

and imaginative solutions on a larger scale than the original problem which faced them. It may therefore be found that the strengthening of the special bonds between the English-speaking peoples - or between the NATO members - will be assisted rather than hindered by our common endeavours to face constructively the greater issue of co-operation between all free peoples; of every race and culture and creed.

This broader co-operation and growing unity must now rest on the unqualified acceptance of and ultimate realization of national freedom and self-government. There is no other alternative. It is because of the necessity for accepting this as a prerequisite to good international relations that I have called my lecture this morning "National freedom and international co-operation".

I do not know of any more important problem than that of bringing together in a constructive relationship these two political concepts, unless it be that of the reconciliation of personal liberty and national security in the modern state.

"National freedom and international co-operation" is a subject in which a Canadian may be expected to have a special interest and on which, because of the history and experience of his country, he may even have some special claim to speak.

Canada is a country which has gained its national independence by evolution from colonial status, rather than revolution against it. This is, of course, not the most exciting method of nation-building; by conference, rather than by convulsion; by the signing of papers, rather than the flashing of sabres. It has, however, been completely effective with us, though its result in the Canada of today is not yet fully realized in all other countries; even in the United States, where we are still supposed, in certain quarters, to be some kind of advanced British colony.

The fact that Canada sealed its nationhood by fighting with, rather than against British soldiers, and for the cause of human freedom which transcends national boundaries or national rights, is one reason, I suppose, why so many people in the United States still think that we are governed by Downing Street and that great man, Mr. Winston Churchill.

It might conceivably be a good thing, if we did not have so many other more important preoccupations, to arrange a sham battle with some British Red Coats, suitably televised over every American network, to prove beyond any possibility of doubt in the deep south or the middle west, that Canada is indeed now a fully self-governing state, as independent as any state has the right to be in this interdependent age. But, as I have said, we have more important things to do; and furthermore, if this sham battle were to have the desired effect, the British soldiers would have to agree to be defeated and capitulate to the Canadians. Then we would be faced with the problem of the voluntary repatriation of the prisoners back to the United Kingdom. Canada is such a happy and fortunate land in which to live!