

(Continued from P. 1)

MR. PEARSON'S WASHINGTON SPEECH

by no means negligible number on our side find they are running into difficulties concerned, though, as we see it, often not very importantly concerned, with security. It would be a sad day, and not only for our after dinner speakers, if our boundary became a sticky one and difficult to cross.

Most Canadians, unless they speak French, are hardly distinguishable from Americans. Differences between a Georgian and Minnesotan are often superficially greater than those between a Chicagoan and a Torontonion. But this very intimacy has its dangers. It means that our disagreements, when we have them, take on a sort of family character.

May I give you a personal example. If some European journalist or lecturer said or wrote that Canada's External Affairs Minister was a 'Pink', I wouldn't hear much if anything about it, I suppose; and if I did I would put it down to the childish ignorance of some benighted foreigner. If a comparable American said the same thing, it wouldn't even have to be translated; and would get in the Canadian papers. My reaction, until my better self asserted itself, would be almost a domestic one. "He can't do that to me. Didn't I tell the Rotary Club at Washington's Corners only last week that I was heart and soul with the great United States in the struggle against communism?"

AMERICAN NEWS

Also, your closeness to us in so many ways, coupled with our dependence on you in so many ways, means that we read and see and listen to almost as much American news as you do yourself; and we follow it with the same intensity; with a mixture of admiration, anxiety and awe! Some of this news, which we get in such abundance, does not put you in a very good light, for we hear more often about your controversies than your colleges.

Furthermore, it would be a great mistake to think that, because our countries are so close, so alike in so many ways, we are identical in all things.

Our political system . . . is different from yours. That difference, to cite one illustration, shows itself in the way we deal with the danger of communist subversion. We leave that to the agencies of government appointed for that purpose, who work quietly and, we think fairly and effectively and normally without benefit of headline; and who are all responsible to some Minister. He in his turn is responsible to Parliament.

But there is another important aspect of our relationship; that which arises out of your position as the leader of a great coalition, determining issues which may mean peace or atomic war.

Canadian-United States relations, in this sense, are merely part of the relations be-

tween members of a coalition of which by far the mightiest member is the United States, but in which Canada is now strong enough to make a contribution of some importance; one which we think entitles us to an appropriate share in the responsibility of making those decisions which affect us.

We realize, of course, that by far the greatest share of the burden is borne by this country; that American power will be decisive in defeating aggression just as its policies are of primary importance in preventing it. Consequently we recognize that there have been and will be occasions when, in case of differences, the views of the United States should prevail in the councils of the coalition.

Canadians realize that we are very fortunate in that the shadow over us is an American and not a communist one; that our relationship is one of free partnership and not communist master and servant. We know also that when the United States has to make decisions that affect its friends, it will always do its best to consult with those friends. But that doesn't completely remove our anxiety over our present position, as a junior member of a coalition in a world poised uneasily on the very edge of an atomic abyss. Nor is this to be expected.

COLLECTIVE ACTION

Next time, there will be no gradual and individual wading into the cold waters of total war. It is more likely to be, for allies, a dive in together from the spring board of collective action.

Indeed, that is the very purpose of NATO, to ensure that in defence we act together and act at once, in the hope, founded on the lamentable experience of the past, that we may thereby not have to act at all.

Mr. Dulles, in a speech on January 12, which may turn out to be one of the most important of our times, announced, as a basic principle for defence action, a Washington decision, and I quote from his speech, ". . . to depend principally upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means, and at places of our own choosing".

From our point of view, it is important that the "our" in this statement should mean those who have agreed, particularly in NATO, to work together and by collective action, to prevent war or, if that should fail, to win it.

But what effect will that have on the other words "instantly" and "means"?

Collective action means collective consultation but that must be reconciled with the necessity for swift and effective action. This reconciliation is not always easy, even within a single government. It is less easy between governments.

Diplomacy, now more necessary than ever, includes two things; first the effort, patient and persistent, to settle differences with those whom we rightly fear, though at times,