

the result of good statisticians carrying the ball and skillful diplomats running interference for them. But, while we must have confidence in each other's intentions and resolve, as well as understanding of each other's special problems, we should at the same time tell each other what we are doing, or explain what we are not doing, in this collective effort to establish and preserve the peace.

So I would like to say just a word of Canada's record as a member of the team and give you some evidence to show that while we are making great progress at home in the development of our resources and economic strength, we are also shouldering our fair share of the direct burden of collective defence.

We are spending this year on defence and defence aid to other North Atlantic countries, in terms of your total national income and making no allowance for our lower per capita figure, the equivalent of thirty-eight billions of dollars. Since the war we have given assistance to our friends in the form of grants, gifts or credits the equivalent of nearly forty billions of dollars. We have at the moment the third largest U.N. force in Korea. We have also a Brigade Group in Germany as part of NATO forces, and are committed to sending there, by the end of 1953, an air division of 12 jet fighter squadrons.

I know that our contribution is very small in absolute terms compared with your gigantic effort, but no country in the world of our size and position is doing more in discharging its international responsibilities.

Canadians, almost without exception, are glad to take part in this great collective undertaking - this partnership for peace. But we hope that it will remain collective, with all members of the group working together; consulting together, so that all - large and small - may have a real sense of participation; of marching together instead of tagging along.

This means - if I may put it this way - that smaller countries like Canada who pay only a comparatively small part of the pipers' wages, may object once in a while if they don't like the tune that has been called. They may even ask occasionally to select an encore. It also means that once the piece has begun all the members of the orchestra should play the part assigned to them with a minimum of discordant notes.

This recognition of individual interest along with collective action is, of course, in the best North American tradition. It used to express itself at the town meeting in questions about "no taxation without representation." Today our preoccupation might be described in the words "no annihilation without consultation."

The application to international affairs of this principal of free consultation and co-operation between big and small, in a manner which will keep all the members of the group reasonably contented, is not going to be easy. It will require the patience of a Job and the understanding of a Solomon; the resource of a Houdini, and the persistence of a Robert the Bruce.