

things over to straighten out our differences. Sometimes, however, when a situation in one country prevents us from working together towards the desired solution, it is mutually agreed that we should proceed independently. This is the solution that has been found necessary in connection with the development of the St. Lawrence waterway, where up to now action by the United States has been blocked in Congress.

Now the existence of the two powerful influences to which I have referred, the one from the United Kingdom and the other from the United States, is bound to give rise to situations calling for skillful reconciliation. One of these is in the field of defence where, unfortunately, our dreams of peaceful association with the Russians in the United Nations were shattered, when through the misuse of the veto, they began to show that they were not prepared to be our peacetime friends. How then would Canada, with a limited military potential and with heavy obligations to develop the natural resources, on which the buoyancy and vitality of our economy depend, reconcile the claims arising from this dual orientation? On the one hand, the United Kingdom looked to Canada as the next largest member of the Commonwealth, for material military support. On the other hand, there was our first obligation to make reasonable provision for the defence of our own territory and, consistent with our size and strength and sovereignty, so to play an honourable role in partnership with the United States in the achievement of continental security. The latter is the obvious prerequisite of any more extended United States military commitments to other areas - and some of these areas are important also to our own defence.

Canada happily found the answer to this vital problem in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with whose early genesis I am sure you are familiar. In 1947, Mr. St. Laurent, who was then Secretary of State for External Affairs, was one of the first to speak out in favour of an agreement for collective security by those like-minded peace-loving nations who realized that because the aim of the Soviet Union was for the world domination of Communism directed from Moscow, our hopes in the United Nations as the bulwark of our security could not be fulfilled. Thus, in 1949 twelve countries signed the North Atlantic Treaty to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples. The aims of the Treaty are to promote stability and well-being in the area and to unite for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security. You will see from these words taken from the Treaty that we banded together for two purposes; the first, the important and urgent purpose of providing for our own security without which we could not work toward the second, which is the stability and well-being of the members.

Good progress is being made towards the realization of the first of these goals. We are gradually building up our collective military strength. It seems inevitable in the case of rearmament that we should experience set-backs here and there. However, I remember very vividly that a little over two years ago, when I was appointed Canadian representative on the North Atlantic Council Deputies, we had only isolated national units and an insufficiency of them. Now we have a steadily increasing integrated force under a Supreme Commander. We have already gone a long way towards the achievement of real security.

Naturally this effort at rearmament entails sacrifices and imposes strains on the economies of the participating countries. After having descended too rapidly into the vale of unilateral disarmament, we are now climbing back slowly and painfully to that plateau of rearmament on which alone we can find security.