administration and in the direction of policy. The responsible officers of the services are well aware of this.

FISHER: How did you iron out opposition between the three services, Mr. Claxton? As you know, with us, there was pronounced difference of opinion.

CLAXTON: I am rather proud of the fact, Mr. Fisher, that the Canadian Services were ready to face this question of co-ordination without bias, and with a keen sense of the need and goodwill to benefit. There are, as you know, no guide lines to follow. Both the British and yourselves are just undertaking this problem, so the job is essentially a pioneering one. Naturally, each major change is looked into thoroughly before it is introduced and this has meant that its value and necessity have been well understood.

FISHER: Then you set up machinery, I take it, to see that the specialized needs of the three branches were protected and that no one branch suffered at the expense of the others?

CLAXTON: Yes. The establishment of inter-service committees to discuss these problems and make recommendations to the Minister is part of that machinery. It insures that all the service interests are protected. But in addition the Minister is advised by the Chiefs of Staff of the three services. All three have direct access.

FISHER: Incidentally, Mr. Claxton, I think we'd be interested to know how you in Canada are providing for manpower in your services?

CLAXTON: There's a simple answer to that. We're doing it by voluntary enlistment, and we are sure that's going to be adequate for all obligations.

ST. LAURENT: I would like to add that Canada is quite prepared to accept and honour military obligations to the United Nations and in fact at the recent meeting of the General Assembly in New York City, Canada urged that the Military Staffs' Committee proceed with their plans speedily in order that all countries might know what their obligations in this field were going to be.

FISHER: Thank you Gentlemen and now I want to turn from national security to social security. I was reminded by an early remark of yours, Mr. Claxton, on the subject of social security that you were until recently Minister of National Health and Welfare. I wish you

would tell us something about your experience in this field?

CLAXTON: Well, Mr. Fisher, I would like to repeat what I said earlier that we regard social security merely as a means of putting people on a more equal footing and not of supplanting that freedom of enterprise which is necessary in order to take advantage of our opportunities. In Canada we have three types of social security in the federal field. The first is the Unemployment Insurance Act, passed in 1940. That was the first piece of social legislation administered by the Dominion Government. It has two parts: unemployment insurance and a nation-wide employment service administered by a three-man commission.

FISHER: Now do the provisions apply to all Canadians?

CLAXTON: Yes, unless their employment is specifically excepted or their pay exceeds certain specified amounts.

FISHER: I take it that both employers and employees contribute?

CLAXTON: Yes. And their contributions are approximately equal.

FISHER: Does the government make any contribution?

CLAXTON: Yes. It contributes one-fifth of the amount contributed by employers and employees and it also pays the expenses of administration. The benefit is payable as a right to any insured person who fulfils the prescribed conditions. And there is no upper age limit. Our second type of social security is designed to better the lot of Canada's future citizens. We are extremely conscious in Canada of the fact that our children are our greatest national asset. Consequently, in order to give them the chance to take advantage of their opportunities, we make monthly payments, normally to the mother. The payments are made in varying amounts, depending on the age of the child and the number of the children in the family. They average about \$15 per family per month. These payments amount to about \$260,000,000 a year. I might add that these payments will maintain basic purchasing power in the event of a depression.

FISHER: Have you had this system of family allowances in effect long enough to determine its value, Mr. Claxton?

CLAXTON: Mr. Fisher, the plan went into operation in July 1945, and already reports show that diet has improved. That there is more adequate clothing and a greater use of medical, dental, and optical services. And in addition, there has been a widening of recreational outlets.

ST. LAURENT: Is it not also true that school attendance has increased?

CLAXTON: Yes, I am glad that you mentioned that. And it would seem from these early reports, Mr. Fisher, that Canada has invested wisely in her future.

FISHER: What's your third security?

CLAXTON: Old age pensions and pensions for the blind. We share the responsibility for this with the provincial governments.

FISHER: Well, I see that we have time for my last question. I mentioned it at the beginning, Mr. St. Laurent, and I've been saving it until now. Just a month ago Senator Austin, our delegate to the United Nations, came on this program and discussed the past session of the General Assembly. I'd like to ask you to what extent you think it succeeded?



ST. LAURENT: Well, Mr. Fisher, when people or organizations face and deal with real problems, they add substantially to their stature and to their own reputation and it seems to me that the United Nations at its last Assembly meeting did just that.

FISHER: I wish you'd tell us what you think the major accomplishments of the session were?

ST. LAURENT: Perhaps the most important single accomplishment was the resolution unanimously adopted by the Assembly on the principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments. Although Article 26 of the Charter provided for the eventual establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments, it is, I think, a most important and significant achievement that before the close of the first session of the General Assembly agreement was reached on some practical measures to attain that end. More significant still, perhaps, is the atmosphere of international co-operation and understanding which developed toward the end of the session when agreement on the disarmament question was reached. It was demonstrated at this assembly that when men want to agree they can usually find some way to compose their differences. If it be true that a will to co-operate was born at the Assembly, then that is the most important accomplishment of all.

FISHER: That is a feeling that seems to be shared by many of the leading delegates, Mr. St. Laurent. Senator Austin specifically singled it out for comment, just as you have. Ordinarily, Gentlemen, we close this program with one of our guests. But on this broadcast we are on two networks. So I would like to take this opportunity to thank you both for coming on this program. I have been your host on the broadcast. But you have been my hosts in the sense that I am broadcasting on your soil. I think that's a minor instance of the happy relationship between our two countries. And I hope that this will not be the last program on which Canadians and Americans will discuss together problems of foreign policy. Thank you very much, Mr. St. Laurent and Mr. Claxton.

ST. LAURENT: Well, Mr. Fisher, when people or organizations face and deal with real problems, they add substantially to their stature and to their own reputation and it seems to me that the United Nations at its last Assembly meeting did just that.

FISHER: I wish you'd tell us what you think the major accomplishments of the session were?

ST. LAURENT: Perhaps the most important single accomplishment was the resolution unanimously adopted by the Assembly on the principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments. Although Article 26 of the Charter provided for the eventual establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments, it is, I think, a most important and significant achievement that before the close of the first session of the General Assembly agreement was reached on some practical measures to attain that end. More significant still, perhaps, is the atmosphere of international co-operation and understanding which developed toward the end of the session when agreement on the disarmament question was reached. It was demonstrated at this assembly that when men want to agree they can usually find some way to compose their differences. If it be true that a will to co-operate was born at the Assembly, then that is the most important accomplishment of all.

FISHER: That is a feeling that seems to be shared by many of the leading delegates, Mr. St. Laurent. Senator Austin specifically singled it out for comment, just as you have. Ordinarily, Gentlemen, we close this program with one of our guests. But on this broadcast we are on two networks. So I would like to take this opportunity to thank you both for coming on this program. I have been your host on the broadcast. But you have been my hosts in the sense that I am broadcasting on your soil. I think that's a minor instance of the happy relationship between our two countries. And I hope that this will not be the last program on which Canadians and Americans will discuss together problems of foreign policy. Thank you very much, Mr. St. Laurent and Mr. Claxton.