The President of the United States of America,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

My dear Roosevelt,

My warmest thanks for your kind letter of sympathy. My Mother had a long life and a full life, and an easy passing, so there are no regrets; but it makes a great gap for me.

It would be an excellent thing if you and I could manage to visit the Prairie Provinces together next fall, if the general situation permits of it.

With sincerest good wishes for your great work in the New Year.

Yours ever sincerely,

[Signature]

3rd January, 1938.
December 23, 1937.

My dear Tweedsmuir:-

It is only today that I have heard of your loss, and I want you to know that I am thinking of you and am sorry indeed.

I like your thought of my visiting the Prairie Provinces. I have never been there and perhaps next year I can manage it, provided the general situation quiets down.

This ought to be a season of Good Will but, alas, there is less of it in the world than at any time since 1918. The brightest spot is the American Continent, plus Great Britain and the other Dominions.

My warm regards to you and Lady Tweedsmuir.

Faithfully yours,

The Right Hon. Lord Tweedsmuir,
Governor General of Canada,
Ottawa,
Canada.
The President of the United States of America,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

My dear Roosevelt,

I am so sorry that you have been having toothache. I hope you will have a most restful and successful fishing trip. Canada seems to have forgotten to begin its winter this year. It is still as mild as early in November in England.

I want to make a suggestion which perhaps you will keep in mind. Our Prairie Provinces have been urging me, if possible, to try to get you to pay them a short visit some time next fall. You generally make a tour about that time, I believe, and if you could come across the border, say to Winnipeg, I would join you there. It would give them enormous pleasure, and the kind of "buck-up" that they want. You see, they have the same problems as your own Middle West, and they are full, too, of American settlers.

More power to you! I think the omens for the trade treaty are good.

[Signature]
January 10, 1938.

Letter to President from Sumner Welles
in re-Dominion Gov. sending Army of Navy man here confidentially to talk "of the record" to some of our Army Gen. Staff and Navy Operations people.
Attaches letter from Norman Armour in re-same subject.

SEE--Sumner Welles folder-Drawer 1--1938
January 14, 1938.

Memo to President
From Sumner Welles
In re-talking with Canadian Army and Navy men "off the record".
SEE--Sumner Welles-Drawer 1--1938
Memo to President
From Sumner Welles

Enc. copy of conversation he had with Minister of Canada on March 15, 1938.

SEE--Sumner Welles folder-Drawer 1--1938
The President,
The White House.

My dear Mr. President:

Re: Alaska Highway.

With reference to suggested Amendment to Resolution No. 679, which I left with you, may I reiterate that such an amendment would be exceedingly helpful from our end and would of course leave the way open for subsequent discussion along lines suggested this morning.

I remain, dear Mr. President,

Very sincerely yours,
June 3, 1938.

MEMORANDUM FOR
HON. GEORGE T. SUMMERLIN

Will you talk with me about this?

F. D. R.
The President of the United States of America,
The White House, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

Thank you very much for your kind letter of May 12th. It would be great fun if we could meet this summer. I would rather it should be somewhere on the Manitoba boundary, for I would like you to see our Prairies. But I have been invited to the opening of the new bridge at the Thousand Islands on August 18th, and I have provisionally accepted. Would a meeting there suit your plans?

Towards the end of August I shall be in the West for a tour of the Prairies and British Columbia.

I have just come back from a tour in the drought areas of Saskatchewan. This year they are wonderfully green, and the prospects are good for a fine crop.

Ever yours,

[Signature]
May 12, 1939.

My dear Tweedsmuir:—

I find your note on my return from a week on a cruiser. I am glad you are going to get a few weeks’ holiday in England in July. I myself hope to go to the West Coast, then board a cruiser and come back via the Galapagos Islands and the Panama Canal — getting home early in August.

I have been asked to dedicate a new bridge between somewhere in Michigan and somewhere in Ontario — I forget where — about the first week in September, and also there is an international bridge to be dedicated in the Thousand Islands at about the same time. It would be most amusing and delightful if you and I could arrange a sort of joint dedicatory tour — and, by the way, there is some kind of a gateway or lodge on the boundary between somewhere in Minnesota or North Dakota and Manitoba!

A little later, early in June, I will collect more reliable data and dates and send them to you. What fun it would be to join up on such an expedition!

Always sincerely,

The Right Honorable Lord Tweedsmuir,
Governor General of Canada,
Government House,
Ottawa.
The President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President

I was delighted to receive your gift of the latest edition of your South American addresses. It will be an invaluable addition to my American library.

We think of you a great deal up here and wish you very well in your difficult task. My wife has just gone home for a holiday, and if I can wind up my Parliament in time I will sail for England on July 1st for a few weeks. In August we start for our tour in the West. If by any happy chance you are in the Middle West of your own country at that time you know how much I would like you to join me in Manitoba for a look at our Prairie country.

With kindest regards.

[Signature]
PSF: Canada
Aug 18/38

LONGUISSA,
BY PENETANQUISHENE.

Dear Miss [Name]

I have just heard

the President at Queen's Convention. He was splendid.

thousands of Canadians will

be a thrill as I was.

Please convey to him my

sincere appreciation

of [Name]. Please expres-

sing sorrow at not being

able to be present.

Yours a few weeks ago.
resulting in having more fluid in it than is necessary so I have to take quick.

I am also very sorry that harm has been able to welcome you to the house may please accept for myself and each to claim my love.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Signature]
Mr. Hepburn Stubs His Toe

IT IS, or so it seems to us, a good sign that so many Canadian newspapers have protested against the letter which Premier Hepburn wrote to the Prime Minister, brought in the opening of the Thousand Island Bridge by President Roosevelt and Mr. King, and that these protests have been found quite as often in the Ontario press as in the Ontario leader politically as in those which oppose him. The encouraging thing is that the criticisms have in nearly every case been based on the Hepburn letter and the language in which it was couched and not with the attitude of the message itself. Not to be conceived to be Mr. Hepburn's policy-actual or potential toward the St. Lawrence development movement, but to be expressed in the language of many Ontario newspapers agree with the Ontario leader in his opposition to the deep water channel and that they protest which some of them felt compelled to expel which some of them felt compelled to expel. The protests were based wholly upon what they regarded—and what some of them roundly described—as being in the language of the St. Lawrence development movement, the complete lack of dignity in its language and its studied offensiveness. The latter is precisely what, whatever it may have thought Mr. Hepburn now was, the language of his warmest supporters, warns the Premier that people are getting hungry of some sort. This is a bar which has been sympathetic to the Hepburn Administration much oftener than it has been to the St. Lawrence development movement. The Winnipeg Free Press in a lead editorial in its Offensive Letter calls it a "conspicuous lapse in the decencies of public life" and an "unwelcome incivility," an open insult to the Prime Minister handed to the press probably before it had become a technically offensive and a sign of bad temper.

All this is in our opinion a healthy sign. We are not concerned for the moment with the rightness or wrongness of the policy, which is the subject of the St. Lawrence seaways but, like our Ontario conferees, we would like to say a word in defence of the vernacular good manners in public life, more particularly when it comes to our own language as between political leaders. The Prime Minister was well in the heat of debate or when at a public meeting he is not supposed to be critical with him becomes "intoxicated with the exuberance of his own verbosity" which in cooler moments he regrets and said them may regret. It is another thing however for a public man—even so really important a public man as Mr. Hepburn—so to sit down and write to the Canadian Prime Minister a letter which cannot measure up to the standard of a good taste.

