

It is for this reason that I see dangers ahead, in new tendencies towards not greater freedom but greater restriction of trade; some of them resulting in actions contrary to international agreements already reached. It may be irritating to a number of producers in particular areas of this great and strong continent to compete with products from some smaller friendly but foreign country. But it may mean serious economic hardship for the whole of that foreign country if those products are excluded or unnecessarily hindered from entering the North American market. If the strong should take refuge in "escape clauses", and administrative restrictions, what can be expected of those who are weaker and more vulnerable?

Once started, where would the process end? Of one thing we can be sure, all our countries in the end would be left much poorer and less united than they are now. Can we really afford to invite such a situation for some real or imaginary short-term gain?

I can assure you that we in Canada wish to see international trade easier, and not less easy, both on this continent and throughout the free world. We are prepared to do our part to this end and specifically to support any move designed to bring about the freest possible exchange of goods, with the minimum of obstructions and restrictions between our own two countries. We would welcome any steps that could be taken in that direction or any inter-governmental discussions that would lead to such a result. Surely such a policy makes continental common sense!

What I have been saying about the trading relationships among the countries of the free world is not merely some exercise in economic theory. This is an intensely practical question, based, among other things, on the proposition that economic strength is essential to defence: that certain of the trading policies now being practiced by countries in the North Atlantic community are tending to weaken rather than strengthen their economies and therefore their defences: that the countries which are experiencing serious difficulties, and which by the same token have very painful tasks ahead of them if they are to be strong partners in defence, need to be heartened rather than discouraged by North American action: and that it is in the vital interests of Canada and the United States to see to it that international trade, like the Atlantic Ocean, becomes a unifying and strengthening, not a dividing and weakening, force. If it is to endure through thick and thin, as we wish, the structure of defence we are now constructing in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization must be built on these solid foundations.

Man, however, does not live by bread alone. There are more intangible, but equally important factors in the building of a nation.

So we have done more than lay the solid economic and financial foundations for a strong Canada. We have achieved, I think, a Canadian spirit and have acquired a growing pride in our national identity and our national destiny. We are perhaps at times unduly sensitive about our position and prerogatives; unduly anxious to remove any impression that may exist in Washington that we are an appendage of London,