



THE MACDONALD-LAURIER INSTITUTE



COMMENTARY/COMMENTAIRE

Trading in Superstitions

By Brian Lee Crowley

We live in a time of great superstitions. Many superstitions are harmless and even amusing, like knocking on wood or throwing salt over your shoulder. Other superstitions, causing us to misunderstand the way the world works, make us miss real opportunities and may even put us in harm's way. We as a civilisation were locked up in Europe for centuries by, among other things, the superstition that the world was flat and we would fall off the edge if we sailed too far out into the Atlantic. More recently, some people following the attacks of 9-11 took to driving rather than flying, based on the superstition that being on the road is safer than being in the air. Because road fatalities are much more common than air fatalities, the documented result was that hundreds more people lost their lives acting on a superstition.

I am sorry to say that a few superstitions are increasingly becoming an obstacle to our two great nations managing our relationship intelligently. If we continue to lose focus on what is good in that relationship, we run the risk of letting superstition crowd out the great good that has come to all of us from the open and trusting relationship we have contrived to build between our two nations. In particular I am concerned about the superstitions that are becoming ever more deeply rooted in the minds of people on both sides of the border about two profoundly intertwined issues, namely trade and security.

Two sets of superstitions

On your side of the border these prejudices include a growing sense that trade is harmful to the health of America, that our free trade arrangements are a source of weakness rather than strength for America, and that Canada is an unreliable partner on security matters and that we even played some role in allowing the 9-11 terrorists into the United States.

On our side the superstitions include that America is a bully that takes its largest trading partner for granted, does not play by the rules under our shared institutions, and that the fundamental values of our two societies are diverging.

I hope, first, to help Americans to dispel some of those superstitions about Canada that

Brian Lee Crowley is Managing Director of the Macdonald-Laurier Institute.

*Based on a talk to the National Strategy Forum
at the Union League Club of Chicago on February 1, 2011.*

persist south of the border and, second, to lay out the reasons why the anti-American superstitions of Canada are, slowly but surely, yielding to a more balanced and reasoned view of the importance of continuing our efforts to work with America to build a secure and prosperous North America.

A foreigner and a friend

**Much is asked
of America in
the world and
Americans
must often feel
that little is
given in return.**

As a foreigner, a call from me for a deepening of the relationship between our two countries may be taken to be self-interested special pleading that takes no account of America's interests. Because much is asked of America in the world and Americans must often feel that little is given in return, I feel the need to establish that I speak as a friend of America, as someone who has spent not a little time trying to understand the United States and its unique and vital place in the world, and trying to understand what is in America's interests and not just in my own or that of my country.

In this regard I think I can do no better than to quote some extracts from an article I wrote in the week following September 11th 2001, that circulated far and wide on both sides of the border in that dark time. This is what I said:

If, as I believe, America symbolizes the yearning of millions — no *billions* of people to be free, then we have a duty as civilized people to stand up and say that what America represents shall never be defeated by hate and terror. It can only be defeated by the indifference and complacency of those for whom freedom matters.

The idea that animates American life is that freedom matters more than anything....

It was no accident that citizens of scores of nations, including Canada, were killed in the attack on the World Trade Center. America is a beacon for those who want to be their own masters, who dream of doing what they want. And America is so feared by the zealots and the ayatollahs of the world because it constantly reminds people that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is an ideal deeply rooted in a powerful nation and will never release its grip on the human imagination....

Yes, the liberty that Americans so value can be misused and abused. But then if you give freedom to all people, what results is the fullest expression of all the yearnings that beat within the human breast.... America is a country of excesses because it is the largest canvas in the world on which all facets of the human spirit are given free rein to paint.

Thousands of innocent people died in the World Trade Center because of what the United States represents. In responding to this outrage, America will, of course, make mistakes — what would be the value of freedom if the answers to

all the difficult questions were already given? But they will never shrink from defending the idea on which their republic was built, because it is worth defending.

America, it is true, is a sometimes exasperating, even infuriating neighbour. And I would have no other.”

