

national power goes hand in hand with the establishment of international power, that they must proceed at one and the same time, and that perhaps the growth may be slow. But do not let us stand in the way of these steps along the road to cooperation, because the instrument is not one hundred per cent perfect.

Speaking in this house in 1943 I quoted these words, which are just as true now as they were then:

To-day the problem of durable peace is being discussed from so many angles that the public is in danger of confusion. If, before we can have peace, the income of every person must be guaranteed, if every vestige of racial or social discrimination must be obliterated, if every man must adhere to rules which mortals have never learned completely to live by, then peace is indeed a complicated business, and not to be achieved short of a perfect world.

Wonders have been accomplished sometimes with instruments that have not been perfect, and this goes a long way toward answering questions which have puzzled the world for years.

Should Canada take part in the formation of a new security league I say we desire to do so, and we must. It is the supreme interest of the nation. Only by widespread co-operation can the nations set up a durable association. It will never be done by sitting back and letting others go ahead. It will never be done by speaking publicly or even officially of the peace we want. It will be done only by getting in there, talking and discussing and doing our part. Canada must play its part in the formation of an organization for the maintenance of peace, just as it is doing its part in the holocaust of war. We must, I say. Mechanical inventions have made this world small. No great city is more than sixty air hours from any other great city. Science has developed fearful weapons, and will continue to improve them. Canada is at the cross-roads among the great nations of the world. Our geographical position has been a factor in saving us from the horrors of invasion, and we have had a good neighbour. We are thankful for that, and thankful for the commonwealth of which we are a part. But even so there have been submarines in our waters. Even so during the last few years there was a threat of invasion. In another few years our geographical position may make us the battleground, the Belgium between great powers, unless those powers, through some organization such as is now suggested, decide that the things upon which they are in agreement are more important than those which divide them.

What other alternatives have we? Maintain neutrality and mind our own business? Norway did that; Holland wanted to live and let

live, and what happened? Ireland was saved by her geographical position, by the British navy and by the conscience of the united nations. You may say we should make no military preparations; that we should not arm. As late as 1936 the view was asserted in this very house that we should rely for protection upon our weakness and our position as a good neighbour of the world. Did Denmark's helplessness save that country from occupation? You may say we should make treaties of non-aggression with other countries. Poland did that. Should we build an immense army? Russia did that, at the expense of almost every material comfort for her civilians. No, there seems no other hope for the world, and for Canada as part of the world, but getting together now, while the will to cooperate is strong, to set up international organizations of the free with the free, the equal with the equal, with as much justice as is capable of achievement.

Speaking in this house two years ago I gave my reasons for believing that a new attempt to build an international association would succeed, and those reasons are still valid. The league of nations did not keep peace; it had weaknesses which may be avoided now. Men learn from their mistakes as well as their successes. We are learning a second drastic lesson. Again the world is being hammered into a realization of the need of one country for the other in preserving and maintaining peace. The league of nations accomplished a tremendous amount of good work in many fields, exploratory work that provides a solid foundation for renewed effort. How far did the first airship fly? Did they give up that experiment? Supposing this should fail, for any reasons you may like to mention. Should the experiment be given up? No. If the league did nothing else but stir up thought, it justified its life. For centuries the world has known how to unite to make war. It has never known how to unite to make peace. There must be an alternative way to settle disputes if war is not to continue; so the proposed charter provides for arbitration, for conciliation, for reference to a court of international justice, all methods which depend on the desire of the disputants to avoid war, and on the good will of those who ask for arbitration.

But the charter goes farther than that. It makes it the responsibility of the security council, the representatives of the big five and six other members elected from the other nations, to see that the matter is settled without resort to arms; and back of the obligation to settle disputes by peaceful means is the