

ments. I am very doubtful whether bureaucracy will bring relief to the entire world. We had that sort of thing in the league of nations and it did not prove successful.

The Prime Minister said yesterday, as reported at page 30 of *Hansard*:

Even should the charter as finally drafted not be all that we could wish, its acceptance might nevertheless be preferable to its rejection.

Well, the question is not one of acceptance; the question is, shall a charter be prepared, which is altogether different. Instead of going to San Francisco to approve the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, without amendment, the proposal before us is to study it and try to improve it. Yalta and Dumbarton Oaks! On March 13 of last year I asked a question about our lack of representation at Cairo and Teheran and the answer of the government was:

Canada is not bound by the decisions of those conferences where she is not represented, but obviously, any conclusion relating to the conduct of the war made by the representatives or heads of governments participating in those conferences will carry very great weight with all members of the united nations.

These big men seem to have power of attorney to make decisions that affect the whole world. It is hard to make comparisons between Messrs. Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill and Talleyrand, Metternich and Nesselrode, but it is to be hoped that when the time comes to obtain the signature of the enemy to the peace treaty the diplomats of our modern times will be as successful as the old men were, such as those at the Congress of Vienna.

It was to my great surprise that I saw in the press that the government had decided to invite members of the opposition. The thing had been done in other parts of the world, in Australia for instance, where the situation of the government is very precarious, and in England where Mr. Churchill wishes to face the country with a union government. But I did not see why it should be done here, with the big majority that the government has in the house. But if it was done, it was just a matter of courtesy on the part of the government to the opposition. It was not a matter of right for the opposition to say, "We will name our own men."

The government may find among the opposition some yes men who will be willing to put a rope around their necks and go to San Francisco as the burghers of Calais. They

[Mr. Pouliot.]

will go there and will show how important they are but I heard my hon. friend the leader of the opposition say this:

Our party now asks that we be given by the Prime Minister the right to choose our own delegation.

If I were the Prime Minister my answer would be obvious: if you are not satisfied with what I offer you, you will get nothing; and no member, at least of the Conservative opposition, would go to San Francisco. But if the Prime Minister desires to make a selection, there are some members of the opposition who might be taken. There is my good friend the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), my good friend the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) and others, faithful members, who could go there; if the leader of the opposition and the past leader of the opposition are not satisfied, the invitation might be extended to others by the government.

But I do not regard it as a plum for them. It should not be a reward bestowed because the members of the opposition have been good boys and have voted for the government. I hope that was not in the Prime Minister's mind when he spoke of a united voice at San Francisco. I hope that Canada will have a united voice, and that Canada will come back from San Francisco not as a small nation, a small country, not as a middle power, but as the great country that she is. Why such distinctions between small countries, middle countries and great powers? Why should any country in the world consider itself a big power because of its population? Then the greatest country in the world would be China, and Japan would be much greater than many civilized countries in the western world.

I say, therefore, that going to the conference must not be the reward for surrender by the opposition to the government. It must be regarded in a different light.

Until now the debate has reminded me of some trips in the air over clouds when it was impossible to see the land below. One could not see the land without coming down to earth. If the Prime Minister goes there to preside at the conference, as has been mentioned in the papers, it will be an honour to Canada, and as president of the conference he should be relieved of some of the responsibility as leader of the Canadian delegation. But if the delegates to the conference wish to be useful to their country they must regard the trip not as a pleasure excursion, a joy ride. They must look upon it differently. They must not forget that they represent this country and they shall share the feelings of the world, because we are