

KNOWLTON NASH

Speech to

TORONTO CANADIAN CLUB

Royal York Hotel

Toronto

FEBRUARY 17, 1969

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I am equally interested to see what happens here in Toronto, as well as Washington. You worried me momentarily when you spoke of loud cheers, I thought you said jeers for a minute.

But I am delighted to be here sharing lunch with you today, in Toronto, which is my home town and to which, as your Chairman has noted, I am about to return after detours in various parts of the world.

And I am about to disappear, I suppose, from the ranks of working reporters and the post of CBC Correspondent in Washington, to leave these exalted, if perhaps somewhat crummy ranks as Mr. Trudeau might put it on occasion, to move into my new role as Director of News and Public Affairs of the CBC English Network.

The other day Mr. Marce Munro who is moving from the post I am about to occupy to become Assistant General Manager of the Network, said he had been keeping the seat warm for me for a couple of years. And I was very grateful for his solicitude, but I am rapidly finding out that it is not only warm, but at times quite hot--but that's the Way It Is, I suppose.

I am not at all certain whether or not from now on my favorite program may well be "Run for Your Life", or possibly "Mission Impossible". But, given the rather exciting challenges awaiting me here in Toronto, at the CBC, I prefer to think in terms of "The Adventurers".

And it will be an adventure, for we will have some changes in our approach in information programming that you see on your screen in Toronto and hear on your radio. We have begun an intensive and immediate study of the kinds of new programs we want for the next season starting in the fall. We are determined to be perhaps more responsive to the people of Canada...not just the people of Toronto or Ottawa or Montreal, but the people in St. John's, in Heart's Content, in Winnipeg, in Vancouver, in Prince Rupert.

We are determined to relate to and be involved with these viewers and listeners. We need, and we will have, a new concept of programming, particularly in the News and Public Affairs areas, and we need to bring our programming plans into the 1970's. And part of my new role as Director of the Information programming area is, I think, as has been said, to stimulate a little creative sabotage in achieving new and exciting programming.

All of this, of course, has involved some number of management changes at the CBC and it seems to be an era of change. The Toronto Star is doing much the same these days. I was attracted to Lister Sinclair's remarks the other day, when he was quoted as saying, that if the boss calls, get his name.

I have just come to Toronto from Washington. I was in Washington over the week-end and these days it is quite an exciting city with the new Nixon administration. I must say though, I was rather taken aback today, to read in the Toronto Telegram, a headline on the front page which said Judy urged to run against Nixon. I know that Judy has ambitions, but that's a bit ridiculous. It turned out, of course, to be Robert rather than Richard, in the end.

But most people in Washington are playing the game, right now, of guessing what the Richard Nixon administration is going to be like. In a political sense, Mr. Nixon certainly has made the greatest comeback since Lazarus. If nothing else, his election has proven once more that there is nothing permanent about death in politics.

With Nixon in now and Johnson out and back on his ranch in Texas, by the Pedernales, it's been suggested, perhaps a little bit irreverently, but rather accurately in a sense, that among the changes in Washington, that barbecues will now be out, but that meat loaf will be in...fur coats are out, but cloth coats are in. Martha Raye is out, but John Wayne is in. Texas is out, but California is in. Jack Valenti is out, but Norman Vincent Peale is in. And also, putting ketchup on cottage cheese is "in" because that's the way Mr. Nixon likes it.

And there is an enormous amount of political and journalistic punditry going on as to what Mr. Nixon will or will not do. It's part of a journalist's job to make some educated guesses as to what a President is going to do, based on private conversations you may have had with him and some of his aides and what his public comments have been.

Being a journalist, of course, is sometimes rather a luxury because we never have to implement the kind of things we think should be done. In a sense to paraphrase Brendan Behan, journalists looking at presidents are something like eunuchs: We see the trick done every day, but cannot possibly do it ourselves. In any event, it now is Mr. Nixon's turn to start doing these presidential tricks. He likely will have the usual, but I think brief, honeymoon with the press, radio and television, and with the Congress.