Mr. Hepburn need not leave Ontario Park, Toronto for a tradition of conflict with Ottawa on all sorts of important issues. In the works of Canadian publicists in his own provincial library he will find that the correspondence in which that province is carried on in the language of gentlemen. Sir James Whitney and Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not always differ in more than one issue and the Premier of Ontario, Mr. W. D. McDougall, has been noted for meekness in action. Sir Oliver Mowat, that doughty little fighter "went to the house" and spent a great deal of time on what he regarded as the vital issue of provincial rights. Yet the public newspapers are not merely in agreement with that province, he said and they may regret. It is another thing however for a public man—even so really important a public man as Mr. Hepburn—to sit down and write to the Canadian Prime Minister a letter which cannot measure up to the standard of a good taste.

Mr. Hepburn is a young man possesses the qualities but, after all, without a very dear life. He has been successful so far—as have so many of us in the beginning of their careers—by playing passively the role of the "plain, blunt man"—and the more so the more he gets older, he will find that the placid and blunter of his followes, the more he demands in his leader certain of the qualities of a good taste.
The Toronto Daily Star, August 31, 1938.

And Now the Weeklies Tell Him

When, for the first time in history, a president of the United States paid an official visit to Ontario, and joined with the Canadian prime minister in the opening of an important international bridge, the premier of Ontario pointedly and inscrutably answered himself from the proceedings. He not only failed in this vital respect as head of the host-province, but wrote an unnaturally and insulting letter to Premier King dealing with the projected St. Lawrence seaway which Mr. Roosevelt had been discussing. In this rude communication Mr. Hepburn referred to “any propaganda or squeeze play that might be concocted by you.”

Some of the well-merited rebukes which these crudities invited, and which the daily press of Canada promptly supplied, have already appeared in The Star. The weekly newsapers have not, however, to hand a number of these are outspoken in their criticism. The Orillia Packet and Times takes two columns on the front page, with a long overflow to another, to tell Ontario’s premier, in the form of an open letter, what it thinks about his recent actions. Reproducing his comments, and adding to Mr. King, it warns him that however people may differ on the seaway project, there should be no difference among true Canadians as to the undesirability of propagating disunity. “Harsh words and signs of ill-will should be avoided and minimized.” The citizens of Ontario are greatly distressed because of “the signs of discord, and the back-biting.”

The Barrie Examiner deals with Mr. Hepburn’s absence from the Roosevelt-King bridge opening and uses the term “gross insensitivity.” It says:

“Premier Hepburn’s action of ignoring the presence in this province of President Roosevelt casts a reflection upon the people of Ontario. Mr. King had the whole presidency of the United States to pay an official visit to Canada. As this visit was made to Ontario, it was the duty of the premier to attend and become the distinguished visitor on behalf of the citizens of this province. Let us hope President Roosevelt is much moved by expression of Ontario than to judge him by the gross insensitivity of Premier Hepburn.”

The Simeon Reformer is against the seaway project, but has nothing but condemnation for Mr. Hepburn’s recent actions. It says:

“it was scarcely necessary, however, for Premier Hepburn to make President Roosevelt express a new confidence in his signal upon the premier of Canada in the form of a letter which contained this unseemly assertion: ‘Irrespective of any propaganda or propaganda is to play the part which be conducted by you, you may rest assured that the Ontario government will resist any effort to force us to adopt the public works such as the one proposed.’ Inasmuch as Premier King had not made the slightest comment on the Roosevelt address, and Premier Hepburn, assuredly not in order. Or perhaps that was just ‘Mitch’s’ usual way of extending a cordial welcome to the president of the United States on the occasion of his first official visit to Ontario.”

Mr. Hepburn has the reputation of being a wise politician and of being quick to gauge public opinion, but he must realize this time that he is alienating his friends and strengthening his foes, to say nothing of injuring the reputation of the province, by words and actions which are not compatible with the dignity and importance of his office.
In reply refer to PR 811.001 Roosevelt, F.D./6057

September 15, 1938

My dear Miss LeHand:

Reference is made to your memorandum of August 31, 1938, enclosing for appropriate transmittal two photographs autographed by the President, at the request of the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

The photographs were sent to the American Consul General at Toronto with the request that they be delivered to their destination, and I am now enclosing, at the request of the Consul General, a copy of a letter of thanks for the President's courtesy, received from the Office of the Lieutenant Governor.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Chief of Protocol.

Enclosure:
Letter of thanks.

Miss Marguerite A. LeHand,
Private Secretary to the President,
The White House.
The Lieutenant Governor
Queen's Park
TORONTO

September 9, 1938.

Dear Mr. Hengstler, -

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor desires me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 8th enclosing the photographs which were sent down to the President for his autograph.

His Honour will be obliged if you will kindly convey to Mr. Roosevelt his thanks for so kindly signing the pictures.

Yours truly,

M. P. JOHNSON,
Secretary.

H. C. Hengstler, Esq.,
American Consul General,
Toronto, 2.
September 23, 1938

My dear Mr. Henry:

Upon our return from Rochester, I found your note of September ninth, with the enclosed copies of the Prime Minister's address at the Thousand Islands International Bridge celebration. I have been glad to pass them along to the President and he has asked that you tell the Prime Minister how much he appreciates his thoughtfulness in sending them to him. He is delighted to have them.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

M. H. McINTYRE
Secretary to the President

H. R. L. Henry, Esq.,
Private Secretary to the Prime Minister,
Ottawa,
Canada.
Ottawa, September 9, 1938.

Marvin H. McIntyre, Esq.,
Secretary to
President Roosevelt,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. McIntyre:

By direction of the Prime Minister, I am sending you herewith copies of a reprint of the address which he delivered at the dedication of the Thousand Islands International Bridge at Ivy Lea. Mr. King would be pleased if you would kindly see that these are given to the President.

Yours faithfully,

H. R. L. Henry,
Private Secretary.
The Bridge-Builders

ADDRESS BY

RT. HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.,

Prime Minister of Canada

AT THE

Dedication of the

Thousand Islands International Bridge at Ivy Lea, Ontario,

and Collin's Landing, New York,

August 18th, 1938.
The Bridge-Builders

ADDRESS BY

RT. HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING, M.P.,
Prime Minister of Canada

AT THE

DEDICATION OF THE

THOUSAND ISLANDS INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE AT IVY LEA, ONTARIO,
AND COLLIN'S LANDING, NEW YORK,

August 18th, 1938.

I had hoped that on this occasion the Dominion of Canada might have been represented by our Governor General, The Right Honourable Lord Tweedsmuir. For months past, His Excellency had been looking forward to to-day's ceremonies. Upon his departure, on the eve of prorogation of our Parliament, his last words to me were: "We shall meet at Ivy Lea." I know how real his disappointment will be to-day that the time of his return has been unavoidably postponed.

Lord Tweedsmuir will particularly regret that he has been deprived of renewing, amid to-day's memorable associations, the warm personal friendship he enjoys with you, Mr. President, and of joining with you in giving expression to the friendship which, over so many years, has existed between the peoples of the United States and Canada. Lord Tweedsmuir's presence in England is itself a reminder of that wider friendship which exists between the United States and all the nations of the British Commonwealth.

I should like to express to Mr. Russell Wright, to the Chairman of The Thousand Islands Bridge Authority, and to its other members, and to my friend, Mr. George T. Fulford, how much I,
also, have appreciated their kind invitation; and how highly I esteem the privilege of being among the number present at this afternoon’s ceremony. I, too, have been privileged to enjoy a friendship with President Roosevelt which extends now over many years. Like him, I have sought, whenever and wherever the opportunity has presented itself, to further and cement ties of international friendship and goodwill, not alone between the English-speaking countries of the world, but between all countries. It is a joy to me to be able to join with the President this afternoon in drawing to the attention of the citizens of other lands, as well as our own, the wide significance of to-day’s proceedings, and much that is symbolized by the new structure, the dedication of which to public use is the occasion of this vast international gathering.

