

means that a government responsible to the voters in one nation must, in determining its policy, take into account the effect of its action not only on the people of its own country but on the people of its allies. The government of Canada may, for example, on a certain issue have to weigh in the balance the direct interests of a section of the Canadian people, who may be adversely affected by a certain decision, against the interests of a section of, say, the people of France. And the people of France have no votes in Canadian elections!

This is a difficult position for any democratic government. But is it not the kind of position which we in Canada and you in the United States have for generations expected our governments to take when they are dealing with problems arising out of the direct relations between Canada and the United States? Is not this the kind of position which we expect a good neighbour to take when he is dealing with a good neighbour?

At the beginning of my address I said that before August 24, 1949, the date of the coming into force of the North Atlantic Treaty, we had been good neighbours. On that day we became allies - I hoped good allies. I now suggest that we will be good allies of each other and of our partners in the North Atlantic Treaty if we apply to the everyday work of the alliance the principle of the good neighbour.

This does not mean that we will not from time to time have differences of opinion. It does not mean that there won't occasionally be bickerings between us. We had lots of differences of opinion, lots of bickering during the period when we were merely good neighbours. Our accomplishment during that period was that from 1814 on we preserved peace between us in spite of occasional friction. Our task now is, even if occasionally frictions may develop between us, to co-operate to ensure the peace of the world. That will be the easier because of the fundamental and deep friendship between us.

During the past, Canada and the United States have been like two farmers who settled on adjoining farms in a pioneer community. For a time the smaller farmer feared that the larger was trying to get possession of his farm. Later he had an uneasy feeling that the larger almost always got the better of him in every dispute over where the line-fence ran. Even when the boundaries between the farms were established, the farmers had constant line-fence disputes. One by one, by constant reflection, restraint, forethought and watchfulness, they reduced the major areas of disagreement between them. They became good neighbours. They still had their line-fence problems but they had learned how to deal with them.

Lately a co-operative society has been formed in the community and the two farmers have joined it. Whereas previously their differences were concerned only with line-fence disputes, now they have differences of opinion about the policy of the co-operative, and the smaller farmer sometimes has the uneasy feeling that his neighbour gets his own way too often in the co-operative and doesn't always pay enough attention to the smaller farmer's views. The larger farmer in his turn may think that the smaller is too touchy and too demanding in support of his interests.