Mr. Nixon is getting full journalistic sympathy with his efforts to settle the number one problem that is immediately facing him; that is, how to get out of Viet Nam. I think Mr. Nixon is in an ideal position to do this....to make the kind of compromises that inevitably will have to be made in negotiation. He is in a position much as General Eisenhower was in 1952 in reference to the Korean war. Given his background and political support, General Eisenhower could and did make concessions which, if Harry Truman had made them, would have probably led to Truman's impeachment. So I think Nixon has an even better opportunity, than Hubert Humphrey would have had, to get the United States out of Viet Nam.

And I think Mr. Nixon will try to follow in the footsteps of General Eisenhower in extricating himself and the United States from the war in Asia. As a matter of fact, to be re-elected in 1972, he has to.

The simple fact is--and as one of the most sensitive politicians alive, Mr. Nixon is well aware of it--that he has to get out of Viet Nam in order to meet the crisis of the cities, among the negroes and among the youth at home. I believe the Nixon administration will take the attitude that this domestic crisis is of more importance to the United States in the long run, than the war in Viet Nam.

That does not mean, of course, that he is going to "sell out" Saigon and immediately bring home the American troops from South Viet Nam. A great nation simply cannot make such an abrupt about-face. A face-saving formula has to be found, and is, in fact being found now. It lies, largely, in the insistent independence being shown by the Saigon Government. The change really started about a year ago--and the credit for this goes to former Defense Secretaries Robert MacNamara and Clark Clifford. By last winter both men knew that the United States had to get out of Viet Nam...that it was becoming a bottomless pit, a war that could in fact, be won in perhaps 10 or 15 years, but at unacceptable cost. The plan was and is to withdraw U.S. troops from many battle areas, supplanting them with South Vietnamese troops.

A part of this plan would be a sharp increase however, and this, of course, is now going on, in American arms going to the South Vietnamese Army. This had been achieved, and I would guess that perhaps by spring or early summer, the bulk of the fighting would be done by Saigon troops, not Americans. And in fact, there may well be some rather significant U.S. troop withdrawals by about that time. But it will take years to get a full withdrawal from Viet Nam, as it will take years likely to reach a peace agreement in full, in Viet Nam. But whatever agreement is reached, almost inevitably it is going to mean major changes in personnel make-up of the Saigon Government, possibly including the withdrawal of some of the present leadership.

What the Americans would like to achieve is something similar to the peace achieved in Korea where the South Koreans have retained their Government even with an uneasy military situation. More likely, though, any settlement may be as in Laos where, as in Viet Nam, there was a civil war, not over invasion from the north, a civil war, aided by outside communist troops, and where today exists a fragile, volatile peace of sorts; but at least it's better than all-out war.

I was in Viet Nam a while back, about a year now, travelling in the Delta, the Central Highlands, up around the Demilitarized Zone and in Saigon. And it's one thing to view the war from your CBC and perhaps CTV television screen, but it's quite another and staggering experience to be there.

Much of the information passed out by Hanoi, by Saigon and Washington simply has not been true: or in Winston Churchill's words, there have been many terminological inexactitudes, in discussing what's happening.

There is for instance, a so-called "Body Count" of Viet Cong and North Viet Nam dead. Most of the time it is a ridiculously high guess, inflated by each headquarters as it goes back to Saigon and Washington. But still, there are some honest counts, as one I recall when I was with some South Vietnamese Rangers up near Dak To in the central highlands. They were counting enemy bodies after an artillery and mortar assault, which is a rather grisly business. And they had a system to try to maintain accuracy: They counted one body for every two legs and one arm they found.

The exaggerated claims and exotic battle optimism of many American and South Vietnamese officials and the simply ridiculous claims of Hanoi, are so often put forth as fact that many people come to believe them through repetition.