Appreciation of President Roosevelt’s visits to Canada

On behalf of the Government and people of Canada, I should like to say to President Roosevelt how pleased and honoured we all feel that he should have found it possible, to-day, to pay our country another visit, and to accept an honorary degree from one of its leading Universities. May I express as well, on behalf of all Canadians, our profound appreciation of the address delivered by the President at Queen’s University this morning. It will meet with a warm response in the hearts of all lovers of justice, liberty and peace. This is the third official visit of the President of the United States to Canada in as many years. We recall with pride and delight the President’s visit to the ancient citadel of Quebec on July 31st, 1936. On September 30th of last year, before embarking upon a cruise on the Pacific Ocean, he paid a brief visit to the westernmost province of the Dominion, honouring by his presence its beautiful capital, the city of Victoria. In visiting Kingston to receive from Queen’s University the degree of Doctor of Laws, he has this morning honoured another of our historic cities, one which, a century ago, was looked upon, and spoken of, as the citadel of Upper Canada. These have been official visits, paid in the course of years filled with overwhelming responsibilities, and the most arduous of public duties.
It is a pleasure to recall that there have been unofficial visits as well. The waters of the Atlantic, even more than those of the Pacific, have extended to President Roosevelt a continuous welcome to our shores. For many years, the Island of Campobello, off the New Brunswick coast, has been for the President a place of residence or recreation in the summer months. Personal and official visits alike remind us how near to the heart of the President—and I might add, to the hearts of us all—is his policy of the good neighbour. For the many expressions of international friendship and good-will, towards our country, by the Chief Executive of the United States, the Government and people of Canada are profoundly grateful. It is a gratitude which may well be shared by an anxious world.

*International significance of universities of Canada and the United States*

In honouring the Chief Executive of the United States, Queen's University has this morning been able also to pay a tribute of esteem and of enduring friendship to the people of the United States. The tribute will especially be welcomed, by Canadians, as the gift of a University of a long and honourable academic tradition, which has given to our country, alike in professional and political callings, not a few of its most public-spirited sons.

It may, at this time, be not inappropriate to remark that the interchange of professors and students between our universities in either country has contributed richly to both. I hope that a continuance of this fraternity of learning may serve to deepen the channels of understanding between our respective countries.

I may be pardoned, perhaps, if I mention that this morning's ceremony vividly recalled to me my own indebtedness to the universities of the United States for opportunities of post-graduate study and research. The passing years have served to increase, rather than to diminish, the sense of obligation I feel for the opportunities thus enjoyed. Particularly is it a pleasure to me to remember, at this time, my own academic connections with Harvard University;
to recall that Harvard was the President's Alma Mater; and that it was at Harvard, on an occasion not dissimilar to that of this morning, I first had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Roosevelt, and of forming a friendship which, in years to come, was not to be without its associations with the public life of our respective countries.

The Thames and the St. Lawrence

May I turn now to the particular ceremony of this afternoon and its significance. There is always a satisfaction in seeing the completion of an important public undertaking. I should like to join with others present in extending heartiest congratulations to all who have had to do with the conception, construction, and completion of the Thousand Islands International Bridge.

In May of last year, while attending, in London, the Coronation of Their Majesties King George and Queen Elizabeth, I had the honour of being invited to open a new bridge over the Thames, at Chelsea. My thoughts at the time were naturally of that historic river whose rural beauty is a pleasure to all, and upon whose banks are famous cities, including Oxford and London. I did not forget that the waters of the Thames had witnessed great struggles for freedom which had brought the British race to a proud position in the world. Nor did I forget that these associations formed a part of the heritage of the British Commonwealth.

All of this comes back to my mind as I seek to speak of the significance of to-day's ceremony. It is not the Thames, it is the St. Lawrence that is in our thoughts to-day. The St. Lawrence, too, is not without its history, a history which may well be the pride of the peoples of this Continent. It, also, has its great natural beauty. Where in the whole wide world is there a more majestic approach to the interior of any land; more in the way of an ever changing loveliness on an unprecedented scale? The St. Lawrence, too, has witnessed cities, universities, and capitals rise into being on its banks. Its waters, like those of the Thames, have been the scene of many struggles which have contributed to a larger freedom.
Symbols of national unity and international amity

So much for similarities which are not without their significance. There are differences, however, which are of even greater significance to the world to-day. The Thames, from its source to the sea, is within the confines of a single State. Its waters are national in character. The waters of the St. Lawrence, in considerable part, are international waters. They serve to divide, as well as to unite. The possibilities of friction between the two countries are not lessened by the fact that their boundary, in part, is a vast inland waterway which stretches a thousand miles and more from the interior of the continent to the sea. Over the greater part of that distance rivers and lakes constitute the international frontier between Canada and the United States.

The bridge at Chelsea serves to emphasize and enhance the inheritance of commerce and culture shared by those who dwell on either bank of the Thames—a single people in one country. This Thousand Islands Bridge serves to emphasize and, we cannot doubt, will enhance through the years, the inheritance of commerce and culture shared by the peoples on either bank of the St. Lawrence—not one people, but two. The bridge at Chelsea stands as a symbol of national unity; this bridge is a symbol of international amity. It constitutes yet another of the many bonds which join two peoples who rival one another, not in enmities or in armaments, but in devotion to the ways of peace and the spirit of conciliation. Upon a bridge, itself a symbol of international friendship and good-will, we are celebrating once again a century and more of peace between the United States and Canada. When we reflect upon the disputed frontiers which threaten peace in other quarters of the globe, we cannot but feel that the ceremony in which we are participating has in it something of significance to the world.

A common background: an insufficient guarantee of peace

It may be thought that we owe our achievement to a common background; or that it is due to Chance that our frontiers differ so greatly from the frontiers of states on other continents. It is true
that we can claim to share the culture of two old world civilizations. The names of Champlain and Frontenac, Marquette and LaSalle belong scarcely less to you than to us, and no historian has recounted their exploits more vividly than your own Francis Parkman. Likewise, until 1776 the history and heritage of the British Commonwealth, to which I referred a moment ago, belonged as much to the thirteen Colonies, as it does to us.

This common background, however, was not sufficient to ensure our peace. The Seven Years war, the war of the American Revolution, the war of 1812, the Canadian Rebellion of 1837-38, all turned the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes into an area of significant conflict. The ancestors of those who to-day are here assembled to rejoice that another link has been forged which serves to further their common interests, and to cement their friendship were, in those turbulent periods of our history, at enmity one with the other in either civil or international strife.

Human nature is much the same wherever it exists. Our populations, after all, do not, in origin, differ greatly from those of Europe. Indeed, the European countries have contributed most to their composition. Each of our countries has its problems of race and creed and class; each has its full measure of political controversy. Nevertheless we seem to have found the better way to secure and maintain our peace.

The art of international bridge building

This international highway speaks of that better way. In itself it is one vast undertaking, but it is made up of pieces of solid ground and a series of bridges. Where solid ground has been lacking, and the way, in consequence, made impassable, bridges have been built. Imposing structures they are, ingeniously combining utility and beauty.

In the realm of international relations we, too, have learned to bridge our differences. We have practised the art of building
bridges. There is indeed no more striking symbol of unity, of intercourse, and of friendship than a bridge. From antiquity to the present, bridges have been built to span the spaces of separation. Their very appearance suggests the surmounting of difficulties, the overcoming of barriers, the broadening of the path of progress and peace. The peoples of this continent, whether concerned with steel and stone, or with the invisible realities of mind and spirit, have, for the most part, been bridge-builders worthy of the name. In politics, as in road-making, it is a great thing, Mr. President, to know how to build bridges.

In the art of international bridge-building there are two structures, each with its association with the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, of which I should like to say just a word. They stand out as monuments of international co-operation and good-will. Each has its message for the world of to-day. The one is the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817; the other, the International Joint Commission created in 1909.

