

Under the imperatives of war or grave emergency, then, our peoples have shown self-discipline and regard for the common good in virtually all of their economic activities. They have been ready to subordinate their individual commercial interests to ensure the political and military security of themselves and their allies. The record is an impressive one. I am sure we can repeat or even excel it if the occasion requires.

That is not to say, however, that either of our countries would welcome this tight co-ordination as a permanent state of affairs. We have learned, and we have shown to others, the value of flexibility in co-operation. If our capacities are to be fully developed, and if our creative and constructive energies are to find expression in their natural directions, we can hardly be content with a rigid and controlled continental system. It is true, of course, that even in normal times we should always have in mind our ultimate dependence on each other and should refrain from actions which would hinder close and effective collaboration in times of peril. Generally, however, neither you nor we would wish to be tied too closely to each other in any rigid, organizational way, and I think there are good and respectable reasons for such an attitude.

In an emergency many of the aspirations of both our countries may have to be suspended and we may have to concentrate on one single, fixed objective. When the crisis is over - or at least eased - it is right and proper that varied national interests should reappear.

That does not mean - it certainly should not mean - that our national purposes then become conflicting and that we find ourselves unable to work together. Fortunately I think it is clear that in ordinary times no less than in times of crisis the national interests of the United States and Canada are more often common than divergent. Nevertheless, in such ordinary circumstances, our interests undeniably become more complex and diffuse, the role of government undergoes a substantial change, and different methods of co-operation are required. Arrangements between us become somewhat looser and less formal. The blunter instruments which may have served in the emergency lose their effectiveness and we must apply ourselves more painstakingly to the more delicate and subtle arts required for international co-operation in the conditions of competition, and heightened national feeling.

With the vigour of youth and in the flush of achievement, we Canadians often remind others that our country is on the march to a great destiny. Even on the most sober and modest appraisal we see a very considerable future ahead - that is if any country is to have any future at all in this age of hydrogen and hate. Indeed we may occasionally appear to be a shade too assertive or sensitive or self-conscious about our nationalism - a fault which would be easier to correct if some people in this country would stop thinking of us as a colony! - I do not believe, however, that we can be accused of following courses in our national policies which deviate substantially from those which might seem best internationally on strictly economic grounds. In the interest of our national unity, Donald Smith may have