This is a highly dangerous thing because to obtain a relatively accurate picture on which to base policies, you have to take off the rose-tinted spectacles of self-deception and look at what really is, rather than at what you would like to think is.

Anyone doing this, of course, is open to denunciation from all sides. I know that sometimes I've been accused sometimes of being too pro-American, and sometimes too anti-American. Perhaps the best combination of criticism I've ever had was a letter from a gentleman in Prince Rupert who accused me of being a communistically-inclined fascist.

But the real question on Vietnam, and one that concerns Canadians as well as Americans, and most of all, of course, President Nixon, is whether or not the U.S. can afford the cost of staying in Viet Nam in its present posture. The answer of the Johnson administration was "no", and I think it will be "no" for the Nixon administration, however shrouded the "no" may be in diplomatic posturing.

As in labor-management negotiations, on Viet Nam what is said publicly by the diplomats often differs from what is really meant. There is some truth, I suppose, to the old adage that a diplomat is an honest man sent abroad to lie for his country.

But on Viet Nam, there is a fast-rising feeling in the United States that the \$30 billion a year the war is costing can simply be better spent elsewhere. It's interesting to note on this question of the cost of war that in the days of Julius Caesar, it cost about 75 cents to kill an enemy soldier. In World War Two, the cost rose to \$50,000 for every enemy dead. In Viet Nam, I was told in Saigon, the cost is running somewhere between a half to one million dollars for each Viet Cong or North Vietnamese killed.

And there was a report that came out the other day on this matter of military costs. This past year, something around 200-billion dollars was devoted to military spending around the world. That represents more than 7% of the world's gross national product; it's three times world-wide expenditures on public health; and is 40% more than is spent on education by all levels of government everywhere in the world. The total number in the armed forces and military-related employment around the world is 50-million--one out of every 25 of the economically active population of the world.

But if President Nixon extricates the United States from the Viet Nam war, there will, of course, be a sharp drop in this military spending, and it will be particularly dramatic for the United States. The current pentagon estimate is for a net saving of about 19 million dollars. The U.S. would not save all it spends now in Viet Nam because some expenditures would have to continue, but even a bonus of \$19 billion spare cash is handy to have around. There already is a presidential task force studying how to avoid the kind of recession which occurred after Korea when military spending stopped. Part of the \$19 billion bonus likely would be passed on in reduced taxes, but, according to what I understand to be at least preliminary thinking among Washington officials, is that much of the money would go for social welfare programs, education, fighting pollution and renewing the cities of America.

In a sense, President Nixon will be racing to end the war in Viet Nam before the domestic crisis of the big city ghettos and the large negro demands get totally out of control at home. While his inclination would not be to have a massive infusion of federal money to revitalize the ghettos, he nevertheless may be forced by circumstances into doing something along these lines once money is freed from Viet Nam. But only when there is at least a measure of peace in Viet Nam, can Mr. Nixon and his administration devote the time, talent, and the money, needed to meet the domestic crisis in the United States.

This will be the second major confrontation for President Nixon: After facing Hanoi, facing the needs of the cities and negroes and youth. And unhappily for him, his credentials are far from healthy in these areas: He received something under ten percent of the negro vote in the Presidential election; He received in the election hardly any or a very small proportion of the young vote and he lost almost all the major cities in the United States to Mr. Humphrey.

And to make matters worse in this confrontation, Mr. Nixon is determined to slow down the rate of inflation that is currently ravaging the American economy at a rate something close to five percent a year. In a sense, this determination may be counter to the needs of the negroes, the youth and big cities, for he will have to cut federal spending and accept a higher level of unemployment, given his objective. If, to bring inflation down to around, say, two percent, Mr. Nixon were willing to accept, five percent unemployment, as well he might have to, that means perhaps one million more unemployed. Mr. Nixon owes nothing politically to the labor unions and this would not be alarmed at union anguish at such an unemployment increase. But, and this is a crucial problem for him, a five percent general unemployment level would mean around 30-percent unemployed among young negroes: These are the most volatile and activist group in the black community. And such a level inevitably would lead to increased big city ghetto rioting, bordering on the kind of fearful violence in the United States that recently envisioned by Prime Minister Trudeau.