The Rush-Bagot Agreement: a means of escape from competitive arming

Before the War of 1812 and while it was being waged, citadels and arsenals came into being. Naval yards were set up and armed craft appeared on the waters of the St. Lawrence and the Lakes. Hostile forts frowned at each other from opposite shores. An armament race had begun; and had it been permitted to continue, we should have been looking back on a century of suspicion, enmity and hatred, instead of rejoicing, as we are, in a century of peace. In the course of the War of 1812, as many as 20 armed vessels were constructed in the Naval Yards at Kingston. One of these, the St. Lawrence, was actually larger in size, and carried more guns, than Nelson’s Victory at the Battle of Trafalgar. Within three years of the conclusion of the war, we, happily, had determined to place our reliance upon Reason instead of upon Force, and to substitute for
any surviving ill-will such a measure of solid good-will as should bridge succeeding years. By the Rush-Bagot Agreement the total armament on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence, as well as Lake Champlain, was not to exceed six armed vessels, weighing not more than one hundred tons, and mounting one eighteen-pounder apiece.

On the first of this month I had the honour of re-opening, at Kingston, the large fort which has recently been restored. Its name is Fort Henry. It, too, owed much of its size and strength to the War of 1812 and to fears of possible future invasion of Canada by her powerful neighbour. Fort Henry has been reconstructed to attract, not to repel, possible invasions from the United States.

The Rush-Bagot Agreement was a self-denying ordinance. As such it provided a means of escape from competitive arming. It was limited in its application to the St. Lawrence and the Lakes. In fact, it served to end all armaments on an international frontier extending from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific. This significant document has served as the most effective instrument in promoting, between our neighbouring countries, an enduring peace.

The International Joint Commission: a crowning achievement

The decision never to arm against each other was taken, as I have indicated, over a century ago. In our own time, we have crowned that decision by the construction of other bridges of international friendship and understanding. By far the most important of them is the International Joint Commission. It was created to adjudicate all questions of difference arising along our four thousand miles of frontier. In the quarter of a century of its existence, by substituting investigation for dictation, and conciliation for coercion, in the adjustment of international disputes, the Commission has solved many questions likely to lead to serious controversy. This bridge of peace has been the more significant in that while countries on the continents of Europe and Asia have been increasing their frontier armaments, the United States and Canada have settled all their boundary differences by the method and processes of reasoned discussion.
The task of the bridge builders

A word in conclusion: The international bridge building of which I have been speaking, and of which our international bridges are fitting symbols, has grown naturally out of our common needs and our common will to live together as good friends and neighbours. All stand as acts of faith in human intelligence and good-will. They mean for us a precious cultural and constitutional heritage which it is our joint purpose to foster and maintain.

It will be at once obvious that the challenges to an international order, founded upon the rule of law, are many and dangerous. No one who looks at the distracted and disordered state of the world to-day can fail to be impressed by the extent to which the forces of international anarchy are seeking to prevail, and to subvert those standards of human conduct which we have come to regard as essential attributes of our civilization. The task of the bridge builder remains. I think I speak the mind of both countries when I say that, not only are we determined to preserve the neighbourly relations, and the free ways of life, which are our priceless heritage, but that we earnestly wish to see them become a part of the common heritage of mankind. To that end, we are prepared to go on building bridges, to throw the span of friendship and of freedom across the troubled waters of our time.
Dear Mr. President,

May I write to thank you once more for your kind invitation. Having asked me to come to Hyde Park? It was so good of you to make time for me. I shall never forget this visit.
With very many thanks,

I am,

Yours sincerely,

Katherine Whitell

I am going to take the hint

offering you a copy of

little book made lately

written on the Spanish Steck
I hope there's a cake or a dog or two on the menu.
October 11, 1938.

My dear MacKenzie:

I am deeply grateful for your message and your letter with reference to the part I was privileged to play in the amelioration of the European crisis. I can assure you that we in the United States rejoice with you, and the world at large, that the outbreak of war was averted.

To me the most heartening aspect of the situation is the fact that this feeling of relief has been so spontaneous and has been expressed with such obvious sincerity throughout the world. We have had before our eyes tangible proof, if proof were needed, that the people of the world have a clear realization of what a general European war would mean and that those who work for the peaceful solution of international problems have the overwhelming support of their fellowmen.

I am still concerned, as I know you are, when we consider prospects for the future. I cannot help but feel that unless very soon Europe as a whole takes up important changes in two companion directions — reduction of armaments and lowering of trade barriers — a new crisis will come. If Hitler means what he said so definitely, he will have to go along and if he did not mean what he said, he will not go along. That thought may be a
childishly simple one but I think it expresses the immediate test.

I still look forward to that visit when we get around to our trade agreement!

Faithfully yours,

The Right Honorable
W. L. Mackenzie King, P.C., C.M.G.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa.
Department of State

Eu

ENCLOSURE TO

Letter drafted 10/4

ADDRESS TO

the President
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON

October 4, 1938

My dear Mr. President:

In compliance with your request, I am enclosing a draft of a letter which you may wish to send to the Prime Minister of Canada in reply to his telegram to you of September 30, congratulating you, on behalf of the people of Canada and the Canadian Government, on the part which you played in the recent European crisis.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

The President,

The White House.
Allama. September 30th, 1938.

Dear Sir President:

I trust it need not be in my own hand the message which found its way by mine last night.

The people of Canada join with my colleagues and myself in offering you our deep and grateful appreciation of the part you have played in the solution of the European crisis.

In your message of the last week you voiced the heart and conscience of mankind. Your words, we believe, have contributed in no uncertain way to preserving peace on a moment when the world's peace itself was threatened.
By making your appeal to reason, and setting no threat of war, you have compelled others to heed the inevitable and unpardonable folly of war.

Nor do we at this time forget the long continued efforts of the [cut-off text, unclear what is missing].

And finally, I do think it would American opinion, and I do think American feeling along lines calculated to worsen the solution of international problems by specific means.

Canada is rejoicing with her good neighbors in the triumph of these principles today.

Yours very sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. President,

The White House,

Washington, D.C.
SPECIAL DELIVERY

The President

The White House,

Washington,

D.C.

PRIME MINISTER

SPECIAL DELIVERY
November 3, 1938.

My dear Tweedsmuir:

I am delighted that you are back and especially that you are in excellent health again. My one regret is that these few days are my last at Hyde Park until late in the Spring. It would be so much nicer in every way to have you and Lady Tweedsmuir come here to Hyde Park where we could lead a simple life with few interruptions from official duties.

I hope, however, that you will both come to us for a weekend in Washington this winter. By that time we shall know more about the King's visit.

As you probably know, I have been corresponding with him directly and have expressed the hope that when he and Her Majesty come to the United States they will spend two or three days with us quietly at Hyde Park. As I said to him, the American people admire the essential democracy of the King and Queen, and it would help if the formal functions could be supplemented by a peaceful and simple visit to a peaceful and simple American country home.

Ronald Lindsay and I agree that it is probably advisable for the King and Queen to spend a day officially in Washington and to visit
the Exposition in New York for a couple of hours -- but, as you know, Hyde Park is enroute to both of these places from Canada.

It was delightful to have the Murrays here and, after you have talked with Mackenzie King, we can proceed further with the preparedness problem.

My sincere regards to you both,

Faithfully yours,

Right Honorable Lord Tweedsmuir,
Governor General of Canada,
Ottawa,
Canada.
The President of the United States of America, 
Hyde Park on the Hudson, 
New York State.

My Dear Roosevelt,

We have had the Arthur Murrays here for the last few days; alas! they go home tomorrow. I was delighted to see them looking so well. Arthur gave me a most interesting account of some of his talks with you, and we have prepared, as you desired, a memorandum which I will discuss with my Prime Minister as soon as he gets back. We expect him about the end of the week.

As I told you, my time in England was mostly spent doing a 'cure' in a clinic in North Wales. It did me an enormous amount of good, and I am starting the winter in excellent health, which is just as well, for I have a good deal to do. I have some big journeys in the spring, and the King's visit will be something of a business.

