

unity about the way in which the United Nations was to fulfil its basic function and protect the security of its members, when this Soviet communist expansion was the greatest threat to such security?

That, Mr. Chairman, is the emergency, and the North Atlantic Pact is one answer to it. I have no doubt that it is a good answer. So far as the people of Canada are concerned, I am confident that it represents a firm resolve to stand with like-minded and peace-loving people for the preservation of our freedom. I am equally confident that this is the case with the people of the other nations who, within the next few weeks, will be called upon to ratify this treaty. The question remains, however, whether the alliance does any more than meet the problem of the moment. Will the historians of the future record it as a mere incident in history, like the Kellogg-Briand Pact? Will they set it down as a successful expedient, like the Quadruple Alliance of the period after Napoleon, that tided its members over a period of danger and then disappeared; or will they find in this alliance a great turning point in history? Will they be able to conclude that the events of this week have put in train a series of consequences as fateful to human history as, for example, those which resulted from the association of American Colonies during the War of Independence?

There is, of course, no categorical answer to these questions. The consequences of the alliance will depend partly on the extent to which it fulfills tendencies already present in the history of the Western World. It will depend also on the way in which the members of the alliance translate into action the words which are written in the document. It is possible that the North Atlantic Treaty will prove worthy of no more than a foot-note in the history of this century. We have it in our hands, however, to make of it the title for a new and thrilling chapter.

I am confident that we can do this because I believe that we are building this alliance on solid foundations. It is a principle of political science that political organizations should not be constructed out of materials with poor cohesive qualities. Where they are so built, they are held together only by buttressing, which sometimes requires greater resources than the structure itself. Amongst the members of the North Atlantic Alliance, however, the cohesive forces are strong and compelling, and they may be discerned in every aspect of the national life of the members of this group. I do not need to discuss in this company the cultural and political background which gives unity to the Western World. I am convinced, however, of the validity of this concept.

From the roof of the small hotel in which the Canadian Delegation to the last United Nations Assembly stayed in Paris, it was possible to look out over the city. I sometimes watched this lovely and impressive sight, and thought of the debt which all of us in North America owe to that great centre of light and liberty. In Canada and the United States alike the roots of our culture reach back into the life of Paris, and the political and social growth of both countries would suffer if the enriching influence of that city were blocked off. Then I thought of how, a half century ago, Paris was one of a great circle of cities, in many lands, which together made up a great cultural commonwealth. Vienna, Belgrade, Prague, Breslau, Bucharest, Warsaw, Dresden, St. Petersburg and Moscow, together with many other cities of many states, were the common home of artists, scientists, and scholars, who gave unity and dignity and depth to western culture. How narrowly is that circle now drawn! One by one the great cities of Eastern Europe have been forced for political reasons by the dark invader to cut themselves off from the intellectual life of the west. If the statesmen of the world could bring about a lasting peace, perhaps the most fruitful consequence of their success would come from the stream of ideas that might once again play freely.

If there is a single ounce of aggressive content in the treaty it is to be found, I think, in the intellectual sphere. We have, in a sense, set bounds to a physical area which we mean to defend. We have also, however, defined a cultural area, which we hope to expand and develop. We do not wish to impose our ideas on others. But we can challenge the communist international with an alternative and far more powerful intellectual force -- the inter-