

independent unlimited political authority or jurisdiction, and this perhaps is most strikingly illustrated by the absence from the charter of any reference to the right or method of withdrawal. A nation can therefore withdraw its membership at any time, but of course it is expected that it will state its reason for so doing. The only recourse in that event is the judgment of world opinion, and then its position becomes the same as that of a nation that had never joined; that is, it would be subject to action by the organization if it threatened the peace of the world. Perhaps if the united nations conference had met subsequent to August 6 instead of in the pre-atomic era the disposition of individual nations to retain unlimited sovereign power might have been modified. Many delegates undoubtedly shared the view of Premier Soong of China, who some time before the conference said this:

Past failures have not dimmed our hopes that an effective world instrument to dispense and enforce justice will arise from the terrors, sufferings and sacrifices of this war: for such an international government China, with all other liberty loving nations, will gladly cede such of its sovereign powers as may be required.

But in June, 1945, a majority of the nations at least were not prepared to go that far. It may be that the application of atomic power to the instruments of war will make nations reconsider their attitudes towards this problem. Our scientists tell us frankly that the secret of the atomic bomb cannot be withheld from any modern industrial power, and that a nation using it in a surprise attack could in a few hours destroy another great nation's ability to defend itself. If anything were needed to underline the need for an effective international organization to dispense and enforce justice, the atomic bomb should be sufficient. General Marshall of the United States army has warned the world, however, that robot bombs, in addition to atomic bombs, travelling to selected targets through the stratosphere at incredible speeds and for almost unlimited distances with unerring aim, are already assured. That being so, the armies and navies of three months ago—in the pre-atomic age, if you care to call it so—are to some extent obsolete, making both national defence, as we have understood it in the past, and isolationism, terms that have little meaning in the dreadful prospect of another war.

Thus, while we must accept and endorse the document before us, a new agreement in the light of recent developments becomes, I believe, a necessity now; and that agreement will have to recognize that no nation, great or small, can safely continue to retain

its own independent unlimited authority and jurisdiction in its external affairs. In its own interests it must agree to a limitation of its sovereign power to do as it pleases, because its own security requires that the power of its neighbour to do as it pleases shall be limited also. That involves indeed no real loss of sovereignty but rather an extension of it.

In our own communities we obey the law which we ourselves have made for our own protection as well as for the protection of our neighbours. Indeed, democratically-made law extends our individual influence, our individual power, our personal sovereignty, if you will, beyond ourselves into the wider field of the life of the whole community. Democratic law is thus an insurance against harm to ourselves as well as harm to our neighbours. In the same way and in the same sense I believe that collective security among nations—sovereign in domestic issues—will be in effect an extension of our national influence, our national jurisdiction, our national sovereignty, far beyond our national borders; thus giving us a voice in influencing conditions beyond our borders which determine depression or prosperity, war or peace, affecting for good or ill all within our borders.

A limitation, then, to do as each nation pleases externally, would be not a limitation of national freedom as distinct from international licence, but a very real extension of our power to exercise a new and important control of our nation's destiny among the nations of the world and thus to secure still greater internal freedom for our people.

Membership, then, in the united nations organization will give Canada a voice in influencing conditions far beyond our borders. The alternative is isolationism, a narrow isolationism which, if all nations pursue it, will lead to international anarchy, international chaos, and another world war. But in the world in which we live isolation is not a policy; it is a myth. Canadians must have done with it. Yet as I see it, the alternative to a world organization for the prevention of war and the pacific settlement of disputes is some new attempt at that mythical isolationism through national self-sufficiency, or in another form, association with some economically, numerically and politically strong power bloc, which in turn will promote the formation of another powerful, self-sufficient and therefore isolated bloc. But with the development of such scientific weapons of warfare as the robot plane and the atomic bomb, this can offer no permanent hope of peace or security. On the contrary it will breed fierce competition and lead again to another war. However we look at this: