

to conclude that the aggression is not of a kind that entails the obligation to provide any help at all.

Yet there can be no doubt that the Atlantic Pact has had a very salutary effect. When James Monroe was President of the United States, George Canning was Foreign Secretary of Britain, and through emissaries, or directly, Canning four times asked Monroe to make a declaration—which he finally did make—and for more than a century that declaration of what is known as the Monroe Doctrine remained the basic principle of United States foreign policy. Now by signing the Atlantic Pact the United States has abandoned the principle of neutrality—of isolationism, if you prefer—set out in the Monroe Doctrine. Is that abandonment not tantamount to an acknowledgment by the United States of the necessary interdependence and co-ordination of nations? Let us thank the Almighty for this change in American foreign policy, for thereby freedom throughout the world has gained a powerful ally.

Should I speak of the failure of the League of Nations? Should I say that notwithstanding the good faith, the endeavours and the hard work of the majority of the nations, they could not establish peace in the world? There was then, as there is today, disunity among the countries which created the League of Nations and were parties to it. Nevertheless, there was an effort put forth, and it is human that we should sometimes consider more the effort put forth than the goal attained. Certainly there is proof that the ambition of a majority of the nations has been to know peace, tranquillity and stability.

The United Nations Organization has accomplished much since its inception; yet, apart from one treaty of peace which it effected, the others are waiting to be signed. Why? It is because of disunity among the member nations. Egoism will always exist; it cannot be removed from nations any more than from the individuals who compose them. When I read the proceedings of the United Nations I sometimes ask myself: Have we by this organization furnished communistic Russia with the safest possible forum for her propaganda?

I suppose it is useless for me to mention the error made at the San Francisco conference when the right of veto was granted. I condemn no one, because I think everyone knows that the treaty of the alliance signed at San Francisco never would have been signed if the veto had not been assented to. Yet, this is the cancer from which the United Nations may die.

Sometimes one is inclined to think that Stalin does not care very much about the

frictions which take place between what he may call the enemy nations. I have before me a statement which he made in answer to a series of articles written by Chicherin, a former aristocrat, and at the time of writing, Foreign Commissar. Stalin had this to say:

I consider that these articles of Chicherin, which I have read carefully, are nothing but words. Comrade Chicherin is inclined to deny the existence of friction between the imperialist states, to exaggerate the international harmony of the imperialists, and to overlook and underestimate the internal friction within these groups. Yet these frictions do exist. They lead to war. These frictions should form the basis for the activities of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

A little further on Stalin says:

The whole purpose of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs is to ascertain these frictions, to make them the basis of its activities, and to manoeuvre within them.

Is it not possible that by means of a world government—call it, if you like, a federal union or an Atlantic union—we would have more assurance and more power to counteract the efforts of the Kremlin to crush our civilization? I say very humbly that undoubtedly we would have more power. Why? We have seen that under the Atlantic Pact there is no obligation on the part of member nations to fight, except when they believe that aggression entails on their part an obligation to join in. Under a federal union—and I am not going into the details, because there would have to be a convention and the countries ready to join would work them out—every country agreeing to come into it would be represented by a delegate, either appointed or elected by that country. The result would be that the delegate when speaking in the assembly of such a federal union would engage the responsibility of the government which he represented. The majority would be supreme. No veto could stop the federal union assembly discussing any question or making decisions on any problems. Do you not believe that these delegates, which should not be great in number, would exercise a tremendous influence and carry a weight which those who represent the nations in the Atlantic Pact do not carry?

But I am not without a suspicion—indeed, nor without the knowledge—that many obstacles will have to be overcome before so lofty a goal can be attained. It is evident that we shall have to take into consideration the egoism of nations, their desire to dominate, and their reluctance to yield even the smallest part of their sovereignty. And such a concession would be necessary. A federal union government, if it is to possess any importance or have any influence, would require, first, the power to conduct foreign relations, to declare peace and war, to raise and maintain an armed force. Next, it must have the right to coin