



## STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No 52/9

CANADA AND WORLD AFFAIRS

Text of an address by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Mr. Walter Harris, delivered at the University of Rochester, Rochester, New York, February 19, 1952.

In undertaking a study of Canadian foreign policy, one should first examine the basis or principles on which that policy is founded. The present Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. St. Laurent, in a lecture at the University of Toronto in 1947 listed five basic principles of Canadian foreign policy. These were:

1. Preservation of national unity;
2. Belief in political liberty;
3. Respect for the rule of law in national and international affairs;
4. Respect for the values of a Christian civilization;
5. The acceptance of international responsibility.

In examining the application of these principles to Canadian foreign policy, the Prime Minister explained that no policy could be truly national, nor for that matter workable, unless it were first of all acceptable to the major sections of the community. The achievement of national unity in both domestic and foreign policies has raised special problems in Canada, owing to the co-existence of two major ethnic groups, both of which have played an essential part in our national development. The concept of political liberty has come down to us from our French-English heritage and has gradually developed during the transition of our country from the status of a colony to that of a completely independent nation. The rule of law in national affairs, not only in Canada but in your country and any other democracy, has grown so familiar that there is constant danger that we take it for granted; nevertheless, a grim reminder of the importance of the rule of law is the evil and chaos which a denial of it in the international sphere has twice brought to the world during the first half of this century. We respect the values of a Christian civilization because, to quote Mr. St. Laurent, those values lay emphasis on "the importance of the individual, on the place of moral principles in the conduct of human relations, on standards of judgment which transcend mere material well-being". Finally, an external policy negative in character is unrealistic at present. We must play our part with others in the formation and conduct of international organizations aimed at preserving the peace.

As is the case with every nation, Canada looks upon her domestic and external policies in the light of geography and resources. We are taught that we are larger than the United States in area but that we have less than one-eleventh the population of our neighbour. A very great percentage of our people reside within 200 miles of the border of the United States. But there are people living in almost all other parts of Canada and our communications system is extended to the limit to serve them. We are taught also that there are great natural resources in Canada; that we produce about 95 percent of the world's nickel and very large percentages of many other essential commodities; that four out of every five newspaper pages throughout the world are from our pulp industry. But we are not self-sufficient. We do not raise Florida oranges, nor I hasten to add the California variety either. Our plenty is of natural products which have to be processed either at home or abroad. Without markets abroad we would be bankrupt. Sales to other countries represent about 1/5th of our production. Our working year is shorter than yours, seasonal un-employment is with us every winter due to the rigours of our Canadian climate. Our gross national product at about 21 billion dollars this year is impressive to us, being at the rate of \$1500 for each man, woman and child. But it does not compare with the gross national product of the United States which is \$327 billion @ \$2100. Under these circumstances, while we share many North American views in common with our southern neighbour, we are restricted in our action because of our smaller population, because of our smaller income and because of our greater costs this will account for our generally more cautious approach to all problems.

Since a description of Canada's position in world affairs must necessarily be a description related to something else, it comes naturally to us to compare ourselves with the U.S.A. I would not compete with the columnist in explaining, or as I think the present wording is "interpreting" events. It will be sufficient to say that it should always be remembered that we achieved independence by evolution and not by revolution. This is not to claim any virtue, it is merely to remind ourselves that our development in Governmental matters was slower than yours and tended to preserve what we thought was desirable in the existing system rather than to launch into new methods. One reason why we did not join your revolution was well put by our Prime Minister when speaking to the Economic Club of New York recently, when he said:

"At the time of your War of Independence, the Canadian population was still almost exclusively French-speaking.....and the leaders of your revolution expected to find ready support among the French-speaking Canadians for their revolt against the English. There were several reasons why they did not get that support. One was that the traditional enemy of the average French-speaking Canadian of the 18th century was not the remote English nation across the Atlantic, but the English-speaking people of Boston and New England, the English-speaking people of Albany and the Hudson valley, with whom they had been trading scalps for a century and a half."

