

fields. In all of these fields there are other agencies already at work. We must avoid duplicating their efforts. These agencies have memberships wider than that of NATO. It is desirable that the approach to all of the economic, social and cultural problems should be on as universal a basis as possible.

Yesterday in an address I delivered to the University of British Columbia, I drew attention to the importance of maintaining the unity of the free world. One of the greatest threats to this unity is the possible splitting up of the free nations into a number of economic blocs each of which would be discriminating against the others. This possibility has always been present but will become inevitable if we are not able to make progress along the lines of a collective approach to multi-lateral trade and payments. Such a collective approach is embraced by the proposals of the United Kingdom Government which emerged from the Commonwealth Economic Conference held in London towards the end of last year. An essential part of these proposals is that there should be a reduction in tariffs and other barriers to trade. In particular, the United States should make it possible for the other nations of the free world to sell more of their products in the markets of the United States and thereby earn the dollars which are required in order to maintain the viability of their economies.

The people of the United States have been brought up to believe that their prosperity and their high standard of living are based upon the protection afforded against imports from abroad. It is difficult to convert them all at once to the realization that both their prosperity and their security are dependent upon a more liberal attitude towards imports. If they are not so converted we shall not have that contribution by the United States which is essential to the success of a collective approach. The alternative, as I have mentioned, would be the splitting up of the free nations into a number of economic blocs. Such a chaotic state of affairs would be the reverse of the economic collaboration envisaged in Article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty. It is important, therefore, that the NATO countries, through their Council, should direct attention to these possibilities. Action, however, to bring about a collective approach must be left to other agencies because it has to be on a broader basis than that of NATO.

In the address I delivered yesterday, I also mentioned two of the other cleavages that are threatening to disrupt the unity of the free world. One of these is the division between developed and undeveloped countries, or between the "haves" and the "have nots". The other is the division between the anti-colonial countries and those with dependent territories. It so happens that the most highly developed countries are members of NATO. All the colonial powers also are members of NATO. Consequently, we must be careful to assure that the North Atlantic countries do not assume positions which will be resented by the rest of the free world. Being the most advanced countries they are in the best position to give leadership but this leadership must take the form of the extension of co-operation and must be free of any implication of a desire to dominate.

You can see from all this that it is very desirable that NATO should not seek to duplicate the agencies which are already available and which have memberships wider than the