with unlimited military force. If that reasoning were accepted, the theory of unlimited collective action everywhere might mean in practice no real security anywhere. While recognizing aggression always for what it is, and while taking appropriate action against it, we will yet need to exercise judgment in any particular case to determine how the obligation of collective security can most effectively be implemented so that aggressors may not exploit the provisions of the Charter to dissipate more than would be advisable the presently limited military forces of the free world. In certain regions aggression must obviously be countered with every military resource that can be mustered. To ensure the protection of these areas, the general obligation of the Charter must be put in more precise and automatic form. This, I believe, can best be done by the negotiation of security pacts for particular areas; indeed that is the immediate purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The need to exercise judgment in deciding how the security obligations of the Charter can be discharged to the best effect does not mean that we can ever afford to turn a blind eye to any act of aggression, or can pick and choose among possible victims, helping some and leaving others entirely to their fate. Nor does it mean that there is one law to be applied to the strong and another to the weak. It does mean, however, that the responsibility of defending the free world in the present circumstances is so grave that those who share it will require the highest qualities of intelligence as well as the most sensitive consciences in deciding where the limited forces at their disposal should be applied. For the time being this principle may seem of not much more than academic importance since any armed attack on a large scale, no matter where it occurred, might easily precipitate a general war, and since one of the most pressing tasks of diplomacy is to convince would-be aggressors that they cannot count on immunity from instant retaliation if they move against their neighbours. But there have been situations, even within the present year, when the necessity for careful judgment has been highly relevant; and it is quite possible that similar situations may recur.

Let no one think, however, that this attitude indicates that the Canadian Government is, or has been, under any temptation to abandon the principle of collective security. The facts speak for themselves. The contingent which we have contributed to the United Nations forces in Korea is the third largest of all those which have been provided by members of the United Nations. Our troops, our ships and our planes have been sent to Korea to maintain the principle of collective security. That will also be the purpose of the brigade group and the 11 squadrons of aircraft which we have undertaken to station in Western Europe.

Let no one think, either that we have lost faith in the United Nations. We believe that the United Nations has still a central rôle to play in security matters, and we welcome the inquiry now being made in accordance with the "Uniting for Peace" resolution of last November to see how the organization can be put in a position where it can carry out this rôle more swiftly and effectively than in the past. The United Nations has, of course, other important functions to perform. But it is probably true that unless it can prove itself as a security organization its vitality will be sapped. Under the strong and resolute leadership of the United States it has met the challenge in Korea and has shown its value as a means of organizing collective resistance to aggression. It should not be expected, however, that the theory of collective security can be translated into practice without encountering complexities and special problems. One of these problems, to my mind, is how to make the best use of the free world's growing, but still limited, military resources for the maintenance of world-wide security.

Another problem which has been revealed by this first attempt to organize collective security on a large scale is how to devise a mode of association which

November, 1951