

over border questions or over trade and commercial matters. They were the kind of disputes that neighbours have over a line fence or an exchange of produce, and in both countries we have developed the habit of settling such disputes without consulting the magistrate or the village constable.

We must show the same spirit in considering the new problems which will confront us now as allies. These problems will often be of a far more serious kind, since they will be concerned with the policies of an alliance of which the United States is the acknowledged leader but in which Canada also has an important role to play. Those policies will concern nothing less than our very survival as free peoples. We will not experience much difficulty, I imagine, in agreeing on objectives. However, it is inevitable that from time to time we should differ on how those objectives can best be achieved. We must expect that Canadian policies will sometimes be under criticism in the United States and that United States policies will be criticized in Canada. In the United States there may be a temptation to feel that any criticism of that country by Canadians is inappropriate, since the United States is bearing heavier responsibilities than any other country for the defence of the free world. I hope that this temptation will be held in check by an awareness that the policies pursued by the North Atlantic Alliance are as much a matter of life and death for Canadians as they are for Americans. In Canada, on the other hand, there may be a temptation to resent criticism from the United States on the ground that it overlooks the fact that, although Canada is contributing men and arms, its voice can never be decisive in deciding how those resources should be employed. I hope that this temptation in Canada will be curbed by recognizing that the weight our representations will have in the North Atlantic Council and in other bodies where the policies of the free world are being decided will be in large part determined by the part we are willing and able to play in increasing the strength of the alliance.

We will then not be able to avoid some differences over the policies to be followed. Nor may we be able entirely to avoid, I am afraid, invidious comparisons about the sacrifices and contributions of the various allies. After all we are free and democratic peoples and we are not going to forego the right to talk and even to wrangle. But let us do our best in our talks to keep a sense of responsibility, a sense of proportion and even a sense of humour.

History shows that the task of maintaining a military alliance in peace-time is always extremely difficult, especially when one member is so much stronger than the other members of the alliance. It calls for great restraint as well as great exertions on the part of all the partners in the alliance. Responsible politicians in democratic countries have always had in the back of their minds, I think, a sense of their duty to civilization as well as to their own countries. That sense of duty to civilized values and the cause of freedom must now be brought into the forefront of our minds. It must colour our words and our decisions. For the present, our association in the North Atlantic area is merely an alliance and not a federation. But increasingly we must try to show as much concern for the interests of every member of the alliance as would be necessary in a North Atlantic federation. We must examine our actions and statements in the light of that broad responsibility and we must consider the effect of national decisions not only on