

The Canadian people have enthusiastically endorsed this policy. Something of the "sense of high adventure" in the words of Mr. Nehru which has marked your endeavours in India has challenged their imagination and enlisted their support. We too you know have a like "sense of high adventure" about what is taking place in the way of new developments and rapid industrial expansion in our own country in these years.

Both our countries are deeply aware that the continued progress of our national development programmes depends on the maintenance of world peace. It is on the question of the policies most apt to promote international security that a difference in our attitudes is more noticeable. Let me say at the outset that we fully understand the historical and other factors which underlie your policy but we believe that for our part of this divided world there is merit in the course we are following in our country. We are all in great need, these days, of sincere negotiation and wise political decisions. If India, in playing her part in the search for such decisions, considers it best to refrain from commitments which others find advisable, we certainly do not question this. The world already has reason to be grateful to India for her achievements in the field of international conciliation and for this we honour you. But let me now try to explain to you our policy and the reasons for it.

When the United Nations was founded in 1945 the world looked forward to a period in which all nations would so respect the rights of others that disarmament would prove feasible. These hopes were not fulfilled. On the contrary, the shadow of totalitarianism was again cast over Europe. It was by no means clear that the United Nations, invaluable though it was proving as a forum for the discussion of international problems and as an agency for furthering economic and social progress, was capable of providing the collective security envisaged in the Charter. With the memory of two disastrous wars fresh in our minds we in Canada together with like-minded peoples in North America and Europe entered into a limited collective defence arrangement in accord with the provisions of the Charter. We did so in the belief that without such a defence arrangement peace might be imperilled.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is also intended to promote economic and cultural co-operation, which, of course, ultimately would benefit others in addition to its own members. We hope to build, on the foundations of the cultures which the peoples of Europe and North America have inherited, a community which, through co-operation and constructive effort, will impart its own creative vitality to our part of the modern world. Our main immediate purpose, however, is to deter any possible aggression and to maintain that collective strength without which we could not confidently play our part in the search for negotiated settlements and for a tolerable basis on which our countries and the countries which have Communist regimes may live side by side in peace.

The United States, much the most powerful nation in this collective arrangement, is its leader. As we see it, in the light of all the circumstances of the post-war period, the readiness of the United States to assume the responsibilities of a major power has been of very great benefit to the free world. We who live alongside of their great and dynamic nation know from our own long experience that the United States