With the increasing power of the right in the United States, as indicated by the more than nine million votes that George Wallace got in the Presidential election, this could lead to classic confrontations between reactionaries and revolutionaries. Arthur Koestler once said that "all reactionaries suffer from constipation and all revolutionaries from diarrhoea." I don't know about that, but certainly there is going to be a large amount of battle fatigue among those of us who will be journalistically observing whatever comes.

I recall spending an evening during the election campaign with Julian Bond, the young negro leader from Georgia who was nominated for Vice-President at the Democratic Convention in Chicago, but had to withdraw because he was too young. He noted how all the Presidential candidates were talking about law and order, and he noted some subtle differences among them as to exactly what they meant.

He felt that when George Wallace said "law and order" he meant that if you, as a negro demonstrator and protester, stood in front of his car, Mr. Wallace would run over you. When Mr. Nixon said law and order, it meant ht would order his chauffeur to run over you. When Mr. Humphrey said it, according to Mr. Bond, it meant that after you were run over, Mr. Humphrey would cry a little.

Julian Bond's recitation of this little story gives a clear indication of the alienation of the major political leaders in the United States from the activist, and young negro community.

There exists a frightening breakdown in communications with the negro activists who are personified by Bond. These are not all wild-eyed, dirty neck, rabble-rousing beatniks. Some of the Black Power people are, but most of them with whom I've talked are not, and are, in fact, dedicated, dynamic and highly intelligent people. It is a tragic mistake to misjudge their intellectual capacity, or their capacity for revolution.

I've spent some time talking, for instance, with people such as Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael who, in their public haranguing, may sound somewhat like overly-emotional high school drop-outs, but in their private conversations, believe me, they, more than adequately, demonstrate their penetrating, single-minded brilliance which is as eye-opening as it can be terrifying.

Rap Brown has said, "Violence is as American as cherry pie," and there is an unhappy degree of current and historical validity to that statement.

So many politicians, looking at the negro community and the ghettos, say the ghetto negroes must pull themselves up by their bootstraps. But they never really realize that the ghetto negroes don't have any bootstraps to begin with.

What is just beginning to dawn on leaders of society now, and especially on the younger politicians, is a very simple demographic fact: Negroes are breeding much more rapidly than whites and are moving into the cities. By 1990, it's estimated there will be a black majority in seven out of the ten biggest cities in the United States. Where I have been living in Washington, the city is more than 70% negro and in the public school system in Washington, more than 95% of the students are negroes. In those statistics alone, there is a cultural and political revolution that will shake the country to its foundation. And, it is this revolution that Mr. Nixon must face as his basic, number one long range problem.

So many observers, so many leaders, simply are unable to communicate with the leaders of the negro and youth of today because they don't understand them, and sometimes don't want to, and don't know them. This is a failure that has to be rectified, for you cannot talk about or act upon what you don't know, any more than you can come back from where you have not been.

There has been much talk--and especially in Canada because we so often tend to be smug and superior about our southern neighbours-- that the United States is a sick society. Of course it's not true to say 200 million people killed President or Senator Kennedy or Martin Luther King. And yet, at the same time, it's too easy to dismiss society's collective guilt in this manner.

Society, for instance, allows the gun control laws in the United States. They are looser than anywhere else in the civilized world. It's been said the United States was settled by pioneers with a Bible in one hand and a six-shooter in the other. And they still have the six-shooter. It's been estimated there now are upwards of 200 million guns in private hands in the United States.

Somehow or other, there is a feeling in much of the country at least, that having a gun proves your virility.

I was talking to an Alabama delegate, a senator in the state legislature, at the Democratic Convention in Chicago and he had been trying to promote a draft of Senator Edward Kennedy for the Democratic party's Presidential candidate. He apparently was known as a liberal back in Alabama and after, on television, he had praised Kennedy and supported the seating of negro delegates, including among them Julian Bond, he got a telegram which was signed, "Concerned Citizens of Alabama."

