



STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 57/3

CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS
A STUDY IN CO-OPERATION FOR PEACE

Excerpts from addresses by the Hon. Ralph Campney, Minister of National Defence, to the Seattle Branch, English Speaking Union, Seattle, January 4, 1957, and the Chamber of Commerce, Portland Oregon, January 7, 1957.

... We all know that there are international problems, plenty of them, which cause us deep concern today and which are crying aloud for solution. I am convinced that these problems can be solved, but they can be solved only by men of peaceful intent, men of determination and of good-will. Force must give way to good sense, greed to a desire for justice, suspicion to a sense of mutual trust.

In the main they can, I believe, be solved by the same reasonable processes which the Governments of Canada and the United States have successfully applied to the important issues which over the years have confronted our two countries,

And so I wish to talk to you tonight about the ways — the many ways — in which Canada and the United States have worked together and are working together in a sound constructive manner on great matters and small ones looking to the solution of our difficulties to the mutual benefit of both our nations.

It is a record of tremendously important co-operative achievement — a record of which we can both be proud. Unfortunately it is a record of which the public of both countries are almost totally unaware.

Our two nations have achieved a unity of purpose and close co-ordination of planning and action as perhaps no two independent, self respecting — proud if you will — nations have ever achieved before.

The reasons for this splendid record of amity and co-operation are to be found in our history — in the unfolding of our common heritage and in the common sense we have learned to bring to bear on our differences.

In the early history of our two countries, the dramatic story of discovery and settlement, we share much in common.

We share also common origins of race, language and law. Canada is unlike the United States in that we in Canada are a nation of two basic races and two official languages — English and French. But French place names scattered over the map of the United States from the Allegheny Mountains to the Rockies — names like Detroit, St. Louis, Vincennes and Joliet — are a reminder that the French Empire once covered the greater part of this western continent.

And there have come to the United States and to Canada alike millions of people of other races from many parts of the world, notably from western Europe. These people, welcome citizens, have added variety and vigor to both nations, have made and are making a special contribution to art, education and culture; and life on this continent has been greatly enriched by the blending of all these strains.

Epochal events in this century have also served to draw our two countries together. We have each participated in two great wars in defence of things we both hold dear. Brave men of our two countries have fought side by side to resist armed aggression in Korea. And in the face of a common and persistent threat to world peace, we are today working together in great projects for the joint defence of this continent and, indeed, of the whole western world.

We read pretty much the same books and magazines, see the same motion pictures and listen to similar radio and television programs. And withal each country has maintained its own individuality.

Millions of tourists cross the border each year. In a single year I am told the border between Canada and the United States is crossed more than 53 million times by citizens of both countries, either as tourists or commuters who live on one side of the border and work on the other.

Moreover, throughout the years there have been continuing migrations from each country to the other country.

During the fifty years 1905 to 1955 you sent 1,400,000 of your people to Canada. Today there are about 280,000 United States born persons in my country, and it would be difficult to estimate the number of Canadians of United States parentage or ancestry. It must be several millions.

Conversely, I am informed that there are more than one million persons of Canadian birth living in the United States.

In this connection I was interested to know that there are over 17,000 Canadian born persons here in Seattle, one of whom is your distinguished mayor.

By reason therefore of history, of common origins, common language and customs and similar complexes of population, Canada and the United States are very like in kind. These things have drawn us together, and even had they not, proximity would no doubt have dictated the wisdom of friendship.

Canada is a vast land — the largest country in the North American Continent, larger in area even than the United States — but most Canadians live in a relatively narrow strip of land adjacent to the 3000-mile boundary line. Indeed, ninety percent of the people of Canada live within 200 miles of the United States border.

In distant decades there have been some bitter disputes between us over specific sections of the boundary line. I need only mention the names San Juan Island, Behring Sea and the Alaska boundary to indicate what I mean. In all cases the differences were settled by diplomatic means although in some instances feelings ran high and negotiations were protracted and sharp, and some bitterness, now happily forgotten, was engendered.

