

maintain our unity, our morale and our strength over the long pull ahead.

The same division of opinion naturally exists in regard to our proper part in collective international action. There are those who say that we have not so far pulled our weight here, except possibly our oratorical weight. There are others who complain that we are doing too much, especially as the big decisions which will decide the course of events will not be made primarily by us but by others. It is, of course, comforting for one who has some responsibility in these matters to conclude that if you are attacked from both sides, you have a fairly good chance of being right. But I certainly would not wish to carry that analogy too far. It may mean merely that you are doubly wrong! We all agree, however, that we must play our proper part, no less and no more, in the collective strengthening and collective security action of the free world, without which we cannot hope to get through the dangerous days ahead. But how do we decide what that proper part is, having regard to our own political, economic and geographical situation? It is certainly not one which can be determined by fixing a mathematical proportion of what some other country is doing. As long as we live in a world of sovereign states, Canada's part has to be determined by ourselves, but this should be done only after consultation with and, if possible, in agreement with our friends and allies. We must be the judge of our international obligations and we must decide how they can best be carried out for Canada, but we have no right to make these decisions in isolation from our friends. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is, I think, a good example of what I mean. The Council of this Organization, or its Deputies, is meeting almost continuously; mainly, at the present time, for the purpose of collective defence planning. The recommendations - because they are only recommendations - made through this collective process are then sent to the separate governments for decision, but no government is likely to reject them without very good reason indeed. The military tasks for the separate members under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have been worked out collectively in detail. Those allotted to Canada, which were considered by all the members of the group to be fair and proper, have been accepted by the Canadian Government and will be carried out once Parliament approves them.

There is another aspect to this problem. What should our role be in the United Nations? Indeed, what should the role of the world organization itself be in the present conflict? I have tried to make my own views known in this matter in recent statements, and I do not wish to go over the ground again here. But I would say this; that we must be sure, so far as we can ever be sure, that the United Nations remains the instrument of the collective policy of all its members for the preservation of peace and the prevention or defeat of aggression, and does not become too much the instrument of any one country. I am not suggesting that this has happened or is going to happen, but it is something that we should guard against. If, however, the United Nations is to be such a genuine international organization in this sense, all of its members, except the Soviet Communist bloc who have no interest in it except as an agency for advancing their own aggressive purposes, must play a part in deed as well as in word. We must be careful not to be stampeded into rash decisions which cannot be carried out but we must all contribute to the implementation of decisions freely and responsibly made. I do not think that we in Canada have any reason to apologize for the part that we have played in this regard. Our record in the United Nations is a worthy one. However,