

will allow for effective leadership and yet give a strong sense of participation to all those countries which are contributing military forces. The same problem has also risen within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Canada shares with her allies a real concern in finding a solution to this problem. The field of our foreign interests and the extent of our military commitments have in recent months been almost visibly stretched; and such a process can never be accomplished without discomfort. This will be eased and Canada's participation made most effective only if Canadians can be made to feel that their share in the vital decisions which must be made is proportionate to their contribution. But that is a necessity for many other countries besides Canada. Indeed, it is a requirement to which great importance is attached by all countries which, like my own, have voluntarily and wholeheartedly accepted the leadership of the United States.

There is, I think, no task more difficult of accomplishment than the leadership of a coalition of friendly but free nations, agreed on objectives but not always agreed on how they should be reached. The operation of a coalition in wartime, as all history teaches, is difficult enough. It is more difficult in peacetime when the absence of external danger accentuates the importance of smaller conflicts of interest and advantage between the various allies. It is most difficult of all in a time such as the present of "partial peace"—or, if you like, "phony peace"—when the threat to security is present but when the willingness to strive and sacrifice which accompanies an all-out armed struggle for survival can be maintained only with great effort. The problem is complicated by the necessity of basing our association on a theory of sovereign equality of states, which is sometimes hard to square with the fact that the states concerned are unequal in power and in responsibility. The reconciliation of fact and theory will require among all of us qualities of restraint, understanding and tolerance; a vision wider than our own national boundaries.

Mr. Acheson put the point wisely and succinctly when he said on June 29 in Washington that "the pattern of responsibility within which we operate is a responsibility to interests which are broader than our own. . . ." We in Canada are confident that such a pattern of responsibility and such a mode of freely accepted association can increasingly be realized. In that confidence, we will continue to make our contribution to the creation of a peaceful world in which freedom can be secure.