He showed it to me, as I was chatting with him on the floor, and it read: "Roses are red, violets are blue, two Kennedy's are dead, and so are you."

He told me the telegram was symptomatic of the atmosphere in many parts of his state, but he shrugged off the threat. I read in the newspapers shortly thereafter that when he got home to Alabama, his home had been damaged, his wife threatened, his children threatened, he himself repeatedly warned of violence with midnight phone calls, his business clients threatened and he was constantly being followed. Rather than face all this, and quite possibly face death, he announced he was giving up politics, giving up making speeches, giving up doing almost anything in public or in deed in private to better society. For he felt it was the only way he could stay alive.

President Nixon and his advisors need to understand not only the new revolution that is sweeping the U.S. indeed, sweeping the world, among the negroes, the young, the intellectuals; but also comprehend the implications of the, what might be called, "Bonnie and Clyde" syndrome. And that means a dramatic shift in thinking of the leaders of the United States, and elsewhere too, including Canada. The riots of France, at Columbia University, at Berkley, in negro ghettos all are symptomatic of the same thing. Something fundamental is happening around this globe and unless we have leaders who can communicate, who can emotionally as well as intellectually relate to and understand the new mood, there will be more brutality....more assassinations.... more killings of negroes and more killings by negroes; more Detroit's, Watts, Newark's and more Chicago's.

With the physical dangers involved, with General deGaulle, with Viet Nam, race riots, the dollar crisis and trade problems, God knows why anybody wants to be President of the United States these days. It takes a very brave man to want to do so. But Richard Nixon not only faces the problems I have outlined, but scores more, including a Democratically-controlled Congress which can frustrate his program. Actually, though, the kind of Congress which was elected in November is rather closer to Nixon philosophically than to, say, it would have been to Mr. Humphrey, and also helping Nixon will be an effective coalition of southern conservative Democrats and most Republican Congressmen and that coalition is in a majority.

In general terms, the Nixon administration and the new Congress will be prudent, protective and quite probably parochial.

In broad East-West relations, however, Mr. Nixon has turned his back on his own somewhat belligerently expressed attitude of years ago against Russia, and now says this is an era of negotiation, not confrontation with the Soviet Union. His foreign policy is certainly not likely to retreat to the John Foster Dulles concept, but rather, I think might be not too far afield from that of Mr. Rusk, with perhaps more conservative coloration as, for instance, not encouraging East-West trade as Messrs. Rusk and Johnson have done, and he is delaying but he will approve, I'm sure, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

But he takes a different approach to his, the rhetoric of Mr. Nixon, for instance, as far stronger and harsher than that of the past administration. Senator George Aitkin recently suggested looking at Mr. Nixon and perhaps forecasting what Mr. Nixon might do on Viet Nam. And he suggested that Mr. Nixon might issue a strong verbal attack on the North Vietnamese, then at one point declare that the war has now been won and pull the troops out. Which may be one way of solving it by having your cake and eating it at the same time.

But as spending for Viet Nam scales down, Mr. Nixon is going to increase spending on the U.S. nuclear deterrent. Despite his emphasis on negotiations with the Russians, he does feel that the American military must be strengthened to enhance Washington's credibility at the negotiating table. And in the Pentagon, the Generals and Admirals will have more influence on policy than they have had under President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Domestically, there is going to be much sharper differences with the Johnson administration than in the foreign area. For instance, Mr. Nixon, I think, may well kill most of, what he would consider the more aggressive consumer protection schemes, many of which he feels have become too aggressive and harmful to business. In short, Mr. Nixon is going to be much kinder to business and he will be less sensitive to labor and consumer lobbies.

