

methods were, first, to advance objections because the charter of the league was not perfect. They were devastatingly effective, and nowhere more so than in the United States Senate. The battalion of death headed by Borah and Lodge placed the demolition charges under the bridge of collective security, and Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo saw to it that electric wires and fuses were well placed and did not fail when the firing trigger was pressed. Now that the world believes nothing without reservations and that we call ourselves realists, when perhaps we confuse realism with cynicism, we can approach the international issue without the sugar icing of Wilsonian idealism. We now get to the meat directly, and the meat we get to is power, and is called by that name. This is a tremendous gain over 1919.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first hypothesis is that the world wants peace. True, every member in this house wants peace and every Canadian wants peace all the time. But because we want peace, or because the huge majority of the rest of the world, war-worn and weary of devastation and bloodshed, wants peace, it does not automatically follow that all the world wants it too, and will continue to want it in the future.

The last effective long-time organization for peace was the *pax Britannica*; and the *pax Britannica*, which was in force for the years between the Napoleonic and the great wars—virtually a century—did not prevent war but it did localize war. During that time there were a number of wars in which the major countries of the world took part. First, there was the Crimean war in which Turkey, Great Britain and France were pitted against Russia. Because of Britain's command of the sea Russia was unable to attack the British isles; therefore the war was localized. Then there was the Franco-Prussian war, in which two major European countries, France and Prussia, fought bitterly. Alsace-Lorraine was overrun and Paris besieged and taken. But that war did not proceed any further. With the transfer of Alsace-Lorraine to Prussia, which became Germany, the war came to an end. Then there was the Russo-Japanese war. Here again two major powers fought, but the war was localized. One major mutiny, the Indian mutiny, occurred, and there was one important civil war, the civil war in the United States. There was the religious war of the Mahdi against the British in the Soudan and Egypt; and there was what is now considered by enlightened people everywhere a predatory war, known as the South African war. All these wars were localized, and they were localized because the power possessed by the British

fleet, which had a ratio of two to one over all the other fleets of the world during a great part of that time, prevented the spread of war. It was not because of modern inventions that war was prevented from spreading, because the Napoleonic wars were virtually world wars. They effected war in Canada, in the islands of Oceania, in Java and Sumatra, in southern India, and in Egypt, where, near Cairo, the battle of the Nile was fought; and almost the entire continent of Europe was also involved. At that time there was no guiding, overwhelming force to control and localize wars; and since the beginning of the German movement for equality of strength in naval armaments, Great Britain could not maintain a strong enough navy to guarantee world peace. So, in 1914, we had the first of the modern world wars.

Because we failed to heed the lesson of power we have had another world war within a period of a quarter of a century, the most devastating war in the world's history. We have now had a conference at Dumbarton Oaks, and for the first time since the ending of *pax Britannica* the world has admitted the necessity for power. I do not believe that this house is sufficiently aware of the tremendous import of the power clauses in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I propose to quote briefly the major power proposals of this conference. The first is in chapter V, section B, 1. It compares the proposals with the league of nations. In the league of nations both the assembly and the council could take action with regard to the settling of disputes and the maintenance of international peace and security. Under the charter of Dumbarton Oaks such action would rest solely with the security council. In other words the assembly is now relegated to an advisory position only. Under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals the general assembly will have the right to discuss any question relating to world peace, but if action were necessary it would be for the security council to decide and act. That is the first fundamental difference between the new proposals and the old league.

The next power clause is chapter VI, paragraph 4, which reads as follows:

The security council would have the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security; such responsibility to be freely conferred upon it by the charter by the members of the organization. The powers to be conferred on the security council are greater than have ever before been given to an international body.

I should like to repeat those words, "greater than have ever before been given to an international body."