

closely tied together by the establishment of a great number of branch plants of U.S. concerns in Canada and some branch plants of Canadian concerns in the United States, may adjust their operations, especially by the production in the branch plants in Canada of goods, or parts of goods, for sale in the United States and other dollar markets; this would involve a change in the manufacturing and marketing policies of many of the parent companies.

A good many people in Canada and some people in the United States have begun to think of North America as an economic whole - a fairly new conception. Canadians do not normally regard Americans as foreigners or aliens, and they do not like to be themselves so regarded in the United States. Hence, they tend to feel a little resentful when their interests and needs are not taken particularly into account in Washington. For example, a measure is now under discussion there which would forbid the export of petroleum products to all countries. Canadians are inclined to ask whether a very old Canadian is not just as uncomfortable as a very old American. Have we not, they say, already bought from the United States a great deal of the oil that we must have? Are we to be faced now with a real disaster by a refusal of access to our main source of supply? Cannot we continue to divide scarce necessities between the two countries on the basis of share-and-share-alike, as we did in wartime, provided that oil is not being wasted in Canada, a fact which can, we are sure, be established? I trust that sympathetic answers will be given to queries such as these.

In wartime we did share under the Hyde Park Agreement, the things needed to keep the production of both countries at the highest level. It worked, and made no small contribution to victory. If this close integration of the economies was good in war - good for both countries and good for our allies - why should we not with profit continue the same principle through this period of what I hesitate yet to call peace, and indeed indefinitely?

There have, in truth, been great changes in the national outlook of Canada towards the United States in the last twenty-five or thirty years. While many of these changes can be ascribed to the impersonal movement of events, we must not underrate the high importance of the personal contributions of individuals in each country. It would be unseemly if I were to end my remarks tonight without some reference to the personal contribution of the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mackenzie King, especially since he announced last week his intention of retiring from the leadership within a few months. He is now in his thirtieth year as leader of the Liberal Party, and for over twenty of the years which have passed since his selection to that position in 1919 he has been Prime Minister. He has seen the fulfilment of many of his early aims. I believe that he would agree that in no field has his harvest been greater than in that in which he devoted his talents to the cultivation of fruitful relations with the government and the people of the United States.

---