

The conference at San Francisco had been called by your President. The proposal for a worldwide organization to maintain peace and security in the world was sponsored by your government, and was already receiving the support of the best elements in both your historic political parties.

It was reassuring to us in Canada to see that your conclusions were the same as ours; that you had become convinced the United States could not again turn its back on the rest of the world, and that this country must actually take the lead in international affairs.

There are many people who feel that the calling of the conference at San Francisco and the establishment of the United Nations, with the United States as its leading member, represents a revolution in your foreign policy. I venture to suggest to you that this is a superficial view; that, in fact, it represents a revolutionary change only in method, and that there has been no real change in the fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States.

I said at the beginning of these remarks that the real aim of your Founding Fathers was to have this country left in peace by the rest of the world to develop a free and expanding society on this continent. I believe that is still the real aim of the American people, and I know it is the real aim of the Canadian people. We do not want to dominate anybody. We do not want to throw our weight around anywhere. But we do not want to let events take such a course that we will find ourselves a third time, as we did in 1914 and in 1939, with no real choice but to take part in a world war.

The change, I believe is not in aim but in method. Perhaps your hopes in the United States were a little stronger than ours were in Canada, but we all shared the hope—that, if we simply minded our own business and did not trespass on the rights of others, we might remain at peace. We now see that, if we are to have peace, the people and the governments of this continent have no choice but to take positive and sustained action to help prevent another war.

It might be said that we have already failed in that task because of what has happened in Korea. To those in that unhappy land there certainly has been no peace. But I think that our action there is designed to prevent aggression from spreading into a general world conflict.

Peace is still our aim, but we see that to have peace we must go about it differently. To the vast majority of North Americans on both sides of the border, keeping the peace is the most important business we have or we can have. It is the greatest national interest of the United States as it is the greatest national interest of Canada.

No doubt it is still true that, if a world war came in 1951, other countries in the old world would suffer more immediate destruction and devastation than this continent—though we could certainly not expect to go untouched. But on the other hand, we on this North American continent are today the most privileged people on earth. Having the most to lose by the devastation and dislocation of a world war, we have the strongest incentive to prevent one. By taking positive steps to prevent war, we inevitably take the kind of action which might be regarded as provocative by the only possible major aggressor. This is the kind of calculated risk which every businessman and every economist understands. In any case there is no real choice. We know what did happen when we were not ready to take such risks.

In the first year or two after San Francisco, we continued to hope, against hope, that the great powers in the United Nations which had been charged with the main responsibility for maintaining peace and security in the world would, in fact, cooperate to that end. But the prospect of that co-operation grew dimmer and dimmer, because one of the great powers seemed bent on different ends, and many of us in