Because we rejected the revolution, we retained the ties with England and this has inclined us to Europe when external affairs are being discussed. You not only cut the ties, you did your utmost to seal yourselves off from all European difficulties. This attitude coloured the American viewpoint and we imagine that it is more difficult, even in 1952, for the average American to fix his mind on the problems of Europe than it is for the average Canadian. Canada has retained not only her connection with the British Crown, but her connection with the countries of the Commonwealth, former colonies of Great Britain and now independent nations. Another result of it is that we engaged in the two world wars from the beginning, and I suppose to this extent offended the Munroe doctrine before you did.

The concept of the Commonwealth is, I am afraid, seriously misunderstood by some people outside of the association itself. No one, as far as I know, has ever attempted to define in precise terms Canada's association with the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has variously been described as a "form of political association which is unique" and "without parallel in the contemporary world". It has been referred to as "the only case on record of a colonial empire being transformed to an association of free nations by experience, by compromise and by political evolution". Canadians are proud of their membership in this association and of the part which they have played in its creation. We regard it as a vital living organism which the members of the Commonwealth throughout the world can, in co-operation with like-minded countries, use for our common good.

Canada realizes that many advantages are to be derived from Commonwealth membership. The principal of these is the broader grasp of world movements which results from the constant exchange of views with other members. It has now become almost a platitude to declare that one of the greatest values of the Commonwealth as it is constituted today is that it provides a bridge, almost the only bridge, between the democracies of the West and the democracies of Asia. The close contact that it affords the Western members with the Asian members is particularly valuable, both in counter-acting any tendency to insularity on the part of Western members and in enabling them to explain their points of view to the Eastern members. In a world so fraught with divisions and misunderstandings, it is a decided advantage that there should be such a common bond of intimacy and complete equality between the East and the West. Canada wishes to see this bond maintained and strengthened, not only in the interest of the members of the Commonwealth but in the interest of all free nations.

During the period when the present structure of the Commonwealth was being determined, Canada always tried to guide the Commonwealth's development in a direction consistent with Canadian national aspirations. Canadians feel that they acted, on the whole, as a moderating influence between those members which would have preferred a greater degree of centralization and those which were uncertain about retaining their membership in the Commonwealth at all. There have been in the past some members who have advocated a closer-knit organization with a centralized machinery which would have given institutional form to the already close and continuous, but often informal, co-operation which existed between members of the Commonwealth. Canada has consistently opposed these proposals. We believe

that the existing organization of the Commonwealth as a group of independent nations co-operating in matters of common concern seems best adapted to the realities of the situation.

To sum up, therefore, we differ from the United States externally in our allegiance to the British Crown, in our membership in the Commonwealth and in our attitude toward Europe. In other words, our attachments and interests have resulted until recently at any rate in less isolationism in the north half of the North American continent than in the south.

I come now to Canada's relations with the United States of America, and our internal political differences. The history of relations between our two countries has been so unspectacular and the development of our co-operation so complete over a wide area of mutual interests that the almost automatic continuation of our present cordial friendship is often taken for granted. The examination, from time to time, of the outstanding problems confronting us is a necessary step in the continuing process of nurturing the friendship and understanding that have been built up over many years.

For Canadians, our relations with the United States have always been and will continue to be an essential part of the foundation of our foreign policy. During the 100 years before the Second World War, most of our problems were of a kind that arise from time to time between any two neighbouring countries -- disputes about the location of the boundary, the use of boundary waters, the exploitation of fisheries, smuggling and tariffs. We have built up a tradition of settlement of such problems through judicial or semi-judicial processes which is almost unique in the affairs of nations and which has become almost routine with us.

There is ample cause for satisfaction in the long period of friendship which our countries have enjoyed. We both have a mercantile spirit increasingly aware of mutual economic dependence, and a belief that there are no national problems as important as the maintaining of friendship. This has predisposed our nations to resort to investigation and adjudication of problems rather than to solutions imposed by force or fear.

