

**“Mosaics and Melting Pots: Our Shared North American Heritage”  
Luncheon Address to the Sons of Italy  
September 15, 2004  
Toronto, Ontario**

As prepared for delivery

Good afternoon i buon giorno. Thank you very much for that kind introduction. As a “son of Italy,” literally a grandson of Italy, it is a special pleasure to be with you today.

I’ll speak today about the broad range of U.S.-Canada relations. But there are two themes that I want to underscore in my remarks. First, that, while relations between the United States and Canada are big and important and sound, they have a global context that is equally important. Our challenge is not just to work together here in North America - something we have done very well for a long time. Increasingly, it is to work together in the world. I’ve been asked to address specifically the role of immigration in our societies. And I’d like to do that in the context of the underlying values and the heritage that we share in Canada and the United States.

The U.S.-Canada partnership is huge. It is by far the world’s largest bilateral trade and economic relationship and it stretches across more than 5,000 miles of shared border. At any given time each of us is hosting hundreds of thousands of each other’s citizens.

Our relationship is so big and diverse that much of it thrives without reference to the federal government of either country. There is a dense web of relationships, communications and agreements between regions; between provinces and states; between municipalities; and between families and friends. When an extended family holds a reunion that includes cousins from four provinces and seven states, differences in federal approaches to climate change policy or whether we voted together in the latest Security Council resolution hardly matter to them.

On other levels, of course, relations between Washington and Ottawa matter a great deal. We have some significant differences on a number of specific issues. But our policy differences pale in comparison to the overall scope of our cooperation. When President Bush and Prime Minister Martin met at the White House last April, they discussed their shared desire for a world at peace. And as President Bush observed, we are working together to achieve that shared goal.

Canada has played a major role in peace-keeping missions in the Balkans and more recently in Haiti. Canada is helping lead the diplomatic effort to end the violence that afflicts western Sudan. Canada has been a leader in Afghanistan. Although Canada did not join the coalition in Iraq, Canada’s navy played a vital support role in patrolling the Persian Gulf. And Canada has been a major contributor to reconstruction in Iraq, having pledged 300 million dollars to help rebuild the country and establish a new government. We continue to be grateful to have a friend and neighbor like Canada, one that understands the power of free societies.

That is especially important today. Just last week we marked the third anniversary of the terrorist attacks of September 11. Those attacks called us to fight a war against international terrorism. Americans still feel those attacks very personally. But it’s important to remember that Americans were not the only targets of attack on September 11. If we needed a reminder of that grim reality, it came just last week in the horrific events that left more than 300 innocent Russians dead, many of them children, at School No. 1 in Beslan.

We recognize that we can neither defeat international terrorism nor protect and defend our homeland by ourselves. Americans have been fortunate to have many friends and allies across the globe, on all continents and of all creeds, who have joined this fight. None is more important than Canada. Because we share this continent, the security and welfare of Canada and the United States are inseparable. With a shared border of 5,500 miles, geography alone makes it inevitable that international terrorists will consider using Canada as a potential launching pad for entry into the United States. It is critically important that Canada and the U.S. continue to work together to prevent and deter that threat.

That is exactly what we are doing. Canada and the U.S. have worked hard to build a "Zone of Confidence" in North America. American law enforcement and intelligence agencies are working more closely than ever with their Canadian counterparts, especially the RCMP, CSIS and Canada Customs, to share information and to screen travelers to North America. We are cooperating overseas before visitors board commercial flights to North America. We are working together on a Port Security Initiative that will screen the millions of shipping containers that enter North America every year. U.S. and Canadian military personnel work together as a single unit at NORAD to monitor the air and sea approaches to North America and to protect us from attack. We have amended the NORAD agreement to extend NORAD's existing aerospace warning function to provide integrated tactical warning and attack assessment. As the U.S. proceeds with its program of ballistic missile defense, we hope that the Canadian government will decide to join us.

Canada's recently announced national security policy maintains this spirit of close cooperation. It has three main objectives: protection of Canadians; protecting Canada's allies; and contributing to worldwide security. In other words, close cooperation between our two countries is not just in the vital interest of the United States. That cooperation is in Canada's own interest, in partnership with Canada's friends, and in response to global challenges.

We also share strong mutual interests in international trade in goods and services. Our two-way volume of trade, in merchandise alone, is well over 1.1 billion U.S. dollars every day of the year. We have a single, integrated, continental industrial base. We have eliminated virtually all tariffs between our two countries and Mexico through the free trade agreement and NAFTA, which has just completed its first decade.

There is still work to do and some difficult trade problems still remain. But there is no longer much controversy in saying that we should work together to fix those problems and remove further obstacles. There is more debate over "how" to go further, than over "whether" we should. We are not competing with each other so much as we are working together to make North America competitive in the wider world.

