

The truth is that states combine readily through fear and very seldom through a desire for the common good, and when Louis XIV ceased to be formidable each state thought exclusively of its own interests.

It was in the same year, 1713, that the great learned scholar, Abbé de St. Pierre first set out the theory of collective security in France. He went to a very able cardinal of France, Cardinal Fleury and asked him to consider the scheme. The cardinal replied, "Have you sent out missionaries to turn the hearts of men?" I think that is what we should do down in San Francisco. We should send out missionaries among some of these forty nations, including some of the four neutrals.

Nothing more was heard of collective security until in 1815 Emperor Alexander I of Russia proposed what is known as the Holy Alliance or the Concert of Europe. Between whom? Between Russia, Prussia and Austria. They were to meet every few years, the contracting parties look over the face of Europe and see how peace and security was. What did it lead to? It led to the great prime minister of Great Britain, George Canning, urging that Britain should get out of Europe and seek a new alliance for a while; and it led by provocation to the United States adopting the Monroe doctrine in 1823. As Lord Castlereagh, the great foreign minister wrote to Lord Liverpool in 1815 at the Quai D'Orsay, "It was not without difficulty that we went through the interview with becoming gravity." It was the spiritual force behind the Concert of Europe of which Russia, Austria and Prussia were the protagonists. They were the high contracting parties. It lasted eight years, its most notable achievement being that it provoked the United States into establishing the Monroe doctrine in 1823.

Then another century passed and you have the league established which I have referred to before, and now Dumbarton Oaks. Mr. Disraeli, speaking in the British House of Commons on July 4, 1864, said:

I lay this down as a great principle which cannot be controverted in the management of our foreign affairs. If England is resolved upon a particular policy war is not probable. If there is under these circumstances a cordial alliance between England and France war is most difficult. But if there is a thorough understanding between England, France and Russia, war is impossible.

If in connection with this matter we substitute the United States or add it to these countries there is hope for the world by power alliance policies. With the alliance between United States, Britain and Russia, if they continue as they have so admirably done during this war there is hope for the world in collective security but not in the old forms of league political security.

I wish to refer to a great textbook writer on foreign affairs, Mr. Walter Lippmann. He has, according to a great editor of the *National Review*, written a textbook on the war aims of the United States. I read it three times. He was one of the sponsors in that great country of the league of nations under Mr. Wilson. He has recorded the action he took and he is candid enough to admit he was wrong in 1919, and now knows it. To those who were always convinced of the dangerous folly of the whole Wilsonian theory and who marvelled at the blindness of our English pacifists, Mr. Lippmann's book will bring evidence that the day of that particular lunacy is over in the United States. He saw the errors of Geneva. He knows that collective security is a dangerous myth. He is now in favour of the policy of the balance of power. He urges his own countrymen not to make promises unless they are sure to keep them and not to threaten when they cannot themselves carry out their threats.

I commend this book to those who are going to this conference; the author is in favour of a good understanding between the United States and the British empire, and also Russia. At the time of the Venezuelan controversy a great prime minister of Britain, Mr. Balfour, speaking at Manchester in 1896 said: "That the time must come when some statesman of greater authority even than Monroe will lay down the doctrine between English-speaking peoples that war is impossible". I am not going to be a party of the liquidation of the British empire through any such economic council as is here proposed at Dumbarton Oaks. The British empire has stood for centuries like the rock of ages for the peace and security of the world. Next to the Christian church the British empire has done more for freedom, liberty, humanity and civilization and for the peace and security of the world than any other agency, and no one else has done so much for the weaker nations. Britain has protected them with her fleet for four centuries, and even during this war. The tragedy which has overtaken civilization in the past twenty years was born of the league of nations and all its works.

In my opinion the future of Canada and the future of the United States lie in their own peoples. We need the closest and most absolute cooperation and collaboration and understanding between this country and the rest of the British empire, and between Canada and the United States. Our position is of great importance. Our air policy, for instance, should be planned in close consultation with Britain, and we should have an empire council such as has been advocated by Mr. Curtin