And so, my American friends, our first order of business is to discuss the real basis of the burgeoning relationship between Canada and the United States, a relationship I believe is built chiefly on shared moral values and only secondarily on economic self-interest.

Second, I want to discuss the unique security and economic relationship that we are in the midst of creating in North America, often in spite of ourselves, and the challenges of building and managing this new creation successfully.

Values

On the first point, about the moral basis of the Canada-US relationship, I have to say that, in my experience, when Canadians come to the United States and talk about the relationship they make a terrible mistake. They describe that relationship chiefly in terms of material self-interest, saying America should want to have an open and constructive relationship with Canada because it will benefit your pocketbook (and incidentally Canada’s). But that is not the foundation on which our friendship and alliance is built.

Material self-interest... is not the foundation on which our friendship and alliance is built.

It is not built on mere economic advantage, on what we can get out of it. It is built on something far more profound: our willingness to make sacrifices for shared values we believe in, values that can only survive in the world if we are willing to ally ourselves with each other in their defence.

When we talk about our relationship as one worth preserving and nurturing, we clearly mean something more than that we can and should trade with one another. After all, the language of trade is one that can and does apply to our respective relationships with China and the other BRIC countries, for example, at least as much as it does to our relationship with each other.

There is little difference between talking about Open Skies between Montreal and Memphis and Open Skies between Beijing and Boston. We have the same interest in creating stability and safety in global financial institutions based in China and India as we do for such institutions based in Toronto and New York. So this is not what the Canada-US relationship is really about, or else that relationship is in deep trouble.

It is sometimes said that the relationship is based on freedom and democracy, but surely while this is closer to the truth, it doesn’t get us the whole way there. Hugo Chavez was democratically elected. The Castro brothers think they have “freed” Cubans from

American domination. The Iranian revolution served to “free” Iranians to live according to God’s law as revealed to Mohammed and as interpreted by a theocracy. These people all have the mere form of democracy; they do not have its precious essence.

We believe in a special kind of democracy, where even the will of the majority is bound by laws and rules. We believe, in other words, that even majorities may be wrong and there are certain things majorities ought not to be allowed to do, such as oppress minorities. This means that constitutionalism and the rule of law are an integral part of the values that should unite us.

We believe in freedom, not just for itself, but because freedom alone allows the fully human life, in which we make choices for ourselves based on our own beliefs, experiences and priorities, not on those of dictators, mullahs, caudillos or even benevolent bureaucrats. Freedom is the essential means to the full flowering of the individual, to living a life of dignity and worth, and that is the highest good at which society can aim. That is why the first paper my institute published on the national security challenges facing Canada argued that preserving the way of life I have just described, is in “Canada’s supreme national interest.” But even this is not the whole story of the moral values that unite us.

Sacrifice

There is a further value: the value of self-sacrifice, the belief that because individual liberty and responsibility for self is the highest good, because limited government and constitutional democracy and the rule of law are the essential means to those ends, that we are all prepared to make sacrifices in order to preserve and protect that good and those institutions.

**Canada and
America...
put ourselves
intentionally
in harm’s way...
to protect
shared values.**

Thus it was that when Europe was engulfed by Nazism and Fascism, the entire democratic world — Britain, America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and others — rose up and, at great cost to themselves, rescued Europe. Thus it was that we went to Korea to prevent the peninsula falling into the hands of tyrants. Thus it was during the Cold War, when the Soviet Union threatened all the values I’ve described that link free societies, politicians like former Canadian prime ministers Louis St-Laurent and Lester Pearson convinced Canadians that they needed to sacrifice, through higher defence spending and membership in NATO. Canada and America put military bases in Germany for the sole purpose of guaranteeing that if Soviet tanks rolled into Western Europe, they could not advance without attacking our two countries as well.

We put ourselves intentionally in harm’s way as a sacrifice to protect shared values. The west’s sacrifices ultimately resulted in the failure of the USSR and a vast expansion of human freedom.

Today we are in Afghanistan together, where Canada has suffered the greatest number of combat casualties since the Korean War, a number somewhat greater, in proportion

to our population, than those suffered to date by the United States. I could choose many other examples, but the point is clear. America is not alone in being willing to sacrifice to protect freedom and democracy because these are foundational values for us just as much as for America.

