

would like to ask hon. members the meaning of this cutting I took out of the *Citizen* a few days ago:

Eisenhower bans use of force on Russian nationals. Frankfurt-on-Main, Germany, October 4 (Associated Press)—General Eisenhower, in an order amounting to a temporary abrogation of one phase of the Yalta agreement, has instructed that American troops discontinue forcing Russian nationals to return home unless the United States government rules otherwise.

Existence of the order, affecting 26,400 Russians still in the American zone of Germany, was disclosed to-day by commanders of displaced-persons camps.

Questioned on reports that troops had fired over the heads or near the feet of some Russians to compel them to board Soviet-bound trains, one officer said:

"Possibly for a time some of them were being pushed on to trains without your asking many questions, but that's all stopped now."

Why should people require to be shot at in order to force them to go home? I know one thing. You would not need to fire a shot at anyone in Europe to force him to come to Canada. And why? Because we enjoy British justice and British freedom. That is the answer.

I wanted to put myself on record because for many months past this thing has been worrying me; it has been on my mind and my conscience, and that is the awful fate of I do not know how many people, possibly more people than there are in North America, in what was once the most civilized part of the world. Where are those people to-day? They have lost everything. They have lost their homes; their families are split up, and finally they have lost their freedom. They have paid the price so that we might have peace. But I do not believe that permanent peace can be built on such injustice and slavery. I believe the words of the New Testament: You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. There can be no lasting peace unless it is built on freedom and justice.

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, at this time when we are called upon to support the agreement establishing the united nations charter, which aims at ensuring world peace, we have but to observe what is happening in the various countries to realize the necessity of a general international organization which may avert threats against peace and ensure international security.

Following the first great war, which ended in 1918, we have had the league of nations which afforded hope for security to peace-loving nations; unfortunately, it was powerless to prevent conflicts.

I do not intend to deal on the causes of that failure. However, I shall make bold to say that if the great powers of which it was composed had not too often been prompted by the desire to advance their selfish interests, the results would have been different.

How will this one fare? Time will tell. In its present form, does it afford any positive guarantee of success? I am doubtful about that. Is it worth while that we should give it a trial, by way of experimentation, it being understood that we may withdraw from it later if it does not fulfil our expectations? That is another question which deserves consideration.

Does the new organization offer a positive guarantee of success?

Let us consider the charter from the standpoint of facts. The object was to establish a united nations organization including every peace-loving state, as evidenced in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Well, oddly enough, such peace loving nations as Portugal, Switzerland, Ireland, Sweden and others who had remained neutral, have been ignored! And there is more: we insisted, which is hard to believe when a peace organization is being founded, that certain peaceful countries, still neutral, such as Turkey, Peru and others, declare war on our enemies to earn the right to participate in the drafting of this charter.

The charter starts with a preamble proclaiming the equality of all nations, great or small, and section 2 states as a principle that the organization is based on the sovereign equality of all member nations.

However, the principles of the charter are to be implemented through a security council of eleven members, of which five are permanent members: the United States, the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R., France and China, enjoying the right to veto decisions on all important matters. This incited the Minister of Justice to say, the other day, that: "It does constitute a serious exception to the principle of equal sovereignty of states regardless of their size."

Indeed, it is a direct breach of the principle on which the charter is based.

Section 25 of the charter states:

The members of the united nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the security council in accordance with the present charter.

However, section 27, granting the right to veto decisions to the five great powers, exempts them from this obligation and places them above the law so that the small and middle nations will be bound by the charter, but not the five great powers.

The five great powers insist that they judge the others, that they enforce penalties, but they refuse to be judged or subjected to