Fortunately for the good relations of our two countries, a special technique was devised early in this century for solving boundary disputes and other problems in a sensible, amicable manner.

The International Joint Commission, consisting of three representatives of each country, was established in 1909. For nearly half a century now that commission has dealt with dozens of problems involving waters which form the boundary line, rivers which flow across the boundary, and other matters which have been referred to it. And it has solved nearly all those problems so effectively and so quietly that I suppose relatively few persons in either Canada or the United States know that such a useful agency exists or are aware of the great results which it has achieved.

In a host of other ways, too, the two countries work together to solve mutual problems great and small.

But I have time to make only passing reference to two or three specific fields in which bilateral collaboration has been of great mutual benefit.

Fisheries

In no field of civil activity has co-operation between our two countries been more marked than in the matter of fisheries. Remarkable results have been achieved with respect to both conservation and research.

Through bilateral arrangements we have been able to rehabilitate two very great fish resources — first halibut and then sock-eye salmon — both of which were threatened with extinction.

Scientific regulations and firm controls exercised by both countries working together have paid many millions in dividends to the citizens of each.

Only last week Canada and the United States signed a convention at Ottawa to bring pink salmon under the same international control.

In the realm, too, of civil defence activities we have developed a new and important field of close cooperation. For civil defence purposes the border between our two countries has been practically eliminated.

Boundary Waters

Again, one of the most important matters of immediate common concern is the problem of the development and sharing of our water resources in the Canadian and American Pacific Northwest.

Solution of this complex problem involves consideration of many diverse interests. Were it a matter merely for agreement between the two federal governments or merely a matter affecting the interests of the provinces and states concerned, it might be susceptible of comparatively simple solution.

But the issue is much more complicated than that. There exist in addition to national and state interests many municipal interests, private and public power development interests, industrial interests, problems of flood control, of wild-life, and of fisheries. In addition there exists in both countries the conflict for priorities of power use among public utilities, industry and agriculture. These many interests are not only individually different. They are very frequently conflicting. And I might observe in that connection that conflicts of interest are not always divided by the border line. In many cases they exist between different groups on the same side of the border.

But all these problems will be solved and will be satisfactorily solved. They will be solved by gathering the facts, studying the effect and implication of these facts, and by informed discussions in which both countries or their agencies participate. That is the time honored-way in which we have in the past settled all the difficulties which have arisen between us.

And if in the solution of these problems our interests may come into conflict, both countries are so accustomed to the democratic processes of discussion and compromise and of living in accordance with the rule of law that I have no doubt but that they will ultimately be settled — and satisfactorily settled.

Defence

May I now turn to the sphere of activity, where co-operation between Canada and the United States has been most complete, most effective and most cordial — the field for which in Canada I am primarily responsible — the field of North American defence.

The close co-operation for mutual protection which has been maintained in recent years between our respective departments of defence is all the more remarkable in the light of history. A century and a half ago we were at war with you. Ninety years ago, fear of the United States was one of the most compelling factors leading to the federal union of our provinces into one Canadian nation.

Yet from 1867 to this day we have lived in friendship and peace with never a real reason for either country to consider the possibility of defending itself against its neighbor.

Nor, in fact, had we in the past much to fear from other foreign powers. The great oceans formed a barrier to invasion, and powerful navies protected our coasts.

It is only in recent years that close co-operation between our two countries in matters of defence was established. In fact, not until 1938 when Hitler was so ominously rattling his sabre. At that time, President Roosevelt gave public assurance that the United States would not stand idly by in the event of threatened domination of Canadian soil. Canada's Prime Minister Mackenzie King immediately reciprocated by announcing Canada's obligation when he declared that:

Should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way either by land, sea or air to the United States across Canadian territory.

Thus was notice served to the world by both Canada and the United States that henceforth both countries were committed to a system of mutual self-defence.

Early in the last world war, during the dark days of 1940 when the Germans overran northwestern Europe and the future of the whole free world fell into jeopardy, the policy of joint Canada-United States defence came to fruition. Prime Minister King and President Roosevelt agreed at Ogdensburg, New York, to set up a Permanent Joint Board on Defence.