Does Canada sacrifice enough in the interests of protecting these values? Perhaps not, although we do more, I suspect, than America gives us credit for. Do we sometimes fail to hold up our end? Yes. A classic example would be our failure a few years ago to follow through on our promise to support missile defence, a failure of political nerve that I personally still find embarrassing and galling and that I will do everything in my power to reverse.

Note too that we paid a big price: in large part due to that decision, America downgraded the continental defence co-operation that has seen Canada and the US work together through NORAD and the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, preferring instead to create a purely American institution, Northern Command or Northcom, to which we responded by created Canada Command. As my Institute's paper on national and continental security argues, if these new institutions could be made to work together more smoothly and effectively, the security and defence of the two countries would be powerfully strengthened. But the fact that America went outside our proven shared defence infrastructure is in part Canada's fault, and ironically resulted in a loss of sovereignty for us, as decisions we would normally have expected to participate in on continental defence are now taken unilaterally in Washington.

Nevertheless, historically and still today, no one can deny that overall Canadians have been more than willing, when they believed fundamental values were at stake, to step up and shoulder their responsibilities. They have earned the right to be a full partner with America in building a secure and prosperous community in North America because we share the same values and have shown our willingness to sacrifice to protect them at home and abroad.

Only strong societies can call on their populations to make sacrifices for values they believe in. We who believe in freedom are faced, elsewhere in the world, with regimes and peoples who are in absolutely no doubt about the values they embrace, and who demonstrate a willingness to make great sacrifices to preserve and promote those values at home and to project those values abroad. There are tests of strength going on all the time between those who profess the values I've described and the Russians over energy supplies; or our own Muslim populations over social integration, equality rights, freedom for women or Middle East policy; or the Iranians and the North Koreans over nuclear proliferation; or international terrorist groups over our ability to live free from attack; or the Chinese over currency manipulation or dominance in the Asian seas or control over natural resources around the world.

No one can deny that overall Canadians have been more than willing, when they believed fundamental values were at stake, to step up and shoulder their responsibilities.

As globalisation and the rise of the developing world signal the relative decline of America's power, all of us who believe in these values have fervently to hope that enough nations will be left with the will to defend the values I have described, for no one, not even America, will be able to do it alone.

Americans today worry that engagement with the world weakens America at home, and so are tempted by isolationism and protectionism. I and others like me urge you to resist this temptation. When we act together we are the world's hope for freedom and progress. When we go our separate ways, those who do not share our values can more easily tempt us with offers of increased prosperity in exchange for compromise on foundational moral issues.

You will forgive me for having taken so much time establishing the common **ends** Canada and the United States have in national security, but I believe that it is our failure to say these things to one another that makes it harder than it needs to be for us to agree on how to work together on this vital common project. We must trust one another without reservation if we are to rely on each other to watch our back and if we are to open our respective societies to each other's goods, services, people and capital, as I believe we can and must.

**Just as we are
to a great extent
a community of
moral values,
we are also
a community
of economic
interests.**

It is only with this discussion out of the way, for example, that we can constructively turn to the subsidiary question of the extent to which our economic life has come to resemble our moral life as New World societies equally devoted to shared values of freedom, democracy and limited government. That is to say that just as we are to a great extent a community of moral values, we are also a community of economic interests. And we must seek to define institutions that cherish and protect those shared values while encouraging the flourishing of our shared interests.

Interests

Let's start by considering how to describe these interests. It might seem that that is all settled — this is a matter of international trade. But increasingly what takes place between us is not international trade in the classic sense at all.

All of the debate over national sovereignty, NAFTA and national trade balances takes as its premise that Canada and the US are separate national economies, that each of us makes a unique range of finished products within our national economy that we then trade with other national economies for what they make. On this view, France makes wine and Japan makes cars and they exchange the one for the other. But this is no longer what occurs between Canada and the US.