I was released from my clinic in the last week of September, and spent that hectic week in London. I have never had the chance of telling you how vital your intervention was. Your second message to Hitler, especially, was, to my mind, what clinched the matter. It made Hitler realise that he could not oppose the massed commonsense of the civilised world.

I hope the Congressional elections will go well, and that you have been having a real rest in the country. Arthur Murray gave
me a very good account of your health. Some time I should greatly like to arrange a meeting and have a talk with you, for there are many matters which concern our common peace.

My wife joins in sending our warmest regards to Mrs. Roosevelt and yourself.
The President of the United States of America,

Hyde Park on the Hudson,
New York State,
U.S.A.

Nelson House
Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Letter dated Dec. 20, 1938 Re: visit of Their Majesties from Mackenzie King - See: King and Queen folder - Foreign File Drawer 1--1939

Carbon copy of letter to Mackenzie King from FDR dated Jan. 18, 1939 Re: King and Queen visit - See: King and Queen Folder - Foreign File Drawer 1--1939
January 19, 1939

Dear Mackenzie:

I have been reading the little volume by your Grandfather and I am delighted to know that the fault was all mine — for I had picked the wrong Benjamin Franklin Butler. There were, as you know, two of them.

There is no question what side your Grandfather would be on today, and honestly I think that liberals in this day and generation have much easier sledding than they did a hundred years ago.

I forgot to mention in my letter of yesterday that it is entirely agreeable that Canadian responsibility for all aspects of Their Majesties journey cease at the border of the United States and that you assume the responsibility again when they enter Canada early in the morning of June twelfth.

I am having our Secret Service and an Army representative arrange to meet with your people.

As ever yours,

The Right Honorable
W. L. Mackenzie King, P. C., C. M. G.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa.
February 9th, 1939

Dear Mr. President:

May I express my sincere thanks for your kind telegram of sympathy to my father. I am afraid that he is not capable of recovering it personally but I will show it to him as soon as he is well.

I fear that there is only a very slender chance of his recovery, but he is in the hands of the most skillful surgeons and nurses in the country and there is still a possibility that things are not as bad as they seem. A clot has formed in the brain which is causing paralysis to spread throughout the body. If it is conceivable possible to remove this, there is a chance of recovery.

Certainly at a time like this, it seems a hard blow to remove one of the thinking men.
I have such faith in his powers of body and mind, that I feel that there is a hope yet. There is still so much that he can do both here and England that it seems inconceivable folly in the part of the Divine Power to remove him.

My mother joins me in thanking you most warmly for your very kind voice.

I am, Mr. President, your humble servant,

A. T. Buchanan.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

March 8, 1939.

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE P. S.

The President would like this given to him tomorrow morning.

G.
In reply refer to
PR 811.001 Roosevelt, F.D./6252

My dear Miss LeHand:

I am sending you herewith a strictly personal and confidential sealed letter addressed to the President by the Prime Minister of Canada. The American Chargé d'Affaires at Ottawa states that Mr. King expressed the hope that it would be brought to the President's attention as soon as possible, in as much as it contained important information which he believed would be of especial interest to Mr. Roosevelt.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Chief of Protocol.

Enclosure:
Sealed letter.

Miss Marguerite A. LeHand,
Private Secretary to the President,
The White House.
Ottawa,
March 3, 1939.


Dear Mr. President:

I have been long in writing to thank you for your kindness in saying, in your letter of January the 18th, that you much hoped the King would bring me with him as his Minister in attendance at the time of His Majesty's visit to the White House, and particularly for your kindness in saying that it would really help if I could arrange to come.

I did not write you at once as I wished, before writing, to obtain further details with sure respect to the Royal visit and, in particular, to be just whether, with our Parliament in session, it was going to be possible for me to accompany the King on his tour throughout Canada. Later, when I saw you were leaving for the South, I thought it better to await your return before writing.

It is now definitely decided that, as Prime Minister, I will accompany Their Majesties on their tour throughout Canada. Parliament will adjourn for a part of the time they may be here but, in all probability, will carry on its proceedings over the greater part of the time. Fortunately, I have the best of colleagues, and a large majority in the House of Commons. I shall, therefore, feel no anxiety in entrusting its proceedings to other members of the Cabinet during the time Parliament may be in session, while Their Majesties are here.
Having regard to the cordiality of your wish, as expressed in your letter, and having regard, as well, for the fact that I shall be accompanying His Majesty as "Minister-in-attendance" throughout the whole of his visit in Canada, nothing would give me, personally, more pleasure than to be present, in the same capacity, with the King during the few days Their Majesties will be in the United States. I understand that before a final decision is reached by His Majesty as to who, if anyone at all, is to accompany him as a Minister or Ministers in attendance, it is proposed to ascertain your own wishes and to be guided by them.

In these circumstances, it would, of course, not do for me to express any opinion as to what may or may not be best from the point of view of the United States. So far as Canada is concerned, I have no doubt that the King will wish to know my views, having regard, in particular, to the relations existing between our two countries, and the fact that it will be during the course of his visit to Canada, that the visit to the United States will be made.

As, however, you may wish to know just how I may be circumstances at the time of the King's visit, I have thought I should let you know at once that I shall be acting as Minister-in-attendance upon the King throughout the period of his visit to Canada, and that nothing would give me more pleasure than to accompany His Majesty, in the same capacity, in the course of his visit to the United States, should this accord with your own and His Majesty's wishes.

I hope you have returned to Washington much benefited by your short trip on the sea.

With kindest personal regards.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, The White House, Washington, D.C.
Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
April 16, 1939.

Dear Mackenzie:-

Your news is a most delightful surprise and I am very happy that you are coming. Frankly though, I had done my best in several conversations and had gathered the impression that some kind of a precedent would be created — and that, of course, represents an extremely high hurdle in some high places!

Your very wonderful statement has just come today and I am grateful. What may come of my effort I do not know. I am none too hopeful but my conscience is clear.

If we are turned down the issue becomes clearer and public opinion in your country and mine will be helped.

My warm regards,

As ever yours,

The Right Honorable
W. L. Mackenzie King, P.C., C.M.G.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa, Canada.
WASHINGTON
April 14th, 1939.

Dear Sir:

The Minister, who is ill in bed with an attack of Influenza, has asked me to send in your care the enclosed letter to the President of the United States from the Prime Minister of Canada which has just come down in the diplomatic bag and to say that he would appreciate it very much if you would be so kind as to give this letter personally to the President.

Thanking you on behalf of the Minister,

Yours very truly,

Gertrude Mathers
Secretary to the Minister.

Stephen Early, Esq.,
Assistant Secretary to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
Ottawa,
April 12, 1939.

Dear Mr. President,

I am greatly pleased to let you know that I have received from the King an invitation to accompany His Majesty in the capacity of Minister in Attendance during the days of His Majesty's visit to the United States. I am naturally delighted at the prospect of being at Washington at the time of the visit of the King and Queen.

For the sake of mankind, I pray that, in the interval, nothing may happen which will make impossible Their Majesties' visit to Canada and the United States. It would almost seem that, short of some actual declaration of war, the European situation could not be more critical than it is just at this time.
It is with the greatest pleasure that I am looking forward to seeing you again in the month of May, and of sharing with Mrs. Roosevelt and yourself some of the memorable events of the Royal visit.

With kindest personal regards.

[Signature]

Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.
May 24, 1939.

My dear Tweedsmuir:-

Now that your distinguished guests have left you, I take it you will be thinking about Summer plans, and I hope very much that you and Lady Tweedsmuir will include a visit to us at Hyde Park.