The obstacles to trading within North America are still important to us, but they are dwarfed by problems like the ones the Doha Development Round is tackling. But the difficulties have also presented opportunities. We are working with our international partners to seize those opportunities, especially to reduce tariffs on agricultural trade. We are doing so because it is good for the United States and Canada, good for North America, and good for the world.

I know this view has become controversial view in many quarters in this U.S. election year. As we have recovered from an economic recession in the U.S., we saw economic growth recover while job creation has remained sluggish. The U.S. economy is growing again - and it is growing jobs. But job growth is still slower than we would like.

But we should not forget that millions of American jobs are supported by American exports. One in five factory jobs in the U.S. directly depend on trade. The surest way to continue adding more jobs to our economy is a confident economic policy that trades with the world. And that means, first and foremost, maintaining trade with our largest trading partner, Canada, and with our

second largest trading partner, Mexico. We won't improve the U.S. economy by retreating from world trade.

Global free trade is not just in the direct economic interest of the United States and its partners like Canada. It is in everyone's interest. When we provide a favorable climate for trade and investment, we lay the basis for lifting people out of poverty. Doing so not only creates new consumers for our goods and services. It also helps prevent failed states, like Afghanistan had become under the Taliban, by giving people hope in the future. International trade and investment figures dwarf foreign aid figures. Foreign aid can help a country build roads to open up resources that will help its economy. But foreign aid alone cannot lift people out of poverty. That requires the resources that come from foreign trade and investment.

Without minimizing the thorny problems that remain between us, the real challenges in trade policy, for both our countries, lie in the wider world - in finding how we can promote our shared values - in harnessing open, transparent, free markets to the task of making the world more prosperous. As in national security, our long and successful experience in working together on trade puts us in an excellent position to tackle these challenges.

Canada and the U.S. are probably the two best environmental partners in the world. Our two countries started formal cooperation nearly 100 years ago with the boundary waters treaty and the creation of the International Joint Commission.

For much of the 20th century the issues had to do with lakes, rivers, migratory birds, and acid rain - overwhelmingly bilateral challenges. Our newer challenges are predominantly global - issues like ozone, persistent organic pollutants, highly migratory fish stocks, and tropical deforestation.

In the 1970s, landmark environmental laws made the U.S. federal government not just a steward of wilderness - which it had been for decades - but also a guardian of air, land and water quality. These were among the first laws of their type in the world. The current administration is building on those laws and responding to society's continuing demand for environmental improvement.

Air quality in the United States has improved significantly in recent decades at the same time that miles traveled by vehicles has increased, and energy consumption has grown, and the economy has prospered.

In the past year the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has proposed a new set of "clean air rules" which will continue these strong improvements in air quality. These rules particularly address the transport of pollution across state borders, by regulating interstate traffic, off-road diesel engines, and mercury emissions. Together, the new clean air rules should make the next 15 years one of the most beneficial periods in our history for air quality improvement.

Early in his administration, in March 2001, President Bush announced that the United States would not join the Kyoto protocol. This has been a source of criticism in many quarters. But the critics quickly forget that, at the same time, the president reaffirmed that the United States would remain committed to the central goal of the UN framework convention - to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere.

The United States has shown sustained leadership in pursuing this goal through means other than the Kyoto protocol. In June 2001 the President created the Cabinet Committee on Climate Change Science and Technology. The following month, we launched the international agreement on carbon capture and storage - in which Canadian oil and gas companies are important partners.

In January 2002, the Secretary of Energy launched the Freedom Car Program, a new cooperative automotive research program between the Department of Energy and major automakers. This program funds research into advanced, efficient fuel cell technology which will use hydrogen to power automobiles.

And most importantly, in February 2002 President Bush announced a multi-billion-dollar program of climate change initiatives. These are designed to slow, and as science justifies, stop and reverse the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. The Administration is committed to cutting America's greenhouse gas intensity - that means, emissions per unit of economic activity - by 18 percent over the next ten years.

This is the equivalent of taking 70 million cars off the road. It will require a major commitment. But it is achievable because it is based on the common sense idea that economic growth is not just compatible with environmental progress; rather, it contributes to environmental progress. Economic growth provides the resources for investment, which in turn brings clean and energy-efficient technologies to life.

As the National Energy Policy made clear, we are committed to working with international partners on climate change and energy supply issues, because these problems are global in their scope. And to prove it further, in March 2002, despite our different views on the Kyoto protocol, the governments of the United States and Canada signed two international agreements, on renewable energy and climate science. These made it clear to each other and to the world that we were committed to expand and intensify shared efforts to address global climate change, whether or not either of us chose to ratify Kyoto. While taking different views of the value of the Kyoto accord, the United States and Canada take similar views of the scale of the challenge and the need to work in concert.