Increasingly (but not exclusively — I am talking about how things are developing, not their end point) we make things together, and then sell them to each other and to people across the world. We enjoy the largest two-way economic relationship in the world. Depending on economic cycles and exchange rates, somewhere between \$1.5 billion

and \$2 billion in exchange takes place across our border every day. Forty percent of all trans-border trade between our two countries is intra-firm trade — in other words it takes place between parts of the same company.

Companies carry on integrated production processes on both sides of the border, moving pieces of production to one country or the other depending on the availability of expertise and capacity. And this very high degree of integration happens not just within companies but within industries as well, as Canada fills specific niches in larger continent-wide industries such as chemicals, telecommunications, and transport. Our major railways use Canadian ports like Halifax, Montreal and Vancouver to service Canadian and American customers throughout the continent without distinction — in fact the Port of Halifax alone sends 100,000 containers a year here to Chicago and beyond. American markets provide the investment and end users for many natural resource developments that our smaller local markets could never justify. Electric generation capacity has similarly been spurred by easy access to American markets thanks to continentally integrated infrastructure. And it is worth underlining the extent to which Canada's energy resources constitute not merely an economic boon, but a national security ace-in-the-hole.

Energy and security

Take the Alberta oilsands. We all know that America's dependence on foreign oil is a matter of great angst for both those who worry about national security and also for human rights advocates. Most other sources of oil tend to be nasty regimes that abuse human rights and that use the revenues from their oil sales to pursue the illicit development of nuclear weapons, or to finance madrassas and other institutions that spread a hateful radical Islamist message, or to undermine the regimes of America's friends and allies in Latin America.

We all know that America's dependence on foreign oil is a matter of great angst for both those who worry about national security and also for human rights advocates.

Despite the fantasies of advocates of alternative fuels, the International Energy Agency's projections for global energy use foresee a growing, not a diminishing dependence on oil for the world's energy needs. America will not be able to reduce its dependence on foreign oil in the short to medium term through alternative energy or energy conservation or further development of domestic supplies. No realistic combination of these factors can do the job.

In that context Alberta's oilsands constitute a geopolitical fact of global significance. Fifty years ago the oilsands were not a source of oil, but a geological oddity of no practical importance. Then we learned how to extract the oil slumbering within them, and through experimentation and investment managed to reach costs-per-barrel that made oilsands oil competitive at less than prevailing world oil prices. Today we are able to extract a mere 10% of the oil in the oilsands, a rate of recovery that has now established the oilsands as a basin of recoverable crude equivalent to the conventional crude supplies of Saudi Arabia.

If we were able to double that rate of recovery to 20%, that would mean a second Saudi

Arabia on America's doorstep, controlled by a benign regime, allied militarily and economically to the United States. It is not freedom for the US from foreign oil — it is freedom from the **dangers** inherent in relying on most foreign suppliers.

We have achieved what economists call “deep” or structural integration. Prosperity on both sides of the border would be deeply damaged by barriers thrown up at the border, because we are now one continental economy.

Prosperity on both sides of the border would be deeply damaged by barriers thrown up at the border, because we are now one continental economy.

This vast relationship between our two countries is reproduced in microcosm at the state level. For example, in 2009, Illinois's exports to Canada reached \$11.1 billion, while your state's imports from us amounted to \$24.5 billion. Two thirds of those imports were in the form of energy — in other words Canadian oil, natural gas and electricity powered a huge part of the Illinois economy. Moreover, Illinois shipped nearly a third of its worldwide goods exports to Canada, more than to its next five largest trading partners combined. Canada ranked as the state's largest foreign market for a ninth consecutive year. An estimated 340,000 jobs in Illinois depend on trade with Canada.

The whole metaphor of trade is now too narrow to encompass what is being built around us, as Bernard Mandeville said in the 18th century, the product of human actions, but not of human design. This new North American reality is under construction all around us by dint of the actions we all take every day. What has not caught up yet is the legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks that are still based on the old self-contained national economy model.

Border security

And if our level of integration now transcends the old ways of thinking about relations between states, we now need to transcend the old ways of managing those relations, for both economic and security reasons. Take the border between our two countries, for example.

