

bettering our democracy; not merely to the negative task of defending an established position.

In order to make a positive contribution to the cold war, we must understand what the issues are. Some people think of the cold war only in economic terms as a struggle between private enterprise and state ownership; others put it in political terms as a struggle between democracy and dictatorship; others view it as a philosophical struggle between idealism and materialism; other still as a religious conflict between the concept of a divinely ordained universe and organized atheism.

I believe the cold war is all of these things and more. I would describe it as a struggle between two totally opposed concepts of human society - the one in which the State is the absolute and not-to-be-questioned master of every aspect of the lives of all its subjects; the other in which the State is the servant of the citizens, existing to meet their common political needs, but leaving them free to order other aspects of their lives for themselves.

A useful shorthand description is that the cold war is a struggle between Totalitarianism and Freedom. Now it is not so many years since we were all talking about total war. It seems to me the cold war is a total war of a different kind which demands the use of all our resources: though, fortunately, in the cold war, we can employ those resources more constructively than we could in a shooting war. If the cold war is really a total war, Canada's part is obviously a matter of the greatest concern not only to the government but to every citizen. Indeed, everyone is vitally interested in the ultimate aim which is to achieve security for our free way of life and a genuine assurance of lasting peace for those who really want peace and that, I believe, is the great majority of men and women in every country.

For a while after 1945, we all hoped that international security would be found in the United Nations. But now, we in Canada, and in other free countries, know that the only realistic hope of security in the immediate future lies in a firm combination of nations strong militarily and economically and pledged to act together to resist aggression if any nation should be so unwise as to start aggression.

That is the immediate purpose of the North Atlantic Security Pact. Since the Atlantic Treaty was signed and ratified by Canada, I have had occasion to travel from one end of the country to the other. Everywhere I have found whole-hearted approval of our country's participation in the security organization of the North Atlantic community. The understanding and the unity of Canadians have been gratifying. It is a promising start on what is going to be a long and hard road towards ultimate security.

Of course, we all know that the signing of the treaty was only the first step. All the members of the North Atlantic partnership must do their part to implement the treaty, and to provide the strength, actual and potential, which is its real sanction. For each partner the first problem is to determine how much it should devote to military defence. The decision as to the magnitude and the nature of the defence expenditures required for national security is certainly one of the most difficult the government has to make. We could probably spend the whole of our national income on defence and still not be sure of complete immunity to attack.