

It is not only medical men who must believe in and act on this philosophy. It is today burned into the souls of all of us. Our deepest hopes and our most terrible anxieties centre around the question of peace or war in the atomic age. There are other problems of course, many of which may seem closer to home like taxes and the cost of steaks or the stupidity of those who govern us. But that of peace between peoples transcends everything, now that "science has been harnessed to the chariot of destruction", and we realize that war might be the end of all.

A poll was taken in Canada the other day by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion. I confess that my feeling about polls is that which I have about pills, they can be very useful if taken in moderation and with care. But I certainly agree with the result of this poll which showed that 22 per cent of those who were asked "What is the greatest single problem facing the government?" replied "War and defence", while the next group, only 8 per cent were worried more about the high cost of living.

How, then, are we doing in the effort to prevent war? Has there been any fundamental change in the nature and urgency of the menace that faces us?

The answer to the last question is "no". The danger to peace and the threat to freedom remain as immediate and as menacing as ever. There may be an easing of the situation here or a deterioration there; in Western Europe some of the feeling of imminent crisis and danger has disappeared; in Asia it has increased. But the menace of Soviet imperialism exploiting the doctrine of revolutionary Communism with its conscious agents in the members of every Communist party in the world, including the one in Canada, that menace remains. We should never forget for one moment that we are facing the cruellest, most powerful, best organized conspiracy in all history. But this doesn't mean that the conspiracy will inevitably erupt in World War Three. It may or it may not. The decision is not primarily and directly in the hands of the free world. It is in the minds of the conspirators of Moscow. Our duty - we who are free - is to do what we can to convince them that if they make the wrong decision they will meet a powerful and united resistance by the free world, and one which gives them no chance of success. By so doing, we can influence powerfully the decision against aggressive military action.

This organization of resistance to aggression should be, and one day, we must hope, will be through the United Nations. At the moment, this is not possible and so today our most effective agency for building up our collective strength to preserve the peace is NATO.

It was, I think, in this room on September 2, 1947, many months before the North Atlantic Pact was actually signed, that I ventured to say:

"If forced, we might make special security arrangements within the United Nations, inviting all those member states to participate in them who are willing to build up an agency within the Organization which would have the power which the whole Organization does not possess under the charter If it is desired to work out a special arrangement for collective security to include those democratic and freedom-loving states who are willing to give up certain sovereign rights in the interests of peace and safety, why shouldn't it be done? Especially as any arrangement of this kind would have to be consistent with the Charter of the United Nations. . . ."