

perfectly clear that the rule of law cannot yet be established internationally. It seems to be equally clear that while the United Nations can do and is doing many good things, and while we should keep striving to make it more effective, nevertheless, it cannot in present circumstances give its members that security against aggression which they seek. It follows, therefore, that the next best way of dealing with aggression, or the threat of aggression, is for friendly states, who have confidence in each other's pacific intentions, to band together in order to be in a position to take collective police action against an aggressor. The North Atlantic Pact is such an arrangement. Its aim is to stop aggression before it starts by convincing the potential attacker that he would gain nothing by a resort to arms. If this can be done, then a better atmosphere can be created for the solution of those international problems which breed mistrust, fear and insecurity. Of course, without such a solution, neither the Atlantic nor any other peace pact can in the long run ensure peace.

The Atlantic Pact is, then, only a "second best", but surely it would be folly to reject it as such because at this time we cannot have the "best", which is an effective United Nations as the guarantor of security and the preserver of the peace.

As we face in the days ahead new international problems of anguishing complexity, may Canada play a worthy part in the attempts which must be made to solve them. She can only do this, however, if she is able to maintain and strengthen the cohesiveness, the stability and the progressive character of her own national life and her own democratic institutions. The first implications of our free society are, after all, domestic and concern the welfare of our own people. The quality of a state must be judged in terms of the life which its citizens live. Many ingredients enter into the good life. Physical security and economic well being are amongst them. But equally, if not more important are independence of spirit, the desire and ability to take initiative, a sense of purpose in life, and the opportunity to participate fully in the life of the community and to share in its responsibilities. These are attributes of citizenship which only a free society can give. If for any reason we lose them, the loss will not be compensated by any material gain. A recent novel by George Orwell, "1984", gives us a picture of a horrible society, replete with efficient devices and techniques of Government, in which the individual has been reduced, finally and irrevocably, to a controlled, directed, purposeless cypher. As one commentator puts it, it is "a world without religion, without art, without science, without freedom, without leisure, without privacy, without law — without any of the things that we today take as much for granted as air and water." The really disturbing thing about George Orwell's book is that it may be not phantasy but prophecy. The constant concern of a free society today must be to make sure that this terrible fate shall not overtake us. For this reason the public and the government alike must be vigilant to make sure that the policies we approve, the legislation we sanction, the administrative programmes we set in motion, in contributing to the welfare of the people, do not weaken our free society or endanger the institutions through which that society has grown. If we fail in this responsibility, then any discussion in the future of the implications for Canada of a free society will become academic and unreal or worse. Those indulging in it may find themselves locked up by the police of a "peoples democracy" as fascists and reactionaries. If so, I hope that my concentration camp will be on the shores of Lake Couchiching and that you will be my companions!

---