The long history of the settlement of our problems by judicial or semi-judicial processes began with the establishing, by joint commissions set up under the Jay Treaty in 1794, of thousands of miles of boundary through imperfectly mapped territory involving the determination of sovereignty over disputed areas. It has continued, and is continuing now, in the control of fisheries and in the use of boundary waters through similar joint commissions established by treaty. The story has not been without outward expressions of indignation on both sides of the border over what were conceived to be sacrifices of "vital interests" and "national honour". However, the successful settlement of our differences during this period when we were both primarily (the United States almost exclusively) concerned with "cultivating our own gardens", has only once been marked by actual conflict -- the war of 1812, a war in which the United States had no very earnest interest; and only the most colourful and "coloured" incidents of this

conflict have retained a place in popular historical folklore. Nevertheless, a certain difference in outlook has developed and has become almost traditional in Canadian thinking. The difference is partly the result of the greater relative importance to Canada of maintaining peaceful relations with a much more powerful neighbour and of our satisfaction that, on the whole, reasonable and equitable solutions have been reached without the pressure which a greater power might have applied upon a lesser. We have come to expect reasonable and fair treatment from the United States, though admittedly sometimes only after intense effort in presenting our views. On the other hand, during the long period of United States withdrawal and aloofness from world affairs, although we were also primarily interested, as I have said, in "cultivating our own gardens", we, in Canada, maintained I think a greater interest in the affairs of the outside world. This was partly owing to our greater dependence on British and European markets and partly because of our membership in the Commonwealth.

In the past, then we observe a history marked largely by the co-operation of two neighbours submitting disputes upon which they could not agree, to impartial adjudication -- or at least to adjudication by as impartial a tribunal as could be found. Until now, the differences in our traditions and in our forms of government and in our relative size have scarcely entered into our dealings with one another. As neighbours, our business was chiefly concerned with the division or control of tangible assets. Policy in such matters is relatively simple and our differences have rarely led us into prolonged or indeed serious disagreements.

There is a further internal difference which must be borne in mind and that is that Canada is a partnership of two great races, French and English, augmented by representatives from many other races. The two large groups, the French and English, have not always been in complete accord about external policies, but the disagreement has always been composed. Any Government of Canada has to consider whether a particular course should be followed against the opposition of a considerable number of the people if one or other of the groups does not support that policy, or whether compromise is necessary in order to gain the support of not only a majority of opinion but of a reasonably large majority of opinion. The business of making sure that our two large groups are in step is an essential factor in any estimate of what Canada's policies might be. Nevertheless, it is proper to say that the growth of tolerance and understanding has been most remarkable in Canada in the past few years. There are few Canadians in any group who now distrust the motives of the other groups. At the moment there is no difference of opinion about our external policies. Both the French-speaking Province of Quebec and the English-speaking Province of Ontario support the efforts being made through NATO to prevent a third world war.

It follows therefore that if any particular policy is suggested by others and we are not the first to agree to it, you will understand that this comes from our desire to make absolutely sure of the position at home. On the other hand, if after a period of careful study and consideration we make a statement of our intentions, this may be accepted at face value. Our Parliamentary system places the support of the majority party behind such a declaration - and no Government in Canada has ever had its external policy reversed

or nullified by Parliament.

After the First World War, the growth of independence in Canada was most marked and resulted in a serious consideration by Canadian statesmen of the problems of the world and our share in them, because we found that hand in hand with independence went a greater responsibility. And so, as I have said, we entered the Second World War at the beginning after debate in our own Parliament, and began the mobilization of our resources for what everyone considered would be a long war. If you had come to Canada in September of 1939 you would have been struck by a feeling of great discouragement which had nothing to do with our expectations as to the outcome of the conflict. It was a feeling almost of despair for the human race. You had the opportunity of becoming conditioned to this world situation so that when you entered the war it was with an economy partly geared to it and a state of mind wholly different from ours. We both emerged from the Second World War determined to avoid another, and insofar as Canada was concerned this meant taking a greater part in responsibility for peace - that is, a reversal of our general policy of pre-war 11 years. You also reversed your pre-war policy.

