

interest of greater security.

Then I went on to give my opinion on the principles on which such an association should be based.

I'm going to do something I don't think I have done before - repeat - that is, deliberately repeat part of a speech which I had previously made to the same group. It will give you a chance to see whether I was a good or bad prophet - and also to check the development of NATO in the first years of its existence against these advocated principles.

I said this about the proposed regional security organization:

"The Canadian official policy on this matter is well known and I need not elaborate it. May I mention very briefly, however, what, in my opinion, such an association of free states should and should not become.

- (1) It must not be a provocative, aggressive alliance against any one state. It must be purely defensive, not exclusive, acting solely within the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter.
- (2) It must not become the instrument of power-nationalism or of the imperialistic policies of any of its members.
- (3) It must not be merely a military alliance -- purely negative in character, with provisions for defence only against the old form of armed aggression, which may be as futile as defence against a muzzle loader in the atomic age.
- (4) It must include provisions, as does the Brussels Pact, for dealing, at least by consultation, with indirect aggression against states, carried on through the spreading of subversive, soul-destroying ideological germs as the prelude to revolution inside and conquest from without. This is, of course, a far more difficult problem than throwing back battalions of soldiers who have crossed frontiers. There is no effective Maginot line against ideas.
- (5) Our security association, therefore, must include provisions, as the Brussels Pact does, not merely for defence against armed aggression, but for peacetime co-operation in the economic, social and cultural fields.

In the development of this kind of association lies our best hope for peace. Through it, we can ensure a decisive superiority of physical, economic and moral power on the side of those who do not believe in power, but will use it if there is no alternative.

It is in this kind of association that Canada can best exert its influence for peace and progress. Indeed, it may be that in the future this will be about the only really effective way in which we can exercise such influence, internationally.

Such a development towards democratic collective action on a wider than national scope, in order to succeed, will require great qualities of political, economic and moral leadership.

It should be the first principle of Canada's external policy to provide such leadership within the measure of its own resources, to follow it when others with greater resources give it, and to insist, in and out of season, that only by such leadership and by the acceptance of the ideas which inspire it, is there any hope for stability and for peace."

I still think that these views are sound and I hope that we will continue to strive to realize them.