

So far as the United States is concerned, there are no two countries in the world whose relations are closer and more intimate than those between our two countries. We have our problems and our differences and will continue to have them; problems which arise not only from strictly bilateral questions, but also, and this is new and important, others which derive from the position of the United States as the strong and courageous leader of the free world coalition of which Canada is a part. Naturally, as the United States possesses so much the greatest power in that coalition, and as its influence is correspondingly, and rightly, greater than the others, the rest of us are preoccupied, at times intensely preoccupied, as to how that power will be used and how that leadership will be exercised. This is, of course, a perfectly natural reaction. This actual disparity of power, however, has to be reconciled with the legal equality of all states inside the coalition. We are all free and equal in theory, and we cherish that theory on which our national freedom is based. So, naturally we speak and act as free states, not as the communist satellites in a Kremlin camp. I am quite sure that the United States would not have it otherwise, because otherwise our support would not be worth having. As Walter Lippmann put it the other day in his column:

"For our own sakes we must wish to live among equals, among peoples who trust us but do not fear us, who work with us but do not fawn upon us. Only equals can really be trusted, only governments that speak candidly and do not say what they think we want to hear, what they believe will keep the dollars flowing. There is no health in satellitism, and even the most ruthless imperialism can never trust the satellite."

One problem for Canada in her relationship with the United States as the leader of our coalition, and it is sometimes a difficult one to solve, is to know when we should give up our own particular views in the interest of general agreement, and when we should persist in support of our own case even if it means an open disagreement of the kind which gives so much aid and comfort to the Communists. In seeking the right solution for difficulties of this kind there are many factors to be taken into consideration; the first is responsibility to our own people; a second is the impossibility of maintaining the peace in the face of the menace that confronts us if we do not maintain the unity of the groups; a third is recognition of the great part and the special responsibility that the United States is bearing in this effort for peace. I hope that in international matters, the Canadian voice will be frank and clear, and in a recognizable Canadian accent, but I hope also that it will be always possible for that voice to be in harmony with the other members of the chorus. This is not the time for solos or discordant notes if we can possibly avoid them.

This brings me to the other part of our foreign policy, that which concerns the role we are playing in the United Nations and in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I have often talked about the United Nations, and, having attended not many weeks ago the Sixth Assembly, I could talk about it now for hours and not too cheerfully. However, today I will resist that temptation as I would like to say something about the more limited collective security system which we now know as NATO. In doing this, I would like to concentrate on one or two special aspects of NATO which are not always in our minds