

out from precedent to precedent it must embody a dynamic idea and ideal. The concentration on security, and on the need to marshal overwhelming force to meet threats to security, is not enough. Security from war is indeed essential, but real security requires international action and organization in many other fields—in social welfare, in trade, in technical progress, in transportation, and in economic development. The general aim must be to lower the temperature of nationalism, while preserving its good features, and thus to diminish national rivalries and reduce the importance of frontiers. This requires that there should be a wide and fruitful area of collaboration, including the continuance of part of the elaborate system of war-time co-operation which we have built up among the allies under stress of danger.

It is perhaps natural that after so many weary years of war some people, looking back perhaps to the high hopes of twenty-five years ago and recalling their disenchantment, should take a gloomy view of what can be accomplished. We must not fear the future. Canadians have every right to be proud not only of what their country has achieved but of what it can achieve. We must not on the other hand think that everything will be simple, that in facing the issues both at home and abroad we can slip into easy ways, and postpone decisions or leave the decisions to other and more powerful states. The opportunity is great, perhaps the greatest that has ever faced mankind. So too will the effort be great which is required to take advantage of the opportunity. Men in all countries will need to make that effort if success is to be attained.

We and the other nations of the Commonwealth already have with the United States what Mr. Churchill has called a "fraternal association". Inside the Commonwealth we already have between its members the type of international relations which we hope to see in wider fields. Many times in recent months, though not too often, there has been described and praised the intimate system of collaboration which prevails within the commonwealth. There is little that I should add to-day, although I think it would be desirable for me to place on record, as I did in an address before the two houses of parliament in London, the methods of co-operation between different parts of the Commonwealth which we believe will best serve to bring about the unity of policy which is desirable for us to have in all matters of imperial concern, and also best serve to keep as largely together as may be possible the points of view of all nations in regard to policies that may make for future peace.

On one point, however, I have noticed since my return from the meeting of Prime Ministers in London a tendency in certain quarters in Canada to revive controversy over an issue which has been settled. This is the issue whether the British Commonwealth should seek always to speak with a single voice and should be permanently represented as such on the new world council.

Right Hon. Peter Fraser, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, was questioned on this by the press when he was recently in Ottawa. He answered:—

There is no question about any of our Prime Ministers or countries delegating to the United Kingdom or any other Dominion the right to speak for our respective countries. That is fundamental. . . . Co-operation, solidarity, help in peace and war, yes; but not subordinating any opinions that our respective governments arrive at.