Mr. Nixon also will have a chance to make major changes in the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Warren almost certainly will retire probably this summer, Justice Hugo Black is 82; Justice John Harlan is in poor health; and there always is talk about the health of Justice William C. Douglas. This means that Mr. Nixon probably will have a chance to change the entire coloration of what has become known as the "Warren Court" from liberal to conservative, if he so desires.

And in his Supreme Court choices, and in his policy decisions, Mr. Nixon will be listening carefully to, among others, South Carolina Senator Strom Thurmond, a die-hard segregationist Dixiecrat who worked political miracles for Mr. Nixon in the South in the election and who had a key role in getting the Republican Presidential nomination in Miami, for Mr. Nixon.

Senator Thurmond is not likely to be given a new job himself, but his voice will be heeded in the White House, as it was in the selection of Spiro Agnew as the Nixon Vice-Presidential running mate.

The men who make up the Nixon administration are important to Canada because the man in the White House and his people, and the Congress, set policies both in international and bilateral relationships which deeply affect Canada.

It is the President's administration, for instance, which decides whether or not Canada is exempted from the interest equalization tax. The partial exemption which we now have allows us to borrow more than one billion dollars a year in the United States money market. It is the President's administration which lets Canadian defense companies bid on Pentagon contracts in almost the same manner as a U.S. company, which is a privilege no other country has and which, in turn, brings to Canada something like \$300 million a year in defense orders from the United States.

It is the President who exempts Canada from the U.S. oil import quotas applying to other countries.

It is important for Canadians to be aware that this new Congress and the President are going to be more susceptible to protectionist pressures than the past Congress and President.

This, in turn, could weaken our hold on many of the special relationships we have with the United States, unless there is an administration which is strongly sensitive to the needs of Canada. All the special exemptions we now enjoy from general U.S. trade restrictions could be reduced or ended by protectionist pressures.

The Americans, however, did not provide these exemptions for Canada solely out of the goodness of their hearts; it is basically enlightened self-interest on their part because Canada is their biggest market.

And we Canadians are not only dependent to a very large degree for our economic well-being on the United States, but also, of course, dependent upon Washington for leadership in the Western world. And that is why we are so concerned...so sensitive to what is going on below the border.

From listening to Mr. Nixon in public speeches, and chatting to him informally over the past year on campaign trains and planes, I have made some tentative judgments on what I think he might do on matters affecting Canada.

He may remove this year, at some point perhaps later in the year, the present restraints on corporate investments in other countries, he might seek to remove the interest equalization tax. Although he indicated he would do so in the campaign, his desires to do so are lessening as he worries about the American balance of payment situation. The whole atmosphere really that has been created from these exemptions, even though we, as Canadians, have not been hurt. But the atmosphere, by the existence of the restraints has tended to diminish the capital flow to Canada from the United States from what it might be. So, it would be a major plus for Canada, if Mr. Nixon did indeed remove these restraints.

On the other hand, some of our exports to the United States may be in a bit of difficulty, given Mr. Nixon's worry about imports and a Congressional leadership leaning towards protectionism. There may well be specific limitations placed on imports of steel, perhaps a voluntary agreement with other countries to hold back their exports to the United States. Restrictions on meat and textiles are another possibility. The Nixon administration may not fight so vigorously against other import-limiting proposals which affect Canada. Mr. Nixon describes himself as a liberal trader and indeed he described himself very emphatically in those terms the other day in a statement in Washington, at a press conference, but as Vice-President under Mr. Eisenhower, he did follow the Eisenhower liberal trade approach. But in his days in the Congress, he once voted against liberalizing or even extending the Trade Agreements Act, and lately, he has become sensitive and susceptible perhaps to protectionist pressures.

I would think there might be more Ottawa-Washington concern and disagreements on foreign policy than we've had in recent years--particularly if we diminish our relationship to NATO, or if we recognize China. Mr. Nixon, however, would be pleased at our increased involvement with Latin America, although he will undoubtedly express vigorous complaint about our trade with Cuba, small as that is.