As Michael Hart of Carleton University in Ottawa has argued, the European experience has shown that open borders between countries of similar levels of economic development result in far lower levels of movement of people than is often feared. And in any case, borders are actually poorly designed, especially in the context of the Canada-US border, to contain the dangers that an open society necessarily brings in its train, while cumbersome border controls undermine our shared prosperity and achieve little or nothing in terms of heightened security. Bad people tend not to use well-staffed border crossings like the 130 or so between our two countries. As your experience with Mexico demonstrates, even draconian border controls and physical barriers enjoy relatively little success in keeping out people determined to enter, people who never ask a border guard for permission to enter. Yet those heavy border controls do much to hinder innocent and legitimate cross border traffic in goods, services and people.

The impact of border controls on security is also easily exaggerated. Pre-entry screening, profiling, intelligence cooperation, and police work are all likely to yield better results in keeping terrorists, criminals, and other undesirables out of a country, or finding them once they have entered, than heavy-handed immigration controls at the border. Yet Americans, including Hilary Clinton when she was still a junior senator from New York, have proved deeply attached to the idea that Canada represents a serious threat to American security, because of the alleged poor policing of our immigration system and the danger of bad people entering the US from up north. Mrs Clinton repeated the now thoroughly exploded canard that the 9-11 terrorists entered the US from Canada, whereas the truth is that they were admitted to the US by US authorities.

Americans... have proved deeply attached to the idea that Canada represents a serious threat to American security.

To put the threat of the Canadian border in perspective, James Ziglar, Commissioner of the US Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) testified several years ago that in one typical six month period, 4,000 criminal aliens were arrested at the Canadian border. This number represents 0.004 percent of the people crossing the border, the relatively high arrest level at the northern border is in part due to high levels of cooperation with Canadian authorities, and most of these arrests involve relatively minor drug offences. In the same year, media reports suggested that the US Border Patrol arrested some 14,000 illegal aliens trying to cross into the US, while Canadian authorities apprehended some 7,000 headed in the opposite direction. Again, this represents a miniscule number, particularly in view of the more than a million illegal aliens arrested on the US southern border every year.

Much is sometimes made of the fact that the Auditor General of Canada found that about 60,000 aliens in Canada are under deportation orders, but we don't know where many of them are. Contrast this with the US situation where the number of illegal immigrants is widely considered to be on the order of 10 million to 12 million. Canada's system is not perfect, but we have to keep a sense of perspective. Your Department of Homeland Security's trumpeting of statistics about the number of arrests on the border is in fact a confirmation of the extremely low risk that border represents and the importance of the degree of co-operation between authorities in both countries.

Given Canada's law-enforcement capacities, our high level of administrative ability, our comparable level of economic development to the United States, the growing economic friction or "thickening" at the border and the consequences for Canada should we fail to be a trustworthy partner in continental security, there is an increasingly widespread view in Canada that we should move away from the border between our two countries as the focus for efforts to protect our common security.

We seek instead to work with America to establish an agreed set of security standards to apply to all points of entry into North America, in both Canada and the United States. This would allow us to move many of the controls currently exercised unnecessarily at the physical border away to the factory gate and the plant floor and the trucks, trains and planes that connect us all.

Moving controls away from the border is not a loss of sovereignty, but a more effective exercise of that sovereignty. Freeing up resources now spent policing demonstrably legitimate activities makes those same resources available to focus on the risky individuals and activities to whom our attention should properly be directed.

A classic example is the NEXUS programme that now links our two countries. By submitting to a background check, I can satisfy the Canadian and US authorities that I am a “trusted traveller” — they know more about me than a single customs and immigration agent could gather in a typical 15 second interview at the border. In exchange, I can pass directly through most border controls with almost no formalities. This frees agents to concentrate their attention where it belongs: on the suspicious people about whom they know little.