Let me turn to a fourth area of U.S. and Canadian cooperation and interdependence, that of energy. Canada is the United States' top petroleum supplier and our largest foreign supplier of total energy - in fact, by a margin of two to one. We share an integrated, continental network of oil and gas pipelines and refinery infrastructure. Canada supplies about thirty percent of total U.S. energy imports. Cooperation and integration are very deep in the energy sector, and much has been done over past 20 years to institutionalize them.

The North American Energy Working Group, formed in the first months of the Bush Administration in 2001, is only the most recent major step. An Alaska natural gas pipeline will hopefully demonstrate yet again what the U.S.-Canada partnership can do together by once again extending the frontiers of our continent's energy supply.

We still have work to do. As the President's National Energy Policy report showed in 2001, we face major infrastructure challenges throughout the energy sector, but particularly in the integrated grid that transmits electric power in both our countries.

The hydrocarbon economy has lasted a hundred years. But it will not last forever. We will eventually move beyond petroleum and coal. It took centuries for our hydrocarbon fueled economy and society - and climate change - to develop. And it will take time to address it. If we take the long view - allowing appropriate time frames, and drawing on the transformative power of technology - we can change on the necessary scale and without economic trauma. And this change will not only address the worldwide challenge of climate change. It will also help to move the world beyond reliance on fossil fuels.

All of the themes I've discussed today - building a more secure and prosperous world, protecting the natural resources of North America while ensuring we have the energy we need to power our economies - are interests that the United States and Canada share with the rest of the global

community. None of us can achieve those goals independently; we can only achieve them by working together.

But we share more than interests, just as we share more than a border. There are fundamental values that unite our two countries. And I'd like to conclude with some observations about the values we share.

Both Canada and the United States are nations of immigrants. Our historic patterns of immigration have points of difference as well as much in common. The integration of immigrants into U.S. society has often been described as a "melting pot," through which immigrants become distinctly Americans. The integration of immigrants into Canada, on the other hand, is often described as a "mosaic," in which immigrants become Canadians while maintaining their own distinct communities. There are some real differences between the "melting pot" and the "mosaic." They certainly describe a relative emphasis on the individual in the U.S. tradition and a relative emphasis on community in Canadian tradition.

But I think this distinction often is overdrawn. Community has always mattered a great deal in the United States, just as the individual has always mattered a great deal in Canada. And there can be no doubt that immigration is one of defining elements in the national identities of both our countries.

The U.S. is still very much a nation of immigrants. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that the U.S. foreign-born population in the U.S. currently numbers 32.5 million, about 11.5 percent of the total U.S. population. That is certainly a lower percentage than in Canada, where about one in five Canadians is foreign-born. But it is significant.

One of the sources of Canada's emphasis on community has been the need to integrate historically diverse English and French speaking communities. As a result, Canada has long had two official languages, English and French. But it's equally significant that English is *not* the *official* language of the U.S. The importance of the English language in defining "American" identity has been debated, sometimes hotly, throughout U.S. history. But there has *never* been a declared "official" language in the U.S.

Of course, there have always been large communities of immigrant Americans whose first language was not English. For much of American history our unofficial "second language" was German. And today, the unofficial "second language" of the U.S. is Spanish. The number of Spanish speakers in the U.S. increased from 17.3 million in 1990 to 28.1 million in 2000, a 62 percent rise.

But immigrants continue to come to the U.S. not just from Latin America, but from across the globe. And it enriches and changes our national life. According to the 2000 census, nearly 1-in-5 people, or 47 million U.S. residents age five and older, speak a language other than English at home. I would note, though, that while much of that figure is accounted for by immigration, much of it is also attributable to greater use of "foreign languages" by Americans whose first language is English.

My point is that when we think about immigration and how it shapes our identities, we need to think beyond surface generalizations. The effects of immigration are dynamic. And within that dynamism is constant renewal. Without doubt, immigration is and will continue to be a defining characteristic of both of our societies. And pride in our immigrant traditions will continue to be one of the defining values shared by Canadians and Americans.

Let me conclude with a final note on the values that unite us. For the second time in four years, Canada and the United States are conducting national elections in the same year. When Canadians went to the polls on June 28, they were participating in a long and proud

democratic tradition. Canadians were participating in a parliamentary tradition that combines executive and legislative powers. And they were participating in an evolutionary political tradition that prides itself on seeking consensus and accommodation among diverse groups of people.

When Americans go to the polls this November, we will be participating in an equally proud democratic tradition. Our tradition takes pride in a political system that separates and balances executive, legislative and judicial powers. And it is a political system that, by design, values, and often forces, conflict and adversarial debate in national political life.

Paradoxically, our differing national political systems illustrate another of the most fundamental values that we share. There is no more important value, for Americans and for Canadians, than a political system that allows us fully to choose our governments and our representatives. This system is the foundation of our freedom to live, think, talk, and prosper. Those values of freedom, represented by free elections and democratic government, are the real bedrock of the great relationship between Canada and the United States.

Molto gra'zie.