

An outstanding example of this larceny by you of our human resources is, of course, your own President. I recall him first as a stalwart University of Toronto freshman. At that time, I was doubling as a history professor and a football coach (we have to organize our resources very carefully in Canada). I spotted young Sterling as a potentially great line-man. He became one and where he planted his feet no opposing ball carrier passed. I thought also that he might, with diligence, become a good historian, but I never dreamed that he would migrate to the Presidency of this great university. This loss to Canada temporarily cast a shadow over our relations with you, and we considered for a time throwing up an academic curtain along the border! But wiser counsels prevailed, we swallowed our pride, and Canadian-American relations remained the model of what relations should be between states.

That relationship, however, should not be misconstrued as meaning that Canada is moving inevitably and happily into union with the United States. That is not true. We are quite content with our present position of independence inside our Commonwealth of Nations. We are also willing and anxious to accept responsibility for the economic, political, and social development of the northern half of this continent. We may, of course, be wrong, but somehow or other we feel that our political and social and legal institutions are better, for us, than yours would be. We move at a somewhat slower tempo in Canada and we like it that way. We feel that we have a sense of social solidarity and cohesion, of ordered progress, which would not be strengthened by a change to any other system of government or by amalgamation with any other country. We are, moreover, engaged in an important and successful venture in the incorporation within one state of two peoples of differing background - English and French - who are committed to the survival of their respective languages, cultures and traditions. We consider this experiment too significant for us and for others to endanger it by absorption in any other state.

We wish, of course, at the same time, to continue and, indeed, to strengthen our close and friendly contacts with the United States. For one thing, we are acutely - I use the word advisedly - aware of your importance to us economically. We would like to deepen and broaden our commercial relationships with you and bring them more into balance. It would, for instance, be fine for us if your 145 millions would buy as much from us as our 14 millions do from you. That would, we think, help both our countries, and would make unnecessary the restrictions we at times are forced to place on trade with the United States because the greater proportion of that trade - the largest volume of trade between any two countries in the world - consists of Canadian imports from this country. But here again, the closest possible, the freest possible, trade arrangements cannot, and in our view need not, mean for us the loss of our economic independence by a customs union or in any other way.

As I see it, the central problem that faces our two governments in their relations with each other is the extension and the deepening of these political and economic contacts, without creating the impression in either country that co-operation means absorption. In any event, I feel sure that Americans would rather co-operate with a free, vigorous and growing Canada than absorb 10 Canadian provinces, which would presumably become States. Surely you do not want another dozen Senators! And what would Hollywood and fiction do if the scarlet-coated Royal Canadian Mounted Police became the Federal Bureau of Arctic Investigation!