As we all leave the recession behind us, reducing border friction and costs and easing the movement of low-risk people and goods will certainly contribute to a return to economic health in both our countries. To do so, we need to expand existing trusted shipper and traveler programs and introduce new, trusted programs based on operational consensus between the two countries’ security specialists. Improvements such as providing 24 hour a day access and border services at major crossings, creating an integrated “single win-

“window” or portal for entering all border-related importing and exporting data, and making sure we treat issues of ordinary regulatory compliance differently than we treat issues of risk to the safety of our citizens, should also contribute to better security outcomes.

In national security terms, where the Canada-US border is concerned, less is more.

In other words, in national security terms, where the Canada-US border is concerned, less is more — we should do less at the physical border but protect ourselves better by harnessing the resources and ingenuity of both countries to overmastering common external threats. We have a long history of such joint execution of joint missions — the International Joint Commission on boundary waters, the Permanent Joint Board on Defence, the NORAD agreement that polices the approaches to our shared continental airspace (and now increasingly maritime approaches as well), the St Lawrence Seaway Authority and, of course, NAFTA. But this machinery is in desperate need of updating, and it needs the close attention of national leaders on both sides of the border.

The North American reality is a complex one, many parts of which are characterized by deep structural integration that is deeply misunderstood. We all depend profoundly on this reality. After a decade of rapid growth, however, and in the wake of the events of 9/11, integration has slowed and the North American economic system is becoming more fragile. To reinvigorate the process of integration requires a vision for the 21st century and the mobilization of interested people, groups and businesses that will press for new steps forward by governments in both Washington and Ottawa.

Practical steps

In the book *The Canadian Century: Moving Out of America’s Shadow*, which I coauthored with Niels Veldhuis and Jason Clemens, we outlined a series of practical steps

to deepen the Canadian-American relationship in our common interest and based on our shared values. I refer you to the book for the details, but some of the main suggestions were:

- A new treaty on continental security and a common external tariff.
- A new joint commission on border management.
- A new joint committee of Congress and Parliament on Canadian–American issues.
- A joint tribunal on issues that arise under our various cross-border agreements.

I was encouraged to see that when Prime Minister Harper and President Obama met in Washington last Friday, a few days after the speech on which this Commentary is based, they issued a statement signalling their intention to move forward on many of these issues (you can read the text [here](#)). All are important and, of course, require a great deal of hard work sorting out details. But moving forward effectively depends on a recognition on both sides of how much we have in common, and a willingness to dispell the myths and misunderstandings I referred to at the outset that tend to prevent us from coming to grips with this sort of constructively specific proposal.

Moving forward effectively depends on a recognition on both sides of how much we have in common.

Conclusion

America needs friends it can trust if it is to be safe at home and powerful abroad. Canada, despite the occasional lapse, has proven itself a friend willing to sacrifice, like America, for values we both hold to be essential to our supreme national interest. And it turns out that our convergence on these values has been accompanied by a convergence on an unprecedented degree of economic integration. Building our alliance and our friendship increasingly means realising that we need to modernize the institutions that oversee and manage every aspect of our relationship. And perhaps surprisingly, it turns out that America's interests in both safety and prosperity are best promoted by reducing barriers between our two countries in favour of joint management of our shared continental space.

As I hope I have shown, Canada is not a problem for America to manage, it is a trustworthy ally who is also a major piece of the solution to many of America's problems — if we have the courage, the imagination and the foresight to build open, transparent and fair institutions for managing our shared North American home.





THE MACDONALD-LAURIER INSTITUTE



“True North in Canadian Public Policy”

The Macdonald-Laurier Institute for Public Policy exists to make poor quality public policy unacceptable in Ottawa. We will achieve this goal by proposing thoughtful alternatives to Canadians and their political and opinion leaders through non-partisan and independent research and commentary.

The Macdonald-Laurier Institute is an independent, non-partisan registered charity for educational purposes in Canada and the United States. We are grateful for support from a variety of foundations, corporations and individual donors. Without the support of people across Canada and the United States for our publications on policy issues from aboriginal affairs to democratic institutions; support for our events featuring thought and opinion leaders; and support for our other activities, the Institute would not be able to continue making a difference for Canadians. For information on supporting the work of the Macdonald-Laurier Institute by making a charitable donation, please visit our website at www.macdonaldlaurier.ca/supportMLI

The notion that a new think-tank in Ottawa is unnecessary because it would duplicate existing institutions is completely mistaken. The truth is there is a deep dearth of independent think-tanks in our nation's capital.