Throughout World War II that unique body, the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, served as the chief agency for co-ordinating mutual defence measures for the two nations. The Permanent Joint Board on Defence is still in existence, is still active, and meets regularly to study and recommend to the respective governments of Canada and the United States further and better measures looking to the overall defence of the Canada-United States region.

Harmonization of the post-war defence policies of Canada and the United States has continued steadily and progress has been such that for some time now the general staffs of our two countries work in complete accord and have entire agreement on doctrine, plans and preparation for the joint defence of our homelands.

The advent of thermonuclear weapons of incredible destructive power combined with the development of long range jet bombers to deliver such weapons has lent ever increasing urgency to the joint defence capability of this continent. And our two countries have been moving rapidly and effectively to meet this transcending danger.

We are convinced that the best way to avoid a war of annihilation is to make it plain to any potential enemy that collectively we have the strength to defend ourselves and overwhelming power to retaliate and destroy an aggressor.

Effective air defence requires adequate detecting apparatus, adequate communications and adequate attacking power to seek out and destroy invading planes.

For six years, as you know, Canada and the United States have been jointly building an integrated warning and communications system to serve a three fold purpose, should the need arise:

- (1) to alert fighter aircraft to the approach of hostile bombers,
- (2) to warn the civil population of that fact, and,
- (3) to enable the powerful United States strategic bombing force to get off the ground and on its way to carry out its crippling, devastating, retaliatory blow at the enemy.

It is in this project of tremendous magnitude, involving unbelievable difficulties and immense cost that co-operation between the United States and Canada has perhaps been most notable.

The main elements in the integrated continental air defence system of North America are three:

First, the Pinetree radar system, covering the industrial heartlands of the United States and Canada. This system provides the Canadian and United States air defence commands with a basic radar warning and control system, and through extensive communication networks it links the Canadian and United States air interceptor forces. The cost of this element of our joint defence system was borne jointly by Canada and the United States. It has been operational since 1954.

Second, the mid-Canada line, situated in Canada north of the settled area, is an early warning line supplementing the Pinetree radar system. It has been built entirely by Canada at a cost of upwards of 200 millions of dollars. It has been a job of real magnitude, fraught with great difficulties and many new problems and accompanied by a capacity to face new tests of hardship and endurance. Its importance in reinforcing the warning system so vital to both countries must, I think, be obvious to you all.

Third, there is the distant early warning line, or the DEW line as it is called, across the most northerly practicable part of North America — the Arctic shore. This has been built at the expense of the United States and its building constitutes one of the epics of transportation and construction of modern times. Here in Seattle, from which huge armadas of ships have sailed northward over the past few years, you are perhaps more familiar than most with the amazing story of the DEW line construction project. The DEW line with its extension down both flanks of the continent to prevent "end runs" by hostile aircraft, constitutes of course the most remote element of the whole warning system.

The three lines which I have mentioned — the Pinetree system, the mid-Canada line and the DEW line with its extensions — when fully operative, will constitute a co-ordinated system interlocked by an elaborate and extensive communications network, the whole designed to alert the continental air defence system, the United States retaliatory force and civil defence organizations as well should a hostile air attack be launched against this continent.

I have indicated only briefly the highlights of this great co-operative Canada-United States defence effort. That effort is really part of a wider program in which both countries are engaged for the preservation of peace — a program based on a dedication to the principle of peace through collective security

Both Canada and the United States have consistently over the years supported the aims of the United Nations.

Within the framework of the United Nations, both have strongly supported the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Canada's participation in two world wars has led Canadians to the conviction that the defence of Canada, the defence of North America and the defence of western Europe are all inseparable parts of the same objective — the preservation of western civilization by ensuring through the strength of NATO that aggression will be deterred and peace maintained.

Since NATO was organized nearly seven years ago, Canada has almost trebled the strength of its active forces. As its contribution to the integrated forces under the supreme allied commander Europe, Canada has in Europe 12 squadrons of jet aircraft and an infantry brigade group. In addition, some 40 Royal Canadian Navy warships are earmarked for duty under the supreme allied commander Atlantic.