On trade questions in general, last year bills were proposed in the Congress affecting about one billion dollars worth of Canadian exports to the United States, everything from oil, to natural gas, to zinc, textiles, plywood, and even mink furs.

In all probability, there will be another such onslaught this year which will be part of the greatest attack on free trade principles in Washington, which has occurred since the Smoot-Hawley days of the early 1930's.

On the question of gold, which is so much on everybody's mind these days, it is not without significance, I think, that Mr. Nixon has not been quite so categorical in his rejection of devaluation of the dollar as was the Johnson administration. One of Mr. Nixon's key advisors, former Eisenhower financial advisor Arthur Burns, says if it comes down to a choice between flexible exchange rates or a change in the price of gold, he favors the latter course and his voice of course, would be influential since he is now on Mr. Nixon's staff. In any event, I think Mr. Nixon will propose another Bretton Woods type of major world monetary conference in 1969 at some point during the year.

How we achieve some of our special economic arrangements with the United States is intriguing and demonstrative of the political aspects of the situation. While officials in Washington and Ottawa spent months putting together the Canada-U.S. auto-agreement, under which our car exports to the United States have increased phenomenally over the past few years--it was basically a President-Prime Minister personal and political relationship which really brought it into being.

In the late summer of 1964, Prime Minister Pearson invited President Johnson to go out to British Columbia to mark the Columbia River Treaty between the two countries. Since that was just at the beginning of the American Presidential campaign of that year, President Johnson felt it fitted in perfectly with his campaign theme of the statesman President in action. He not only went out West with Mr. Pearson, but took the Prime Minister along on what was labelled as a non-political meeting in the U.S. Pacific Northwest.

After the election, in January 1965, Mr. Johnson was chatting in his office with Senator Warren Magnuson, who is Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, and he asked Magnuson whether or not he should personally sign and add Presidential weight to the auto agreement with Canada making it much easier to get through a relatively wary Congress. Mr. Johnson was doubtful that he should sign it because he knew it would engender some heavy protectionist opposition and he did not want to be caught in a cross-fire. But Senator Magnuson reminded him that Mr. Pearson had helped him out politically by inviting him to the West Coast and producing a good deal of favorable publicity at the start of the past campaign. Mr. Johnson slapped his forehead, at that point and said, "My God, that's right," and decided then and there to sign the automobile agreement and if he had not, we probably wouldn't have been able to get it through the Congress.

I might mention though, that despite a great deal of academic discussion about the possibility of extending to other industries limited free trade principles enunciated in the automobile agreement between the two countries, is just not going to happen in the near future. The reason is the more inward-looking attitude that is prevailed in the New Congress and indeed in the administration itself.

So to sum up, there are going to be significant changes in Washington, in policies at home and abroad, and in matters affecting Canada. There may be some bonuses, and there may be some jolts. The country needs a President attuned to the social revolution that is now exploding, as well as a man ruthlessly capable of using his power to better society. There is, I think, a need for occasional ruthlessness on the part of any President. As businessmen, of course, you all know that at least some ruthlessness is necessary and good, just so long as it's efficient. There is nothing worse than sloppy ruthlessness.

H. G. Wells once said, "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

We now are right in the middle of that race, and this is why, more than ever before, there is need for leaders in the United States, in Canada and elsewhere in the world, and indeed in broadcasting for that matter, leaders and men who can dream and dare, who have judicious audacity--and leaders who can, not just control society, but lead society, so that man is in the saddle riding events, rather than the other way around. Only time can tell whether Mr. Nixon will meet the challenge.

Campaigning with the late Senator Robert Kennedy, in the election primaries and campaigns, we always used to know when he was winding up his speech and we would run for the bus, train or aircraft, as he began to quote George Bernard Shaw.

It was his favorite quotation, I think, and has particular relevance to the kind of political leaders now needed, and what is needed in broadcasting, too, as well as political leadership. You've heard it before, but it ran: "Some men see things as they are and say, why? "I dream things that never were and say, Why not?"

Thank you.