*Allan Gotlieb, former Deputy Minister of
External Affairs and Ambassador to Washington*

To surmount the enormous challenges of getting Canada's place in the world right and taking advantage of changing opportunities, we need more ideas, input, discussion and debate in Ottawa-- that is where the crucial decisions about our future are made. That's why MLI is so vital to Canada today.

*Hon. James S. Peterson, former Minister of International Trade and Member of
Parliament for 23 years*

MLI has been registered by the IRS and CRA as a charitable organisation for educational purposes.

WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING ABOUT *The Canadian Century*, THE MACDONALD-LAURIER INSTITUTE'S FIRST BOOK

It is not often that Canadians talk about moving out of America's shadow—for far too long we have simply assumed that being in that shadow was the natural order of things. Crowley, Clemens and Veldhuis remind us that Sir Wilfrid Laurier thought that all things were possible for us, and they show, with an impressive array of facts to support their argument, that Laurier's plan for Canada can still carry us through to that Canadian century we have all been eagerly awaiting for over a hundred years.

-Allan Gotlieb, from the foreword



*"As the U.S. and other nations struggle to defuse some potentially disastrous fiscal time bombs, *The Canadian Century* makes a compelling argument that the world should be looking to Canada for lessons on how to get reform right."* - Robert Kelly, Chairman and CEO, BNY Mellon

"The Canadian Century reminds us that the temptation for governments to solve all our problems with higher spending always ends in grief—a lesson the U.S. will soon learn. It's a reminder that prosperity can be ours if we remember Wilfrid Laurier's legacy of liberty, lower taxes and smaller government." - Patrick Luciani, author, Economic Myths

"Crowley, Clemens and Veldhuis show that if we establish a real advantage vis-à-vis the U.S. on tax and other policies, that will increase both our attraction

with emerging powers and our leverage with the US. The question the authors pose is whether we have the wherewithal to finish the job." - Derek Burney, former Canadian Ambassador in Washington

"The authors strike exactly the right balance with enough detail to keep the most ardent policy wonk captivated while writing in a breezy style that will engage non-economists. And as with a good novel, the authors leave us in suspense. I urge people to read this compelling tale and then, like me, anxiously wait for a sequel to see how the story ends." - Don Drummond, Senior Vice-President and Chief Economist, TD Bank Financial Group

"Entrepreneurship, hard work and self-reliance are deeply ingrained in our psyche. During the Redemptive Decade of the 1990s these virtues were resurrected. In tandem with concerted

actions by the different levels of government, we put right the debt and despair created by a couple of dark decades when we wobbled towards what the Wall Street Journal described as Third-World Status. Limited government, light taxes and fiscal discipline, argue the authors, are the ingredients that bring gold in the Olympiad of nations." - Colin Robertson, first Head of the Advocacy Secretariat at Canada's Washington Embassy

"This timely and provocative book will remind Canadians that the smart fiscal and trade policies pursued by governments of all stripes in the past two decades has made Canada a star at the beginning of this century. But history should not repeat itself. What we have achieved recently is what Wilfrid Laurier understood to be the right path forward for the last century. Instead, wars and economic depression led to

inefficient government spending, high taxes and deficits, and protectionism. Canada should avoid this poisonous policy recipe in the coming years to fulfil Laurier's dream of a truly great nation of the North, which we should rightly be." - Jack Mintz, Palmer Chair in Public Policy, University of Calgary

"This wonderful book is an urgent wake-up call for Canada's current leaders—of all political stripes—and raises crucial economic issues that should be top-of-mind in coming federal elections. Now is the time to reaffirm the power of Laurier's vision, to make some courageous policy decisions, and to thereby ensure that the 21st Century belongs to Canada in the way Sir Wilfred intended a hundred years ago. Will Canada's political leaders pay attention?" - Christopher Ragan, Clifford Clark Visiting Economist, Finance Canada