

I said in the House of Commons last January that it was indeed true beyond question "that the peace of the world depends on preserving on the side of peace a large superiority of power so that those who wish to disturb the peace can have no chance of success." In recent weeks the Germans have added to their armoury of weapons a new instrument of blind destruction, the use of which may serve to underline the thought which I then expressed. The "flying bomb" of to-day is a weapon in its infancy. If it is developed with all the resources and ingenuity of modern science, we may find in a few years that it has become an engine of war which without warning and in no time at all could be used to destroy peaceful countries from afar. The weapon which the Germans are using so indiscriminately against southern England may be as crude in performance in comparison with its successors as was the tank first used in battle on the Somme in September, 1916, in comparison with the latest tanks now in production.

We must indeed preserve a large superiority of power on the side of peace. We shall have that power among the United Nations from the hour of victory. We must keep it in the first place to disarm our enemies and prevent a revival of barbaric militarism in their countries. We must keep it also not only to meet dangers from other quarters which might arise, but to further constructive solutions of the problems which give rise to such dangers.

Canadians should, I think, approach these great questions of the organization of security with two main objects in mind: first, that the methods adopted should be as effective as can be contrived; and, second, that they should safeguard the interests of Canada and commend themselves to the Canadian people so that they can secure steady public support.

There is no constitutional cure for the diseases of international society. Indeed, perhaps one of the errors into which many people fell between the two wars was to feel that the establishment of the League of Nations had somehow itself removed the danger of war. The League was an institution which provided a method and occasion for international co-operation. Without the will to co-operate through the League machinery on the part of countries possessing a large superiority of power, the League could not succeed. It used to be said, in the language current at Geneva, that what was the matter with the League was its lack of universality. This did not mean that a League to which some states did not belong was ineffective; it did mean, however, that unless all or nearly all the most powerful states belonged to the League and accepted its basic principles the League machinery was inadequate to prevent the possibility of war.

We should be able to make a better start now. The four greatest states among the United Nations have joined in the Moscow declaration and there can be no doubt that the rest of the United Nations fully endorse its terms. In the organization of power it is for the most powerful states to take the lead. This is a correct application of the functional idea of international organization. The outlines of the plan which are now emerging involve a constitution generally similar to that of the League of Nations, including an Assembly in which all member states would be equally represented and a Council consisting of representatives of the greatest powers, together with a few other members. Great emphasis is being placed on the authority