We in Canada have made our contribution to the cost of airfields, pipelines and communications systems in Europe. We have given mutual aid to our NATO allies in the form of equipment and other help to the extent of one and one-quarter billion dollars. This latter item includes the cost of our NATO air training scheme under which the Royal Canadian Air Force has been training aircrew for our allies — incidentally we have already trained 4400 aircrew for our NATO allies.

Our rapid and extensive defence build-up at home and our contributions abroad are, I believe, no mean achievement for a nation of only sixteen million people.

May I now return to my main theme—the close, friendly relationship of Canada and the United States. It took many years to develop the understanding, the mutual trust and the confidence which characterize our relations today. We have had to devise new international techniques, new diplomatic devices. But through patience, study, discussion and compromise we have settled peacefully most of the problems affecting a large part of this continent. And we have settled them in such a way that the decisions have occasioned a minimum of acrimony and a maximum of satisfaction.

Is it too much to hope that the practical example which our two nations have set for the world may yet prevail—may yet lead to an ever widening appreciation and application of the principles which have come to govern our relations?

I have just returned from attending the NATO Council meeting held at Paris. NATO has, I believe, been the bulwark which has during recent years saved the Western World against the threat of aggressive attack. The Soviets do respect power and military strength if nothing else. And NATO, I believe, notwithstanding some set-backs, has been growing stronger and more effective as the years pass.

But, the suspicions and the prejudices born of history which, as was for long the case in respect of the Civil War in the United States, still haunt the peoples of Europe will be gradually eliminated only with the passage of time and as the free nations draw closer to each other in mutual dependence.

And to say that is not to be critical of European countries—these conditions are the product of history, not the wilful wish of the nations of today. These nations have lived through bitter trials and troubles—through wars almost without end—through vicissitudes unknown to us on this continent.

Is there no way by which we can assist these countries toward greater mutual confidence by familiarizing them with the joint experience of Canada and the United States, which for a century and more have never failed to solve their difficulties by peaceful means and without impairing their friendly relationship?

Surely there must be some way of making the history of our joint relationship a power for good, a compelling power for the establishment and maintenance of peaceful relations, of sensible settlements of disputes and difficulties between nations.

Our two countries have surely set an example, for the rest of the world. How can we make the example more effective in the cause of peace?

I leave that question with you. The organizations represented here tonight are all dedicated to the cause of peace. Can you not help make more effectively and widely known to all the world that Canada and the United States have learned how to live in peace, have learned how to settle their troubles as they arise, how to do so while maintaining their friendship and respect for each other?

If this could be accomplished, a great forward step would have been taken, I am sure, toward the goal for which we all strive—a world at peace—a happier world than we have ever known—a world where progress beyond man's fondest dreams may yet be possible.

St. Lawrence Seaway

The co-operation which has been shown by both Canada and the United States over recent months in that huge navigation and power project — the St. Lawrence Seaway — now well on the way to completion has been indeed remarkable. The problems to be tackled were tremendous. Apart from the sheer physical magnitude of the project, there were many large and difficult problems to be overcome. State, provincial, municipal and federal interests had to be reconciled. Towns and villages had to be moved. Territories set aside as Indian reservations

had to be appropriated. Municipal and domestic supplies of water and sewage disposal arrangements had to be considered anew. Upstream and downstream riparian interests had to be adequately protected. All these problems and others had to be studied in the large context of providing a seaway into the heart of a continent and putting into use a large international source of power of upwards of two million horsepower and at a total cost for navigation aids and power development of upwards of one billion dollars.

In this vast undertaking, both your government and mine, the International Joint Commission, the Power Authority of the State of New York, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and many other public and private agencies have worked together to complete the plans and get on with the job. As a result of these combined efforts, the St. Lawrence power and seaway development will be a reality in a few short years and will provide yet another monument to the co-operative spirit which has traditionally existed between our two countries.

S/C