Unfortunately my plans are still a bit vague, though my only trip will be to the San Francisco Exposition and thence to Seattle and up to Juneau, Alaska, and back — an absence of only three weeks at the outside. Things depend wholly on the date of adjournment of the Congress. If they go home in early July, I will go West after that. If they do not adjourn until early August, I shall probably go out to the Coast after the King and Queen have left here.

In any event, I hope to be at Hyde Park fairly steadily after the middle of August. I hope much that you will come down for a weekend after that time and I take it that you will be back from Hudson's Bay by then.

We are all looking forward to the Royal visit — especially the thirty hours of comparative quiet with the King and Queen at Hyde Park.
From all we read here, the visit in Canada has been truly successful, and I think Their Majesties have created a splendid impression in this country. The only contretemps has been caused by social climbers and the newspaper girls who failed to get "pasteboards" for the Lindsay's Garden Party.

As ever yours,

The Right Honorable Lord Tweedsmuir,
Governor General of Canada,
Government House,
Ottawa, Canada.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

May 17, 1939.

MEMORANDUM FOR

THE PRESIDENT

You asked to be reminded to write to Lord Tweedsmuir on Monday.

G.
Government House, Ottawa.

Private. 11th March, 1939.

The President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.


I am venturing to send you a line of greeting before I start on a month's tour of British Columbia, where, beside much speech-making, I hope to get some steelhead fishing.

I need not tell you with what admiration I have followed your recent doings. Your utterances urbi et orbi have been far the most important events in recent months, and they have done an enormous amount to quieten the world. A good deal, I think, depends upon whether Franco will follow the Spanish tradition of truculent independence. But the key-point is still, I think, Germany. I agree whole-heartedly with the London charwoman who, struggling with a gas mask, observed "If only that Mr. 'Itler would marry and settle down!"

You have had Tommy Lascelles with you in Washington, and you will no doubt have got the details for the royal visit more or less settled. I have an easy job. My task was to get the King and Queen to come out, and it is now Canada's funeral. I have nothing to do except to entertain Their Majesties at Ottawa and see them off at Halifax. The heavy end will fall upon my Prime
Minister, who will have to accompany them on their tour in the West.

I do hope it will be possible for us to meet some time this summer. I am going to Hudson's Bay and the Peace River in August. I long to accept your kind invitation to Hyde Park. Would it be possible to invite myself to come to you for a couple of nights some time in the fall?

My wife joins me in sending our warmest greetings to Mrs. Roosevelt and yourself.

John w.

[Signature]

Woodward
LA CITADELLE
QUEBEC

17th June, 1939.

The President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

My dear Roosevelt,

Thank you very much for your letter of May 24th which arrived when I was trying to catch salmon on Tom Lamont’s water in the Cascapedia.

There is nothing that my wife and I would like better than to visit you at Hyde Park for a week-end in September. I gather you will be there then. I think it very likely that about that time there may be a Canadian election, when it would not be a bad thing for me to be out of the country. I expect to be back from Hudson’s Bay by the end of August.

The Royal visit to Canada was a miraculous success. French Canada especially went off its head about it. The visit needed a good deal of arrangement, but there was no hitch, and there has been no ill-feeling left behind anywhere. I most warmly congratulate you on the arrangements you made for the visit to the States. I have just returned from seeing the King and Queen off at Halifax, where I had long talks with both of them. They were enthusiastic about their visit both to Washington and to Hyde Park, and the King especially was very full of his talks with you. You have given him many things to think
about, and he really thinks.

With kindest regards to you and your family.

Yours ever,

[Signature]
The President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.,
U.S.A.
June 24, 1939

To: The Legation (The Minister)

From: Commercial Attaché, Ottawa

Subject: Avenues of Approach Toward Better Relations Between Canada and the United States

As result of the discussions before the third conference on Canadian-American Affairs at Canton, New York, it has been suggested that as a supplement to these relatively abstract reviews of problems between the two countries, it would be constructive to point out specific action which would provide a foundation for better relations between the United States and Canada, two countries which have already established an example in harmonious relationships, economic, social and otherwise.

One of the most far-reaching proposals discussed was the possibility of mutual governmental assurance to the stability of exchange rates between Canadian and American currency. It was pointed out that a divergence in values for the Canadian and United States dollar had in past upset the whole fabric of business relationships between the two countries.

Speaking generally, capital investment between the two countries is based on the assumption that parity of exchange would exist between Canada and the United States but whenever exchange equilibrium is upset, definite hardships are incurred and these frequently produce emotional reactions unfavorable to the relations between the two countries. For example, between 1932 and 1933, when the value of the Canadian dollar was at a discount ranging from 8 to 18 per cent on monthly averages, the federal and provincial governments in Canada, as well as corporations having obligations payable in United States funds, found themselves faced with an obligation to pay their debts at a premium ranging from 10 to 20 per cent, an unforeseen exchange liability. Canada discharged the obligation but in fulfilling the contract public opinion was inclined to the view that the exchange premium was an unwarranted surcharge. Few people understand international finance and the majority have no satisfactory definition for a dollar. Therefore, it is difficult to explain to the average taxpayer why a dollar issued by one country in the North American continent should be different from the value of a dollar issued by its neighbor, especially when both countries have similar governmental and financial structure with credit in both instances backed by proven capacity to pay and similar economic resources.
In day-to-day commercial obligations disequilibrium in exchange rates causes hardships because purchasers of American goods in Canada must meet a surcharge in discharging their obligations, although the payment of this premium does not represent any advantage to the American seller, who simply receives his regular price in American dollars.

Conversely, when the Canadian dollar is at a discount, American interests which serve domestic markets complain of competition from Canada because the reduced value of the Canadian dollar seems to give the foreign supplier an unwarranted competitive advantage. The same is true in third markets in which Canadian and United States exporters compete. In trade between the two countries the assumed stimulation to exports arising from depreciated currency is not always realized because Canadian tariff laws and, to a lesser extent, United States tariff provide for exchange dumping duties on imports from countries with depreciated currencies.

Even in casual individual transactions, exchange differentials in the two currencies cause hard feelings. The Canadian traveler in the United States views his country's currency with an element of patriotism and when he finds in transactions within the United States that the currency is not acceptable at all or is taken only at a heavy discount it is natural that the feeling should arise that someone is cheating at some point. The American traveler entering Canada with United States funds may be pleasantly surprised to secure a premium value for his currency but this does not make up for the loss of values occasioned by the discount on Canadian funds in the United States.

If Canada and the United States would make a mutual declaration that official action would be taken by both governments to maintain parity between the United States and Canadian dollar it would promptly eliminate an uncertainty which now exists in long-term capital investments between the two countries, governmental and corporate financing and a wide range of commercial transactions. Tourist trade, which has already contributed much to favorable relations between the two countries, should be assisted by mutual acceptance of the two currencies.

Quite probably such a declaration of exchange equilibrium would require an escape clause in the event the authorities in one country took action which was deemed inflationary by the other but with this proviso it might be possible to issue part of the obligations of the United States government as payable in either Canadian or United States funds and, reciprocally, Canada might make part of its governmental obligations payable in either Canadian or United States funds. Some tangible action along these lines would give an element of assurance to the business community, which in the past has had to contend with Canadian funds at a discount of 2 to 12 per cent between 1919 and 1921, an even larger discount between 1931 and 1933, which relationship was followed by a premium of up to 5 per cent in 1934 and a rather irregular trend near parity since that date.
Educational Matters

There would seem to be room for constructive action in the field of education, looking toward improved relations between Canada and the United States. In both countries the text books for history as used in the school systems are written largely from a national viewpoint and frequently single incidents are presented from different angles, resulting in conflict of public opinion in the two countries. All too frequently the United States histories fail to give attention to Canada which is warranted by the inter-dependence of the two countries. While the narrow view found in history text books has been partially eliminated by good sense and voluntary collaboration by publishers in the two countries it would seem feasible that the two governments could cooperate to advantage in establishing some mutual organization to review the presentation of Canadian-American history in the educational system, providing constructive suggestions for text books on this subject. Such a review body would presumably require support from the state organizations responsible in educational matters in the United States and from the provincial governments in Canada which similarly hold constitutional authority in matters of education.

