

This kind of philosophy is basic to Canadian Government thinking, and it is supported, I believe, by the overwhelming majority of the Canadian people. You can understand then why Canadians are disturbed when tariff barriers are raised, import quotas are imposed in response to special pleas, or domestic industries are subsidized to keep competitive foreign products out of the country.

We in Canada believe that government interferences should be kept to a minimum. I am quite sure that most of the newspaper editors assembled here today, and along with you, most of the American people, share this view. But I know, from my experience in public life, that even such a broad measure of agreement in principle is not in itself a guarantee of wise action. When particular issues arise it is only too easy to regard them as exceptions which justify exceptional action at variance with agreed principles.

I shall speak about the application of sound policies to the development of North American resources and the exchange of raw materials between our two countries. But I must emphasize before I turn to this subject, that I am not thinking only of bilateral relations between Canada and the United States, however important they may be, nor am I advocating a bilateral approach. The principles which I believe are sound in this respect apply equally well to the relations between each of our two countries and the rest of the free world.

What we must all seek - and advocate - are policies that strengthen the forces of freedom throughout the world, that enable free peoples to live a happier and more abundant life and that increase their ability to withstand aggression from those who would destroy freedom throughout the world.

How Strong is the Case That the U.S. is Becoming a Have-Not Nation With Respect to Certain Natural Resources

We have been hearing a good deal about the United States running out of this or that non-renewable resource in this or that period. We have also been observing the public discussion in your country whether or not the United States is on the road towards becoming a "have not" nation with respect to certain natural resources. We are a little puzzled by this talk about becoming a "have not" nation. What does it mean?

Does it mean you are a "have not" nation because you import almost all of your nickel and most of your asbestos? Or does it mean you are a "have not" nation because you are now importing 83 per cent of your newsprint requirements as against 64 per cent in 1929?

It seems to me there are very good reasons why you are now importing more nickel and newsprint than ever before. You can get these commodities more cheaply abroad than by using domestic products or alternative materials. It is like somebody suggesting that Canada is on the road to becoming a "have not" nation merely because we are now importing more cotton and more bauxite.

Perhaps those who speak of the threat to the United States of becoming a "have not" nation have in mind that some of your high quality resources are being