

Yet it is a fact that opinions, attitudes and policies have changed in the United States most remarkably. Our own change in attitude has been a reaction to American change. It is not that we have suddenly developed a rush of nationalism to the head, and have become a difficult neighbor, more or less over-night. What we are doing is what we have always historically done. We are reacting against the pressure we most immediately feel; and if the reaction seems odd to our neighbors, it is they, rather than we, who should make the adjustment. If our neighbor is wise, he will realize that our storm signals are flying.

Don't let's forget that one of the big factors which brought the colonies of British North America together in 1867 was the emergence of Manifest Destiny in the United States together with a huge army of warlike veterans who had fought the civil war. The Mexican war had taken place only 20 years before, and the incident we know by the American slogan, "Fifty-Four-Forty or Fight", was more recent than that.

Now I draw near the end of this dissertation, and I bring my argument, such as it is, round full circle. I referred earlier to the fact that we went through a period when we resisted British pressures. What has happened since the war, with the re-emergence of American pressures, is that we seek to find some counterpoise to them, and we have moved into the North American Treaty Organization and toward the Commonwealth. That historic institution has, apparently, felt renewed strength. Our Government, quite consciously, is cultivating our Commonwealth wealth bonds. If economics remain harshly opposed to them, there is much in other fields which has been strengthened.

The reason for this, so it seems to me, is exactly the same fundamental reason as that which lent weight and strength to the movement for Dominion status in the first quarter of this century. We are doing now in reverse the same things we did then. We are creating a counterpoise against the most immediate and heaviest of the pressures upon us. In this our Commonwealth partners are playing an important role. There is, and there can be, no such thing as a Commonwealth bloc. Even were it possible I would doubt its value. But, more than once in recent years, Canada has found itself side by side with Britain, India and Pakistan in joint attempts to moderate the apparent course of American policy in the United Nations. Australia and New Zealand, in spite of the special defence ties created with the United States in ANZUS, have also on occasion played their part.

We have special qualifications for this role. If there is one point at which suspicions are roused in the two republics which occupy the old sub-continent of India, it is their historic fear of white imperialism. The speed and honesty of the British withdrawal in 1947 went a long way to mitigate, even to remove, the old fears of the United Kingdom. But the Indians and Pakistanis, with a keen perception of the realities of power, rapidly transferred their suspicions to the United States and the objectives of American policy. In these circumstances it is by no means disadvantageous to the world picture as a whole that these two new republics should find a friend in Canada. Like themselves, Canada