Here may I dispose of some fallacies about the Second World War. It is still believed in some parts of the United States that Canada received Mutual Aid during the War. We did not, we paid cash for whatever we received from you. In fact, we had a Mutual Aid programme of our own which was made available to our Allies, including the United States. Some of our Allies took advantage of it although the United States did not. And since Marshall Aid became available we have only received it indirectly in that some countries who received it directly expended a portion of it in Canada.

Other results of World War II were the tremendous growth in the industrial capacity of Canada and the rather remarkable growth in the population of our country. As a result of the closer contacts during the war years the people of Newfoundland decided to join Canada and this union was effected three years ago. After deducting this unusual increase in numbers (over 300,000), we find that our population has grown in the last ten-year period by over 18 percent and this increase, together with the expansion of industry during the war years, is changing Canada's viewpoint on many things. We are by no means self-sufficient nor do we particularly wish to be, but neither are we as dependent on others as we once were. Perhaps the best evidence of that is the recent announcement that we were prepared to go it alone on the St. Lawrence Waterway. Such is our confidence in Canadian productive effort and Canadian financial stability that we are ready to undertake an expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars on this project alone without curtailing other Governmental activities. We hope we are not misunderstood. We know that we must have a partner in the hydro-electric project connected with the Seaway and whether that is the State of New York or the U.S.A. Federal Power Authority is not, of course, for us to say. A project of this size with a cost comparable with our pre second world war budget is now planned by the Canadian people without misgivings. Perhaps we are now a little less cautious than we once were, perhaps we do now expect and believe that our growth will be comparable to your own of by-gone decades.

This brings us to sum up the situation as I believe it to be. First and foremost, we desire to live as good neighbours with the United States and to work in equal co-operation with you, not only in solving our own common problems but in solving all problems within our competence in preserving peace in the world. This desire is not one of necessity only, it is an earnest well-founded desire which springs from an admiration of the role which you have been playing in world affairs.

We believe that the strength and freedom of the United Kingdom and Western Europe must be maintained. Canadian soldiers, sailors and airmen have been lost in Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Germany, Italy, France, Denmark, Norway and the United Kingdom in two world wars and we want to make sure that these sacrifices are not to be in vain.

We believe that all the evidence shows that the removal of obstacles of trade is one of the most effective means of promoting peace and the imposition of obstacles one of the causes of war. We have consistently favoured a general opening of world markets and have carried this belief into our own national life and have welcomed trade within our borders from abroad.

We strive for peace as an ideal because we, too, are idealists, although not in the grand manner that you are. We are, however, convinced and I think you have been convinced that we cannot keep out of world wars and for that reason we are taking far more responsibility in joint international efforts designed to prevent a war than anyone in Canada thought possible a few years ago. My recollection is that NATO was first suggested in Canada by the present Prime Minister some months before it was broached at the meetings of the United Nations in the fall of 1947. We have been consistent advocates of NATO since. We have been consistent supporters of the resistance to aggression in Korea. The extent of our contribution is, of course, quite small compared to your own but it would be proper to say again that our eyes were not turned to the Far East until the Second World War, whereas you have been preoccupied with the problems of Asia for many years.

Finally, we recognize the United States is giving a leadership at once heartening and effective to all the free peoples in the world. No plan for the resistance of aggression is likely to succeed without your seal of approval. No combination of other democratic countries can provide the means of defence which you can.

Canada is not a great power, nor have we any pretensions that we are, but we have many interests that have to be reconciled and we respectfully suggest that in reconciling them we have evolved a policy which is likely to be an effective means of preserving world peace. A North American nation primarily interested in the defence of Europe, with growing interests in Asia, a close connection with and perhaps even growing leadership in the Commonwealth with interests throughout the whole world, Canada believes that we know something about the relative importance to be given to the difficulties in one country and another. Limited though our numbers may be, our production is third only behind the United States and the United Kingdom - no mean accomplishment for a country of 14 millions, and our contribution to world stability will be effective within the limit of our capabilities.

The U.S.A. is inevitably the dominant factor in the free world. Our belief is that the free nations will need each other - that none of us is strong enough to go it alone - and all the free nations, Canada included, are looking to the U.S.A. for that wise and patient leadership which we believe both can preserve freedom and save the world from another war.

---

S/C