Such a board of historical education might, on its own account, present a review of Canadian-American history adaptable for dissemination over the radio. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National networks in the United States already have a desirable exchange of sustaining programs and as historical drama is currently popular as a radio theme the possibilities of constructive action via radio are promising.

More Canadian news in the United States press would be constructive to good relations between the two countries. In Canada a surfeit of United States news is found in the daily press in contrast to the situation south of the border where coverage of Canada is scanty, irregular, and frequently given secondary position to news from countries with which our relations are not likely to be important in the future. The NEW YORK TIMES maintains a correspondent in Canada but other important dailies in the United States secure their Canadian news second-hand, largely under an exchange arrangement between the Canadian Press and the Associated Press. More correspondents of United States papers could be advantageously assigned in Canada.

Since French is a popular foreign language for study in United States educational institutions, there should be some possibilities for an exchange of students between the United States and the French-Canadian section of Canada. In Quebec the mother tongue is French but English is considered essential to a complete education and students in both
countries would benefit under an exchange arrangement. Further, such an exchange would build up in the United States an understanding of the problems peculiar to the French-Canadian element in Canada and, conversely, would give to Quebec students in the United States an understanding of national problems, policies and views of our own country. Such an exchange would be helpful in Canada's internal relations because the elements of conflict between English Canada and French Canada would be tempered if the latter had available an objective acquaintance with the Anglo Saxon. The nationalistic element among French-Canadians and the provincial and racial feeling is engendered chiefly in that section of the population which has never moved from its own bailiwick. The French-Canadian who has visited other parts of Canada or the United States is usually in a position to contribute most toward national unity and racial accord within Canada.

Collaboration on Standards

In discussing the possibility of trade between the two countries which would be facilitated by a common standard of liquid and other measure, it was mentioned that the use in Canada of the Imperial gallon in contrast to the use of the wine gallon in the United States was an occasional source of difficulty. However, since weights and measures in both the United States and Canada are on a system different from the metric system it was tentatively concluded that the best solution of the problem of weights and measures would require abandonment in North America of the present system in favor of the metric system, since the latter has definite advantages in science, is already standard throughout Europe, and is in keeping with the monetary system in North America.

However, on a general subject of standards it was believed that the recent trend in both countries toward governmental standards for the protection of the retail buyer had opened up a good field for mutual agreements conducive to good relations between the two countries. Progress already made on consumers' standards problems have been complimentary rather than conflicting and it seems logical that the United States could take the best part of Canada's work and Canada support the best part of work undertaken in the United States to mutual advantage. For example, the Federal Trade Commission in the United States is giving consideration to standardizing containers and quality marks on canned fruits and vegetables, a subject of interest in the United States. Rather than develop independent American standards it would be constructive if United States authorities would follow the conclusions already reached in Canada, making such adjustments or enlargements as are required, thus setting up a single set
of standards for the North American Continent. An interesting discussion on Canadian laws protecting consumers of food and drugs (and the lack of such laws in the United States) is found in the March 27 issue of the CONSUMERS GUIDE.

In certain other fields consumer and technical standards established in the United States are of primary interest to that country and therefore Canada could afford to utilize the American definitions rather than develop conflicting national standards. In mechanical engineering standards for machine screw products and other technical definitions provide a good example. Both countries are interested in consumer standards for textiles, an excellent field for cooperative action. Canada has developed a grain inspection service and certificate which is considered in third markets as better than that employed in the United States and since grain is a Canadian specialty the United States could advantageously take its cue from Canada.

For some time differentials in electrical standards between the two countries have been a source of irritation. The Underwriters Laboratories in the United States as a private organization without any statutory authority provides an inspection service for American electrical goods, issuing a label which already holds extensive consumer acceptance. Electrical inspection in Canada is furnished chiefly by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario holding provincial authority, and by cooperation, authority in Quebec. It is commonly found that specifications and approvals requirements of the Underwriters Laboratories and the Ontario Commission are at variance, necessitating separate tests on Canadian electrical goods sold in the United States and changes in construction, approval tests and fees on American electrical goods sold in Canada. The Dominion is now taking steps to provide an electrical inspection service on a quasi-federal basis and the United States might well give consideration to a federal agency for the approval and inspection of electrical goods, merchandise sold on a national basis. Assuming the existence of these two federal agencies dealing with electrical standards it is logical to suggest common agreement on equipment which comes up to standards and is safe for sale in either country.
Postage Stamps

The feasibility of issuing a commemorative postage stamp jointly by the governments of the United States and Canada is suggested as a possible subject for discussion. The same stamp would be valid for mailing letters from the United States to Canada and visa versa. Such a stamp should be of educational value in emphasizing the close relations existing between the two countries and should not create any adverse criticism to the effect that it would be one step towards annexation.

Establishment of International Border

In many cases the international line dividing the two countries intersects lands and even buildings of the nationals of one country or the other. The possibility of establishing an international zone between the two countries has arisen from time to time.

About seven years ago the INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN was established by the governments of the two countries between North Dakota and Manitoba in commemoration of the lasting peace between the two countries. There would appear to be a possibility for the expansion of this idea.

Simplification of Customs Procedure at the Border

In 1933 and 1934 studies were made respecting the steps which the governments of the United States and Canada might take to simplify the customs formalities on border traffic between the two countries. Among the subjects to which attention was given were the following. An asterisk indicates that there has been an improvement in the situation since the studies were made in 1934:

- $100 exemption granted residents returning from either country*
- Reporting at the border
- Gifts*
- Automobiles and settlers' effects
- Goods returned for repairs
- Samples*
- Emergency equipment
- Automobiles*
- Trucks
- United States anti-dumping procedure

These various subjects as well as others were discussed in considerable detail in a memorandum for Mr. Boal prepared by Consul Julian Harrington and C. B. North which was submitted as Enclosure No. 2 to Despatch 868 of October 31, 1934, from the Legation at Ottawa.

Avery E. Peterson
Trade Commissioner
Memorandum for Admiral Stark
From Capt. J. H. Towers
August 28, 1939

Subject--Airplanes for Canada
       Requested by Air Commodore Steadman for Canada.

See-Navy folder-Drawer 1-1939
Personal.

8th September, 1939.

The President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Early in the summer you very kindly suggested
that my wife and I might pay you a short visit at Hyde
Park this fall. A good many things have happened since
then, and I do not know whether you still desire such
a visit. There are many things I should greatly like
to talk over with you, but it might be an embarrassment
to you if I came to see you at this time and the fact
were known to the public. If, however, you were at
Hyde Park towards the close of this month I might be
able to slip down inconspicuously. I rather want to
spend a night in New York, too, to get a little medical
advice. Will you tell me quite candidly what you think?

I greatly sympathise with the difficulties of
your own position at the moment. For Britain the issues
are pretty grim, but they are perfectly clear. A few
days ago I mobilised the armed forces of Canada, and
yesterday I opened Parliament without any ceremonial.
As far as I can judge, Canadian sentiment is far more
united than it was even in 1914.

My wife joins me in kindest regards to Mrs.
Roosevelt and yourself.
My dear Tweedsmuir:

I have put off writing you for these several weeks because I have been torn between a great personal desire to have you and Lady Tweedsmuir visit us at Hyde Park and the problem of the position of the United States in regard to the so-called neutrality laws. I have been hoping from day to day that the situation would clear up sufficiently to make the political angle of things conform both with our own personal relationship and with what should be the completely normal official relationships between Ottawa and Washington.

I have been talking with Cordell Hull about it and we have reluctantly agreed that for two reasons it is best, both for you and for me, to defer the visit. The first is that you could not "slip down inconspicuously" to Hyde Park because under existing circumstances it would be bound to be front page news both in your papers and mine. The second reason is that, as you have probably sensed, I am almost literally walking on eggs and, having delivered my message to the Congress, and having good prospects of the bill going through, I am at the moment saying nothing, seeing nothing and hearing nothing.

Frankly, I think that the bill has a good chance of going through within the next two or three weeks and when that time comes it will be not only wholly fitting but "all to the good" to have you and Lady Tweedsmuir come down for a weekend.

As you know, my trip to the West Coast is off and I shall probably be at Hyde Park every other
weekend until towards the end of November - and I am most anxious to have you come in for a quiet few days.

I will write you again just as soon as I know more definitely about dates - and in the meantime I know you will understand.

As ever yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedsmuir,
Governor General of Canada,
Government House,
Ottawa, Canada.
Personal.

G o v E R N M E N T H o u s E,  
O T T A W A. 

The P r esident of the United States  
The White House,  
Washin gton, D. C.,  
U. S. A.

26th October, 1939.

My Dear Roosevelt,

Thank you very much for your letter of 5th October which reached me in New York last Saturday, whither I had gone to have some medical treatment.

If all goes well with the Neutrality Bill it would be a very great pleasure to my wife and myself to pay you a short visit some time in November. You will let me know what you think about that.

I was greatly interested in what I judged to be (from my talks in New York) American opinion. It is puzzled, as indeed we all are. But events will no doubt soon clarify the issues. I am very anxious that the British Government should state, not specific war aims, but a war purpose on the most general terms which would give some hope, especially to youth, that the world will some day be organised on saner lines.

I was delighted to find that some of your most strenuous critics in the past are now your whole-hearted supporters.
My wife joins me in kindest regards to Mrs. Roosevelt and yourself.

Yours ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Tweddell
October 5, 1939.

My dear Tweedsmuir:

I have put off writing you for these several weeks because I have been torn between a great personal desire to have you and Lady Tweedsmuir visit us at Hyde Park and the problem of the position of the United States in regard to the so-called neutrality laws. I have been hoping from day to day that the situation would clear up sufficiently to make the political angle of things conform both with our own personal relationship and with what should be the completely normal official relationships between Ottawa and Washington.

I have been talking with Cordell Hull about it and we have reluctantly agreed that for two reasons it is best, both for you and for me, to defer the visit. The first is that you could not "slip down inconspicuously" to Hyde Park because under existing circumstances it would be bound to be front page news both in your papers and mine. The second reason is that, as you have probably sensed, I am almost literally walking on eggs and, having delivered my message to the Congress, and having good prospects of the bill going through, I am at the moment saying nothing, seeing nothing and hearing nothing.

Frankly, I think that the bill has a good chance of going through within the next two or three weeks and when that time comes it will be not only wholly fitting but "all to the good" to have you and Lady Tweedsmuir come down for a weekend.
As you know, my trip to the West Coast is off and I shall probably be at Hyde Park every other weekend until towards the end of November -- and I am most anxious to have you come in for a quiet few days.

I will write you again just as soon as I know more definitely about dates -- and in the meantime I know you will understand.

As ever yours,

Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedsmuir,
Governor General of Canada,
Government House,
Ottawa, Canada.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

The proposed visit of Lord Tweedsmuir this fall would, in my opinion, be most inadvisable in view of the forthcoming special session of Congress. As the head of a belligerent state and a man well known in this country it would seem to be quite impossible for him to "slip down inconspicuously" even to Hyde Park as he suggests. The press, I feel sure, would learn of his visit and any attempt at its being inconspicuous would only increase the amount of speculation as to his purposes. Such publicity, I feel sure, would be used to advantage by the administration's opponents to the repeal of the arms embargo.

Lord Tweedsmuir appears from his letter to sense the difficulties which his visit might entail and I am sure that he would fully understand and appreciate a suggestion that he defer the visit on the grounds that you feel that you must devote all your time and energy to the international situation and the forthcoming special session of Congress.
MEMORANDUM FOR
THE SECRETARY OF STATE

What do you think I should say to this? I could have him and Lady Tweedsmuir at Hyde Park over a weekend in October but don't you think it would be better to wait until we get the Neutrality Bill through?

F. D. R.
Government House, Ottawa.

8th September, 1939.

The President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

My dear Roosevelt,

Early in the summer you very kindly suggested that my wife and I might pay you a short visit at Hyde Park this fall. A good many things have happened since then, and I do not know whether you still desire such a visit. There are many things I should greatly like to talk over with you, but it might be an embarrassment to you if I came to see you at this time and the fact were known to the public. If, however, you were at Hyde Park towards the close of this month I might be able to slip down inconspicuously. I rather want to spend a night in New York, too, to get a little medical advice. Will you tell me quite candidly what you think?

I greatly sympathise with the difficulties of your own position at the moment. For Britain the issues are pretty grim, but they are perfectly clear. A few days ago I mobilised the armed forces of Canada, and yesterday I opened Parliament without any ceremonial. As far as I can judge, Canadian sentiment is far more united than it was even in 1914.

My wife joins me in kindest regards to Mrs. Roosevelt and yourself.

Yours ever,

[Signature]
My dear Mr. President:

Following your press conference on October 27th at which you stated what you proposed to do with regard to the membership of the International Joint Commission, Mr. Christie, the Canadian Minister, spoke to an officer of the Department and said he had received a telephone call from Dr. Skelton, the Canadian Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, urging that nothing be done until he had had time to make representations. Mr. Christie was informed that we were rather surprised at Dr. Skelton's request since the matter had been cleared with the Prime Minister, as reported by Mr. Roper in two letters copies of which were sent to you by Mr. Welles on August 2 and 23, 1939. It was suggested to Mr. Christie that Dr. Skelton might therefore wish to discuss the matter with the Prime Minister.

Later

The President,

The White House.
Later Mr. Christie telephoned again and said that Dr. Skelton had talked to the Prime Minister and heard about this for the first time. In order to be fully informed, Dr. Skelton also discussed the matter with Mr. Key, an officer of our Legation, who has informed me that it appears that the Prime Minister's version of what was said during the first conversation tallies substantially with that reported by Mr. Roper in his letter of July 29th (enclosure to Mr. Welles' letter of August 2nd).

However, with regard to the second conversation between Mr. Roper and the Prime Minister it would seem that the latter apparently failed to make his views entirely clear. According to Dr. Skelton the Prime Minister stated to Mr. Roper:

"that he regarded the International Joint Commission as a symbol of North American good neighborhood and was afraid that the prestige and effectiveness of the Commission would be jeopardized if its present composition were changed as contemplated by the American Government. He claims that during the second conversation he emphasized to Mr. Roper that the Commission was a judicial rather than an administrative body and that, in consequence, it would be difficult, if changed, for it to retain the independent and judicial attitude which was its essential feature. The second point which the Prime Minister claims that he stressed was the belief that it would really be to the interest of both governments to have the Commission continue as
as a buffer which could deal with any tangled questions without involving the governments directly in their determination."

Mr. Key further informed me that he gathered that Dr. Skelton shares the Prime Minister's views with regard to the personnel of the International Joint Commission but feels that it will be difficult for the Canadians to retain the present character of the Canadian membership of the Commission in view of the changes about to be made in the American section and that, consequently, in due course, the Canadian Government may, with what appears to be considerable reluctance, appoint officials to be Commissioners who more or less will correspond with ours.

It is clear that the Canadians have some objections which are stronger than those reported to us heretofore. While I do not believe that it is necessary that there should be any change in your program, it seemed desirable, however, to bring this situation to your attention.

In the meantime we are continuing to give attention to the selection of an appropriate officer to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Governor Bartlett.

Faithfully yours,