

shocked at the superficial manner in which the charter has been presented to the people of Canada and to the members of this house for their decision on behalf of the people of Canada. I think Canadian participation in the united nations security organization should not be ratified until the people of Canada have had full opportunity to learn what it is all about, until they understand all that is involved. I maintain, too, that an understanding of the united nations charter is not possible without full consideration being given to the circumstances under which that charter came into being.

To emphasize this point I need only touch upon an aspect of the whole matter which I have no doubt will be in the minds of many hon. members of this parliament. It is generally understood and accepted that the preamble of a statute or, as in this case, of a charter, provides the pith and substance of its purpose. If the preamble is false or is in direct conflict with the body of the charter, then the purpose of the charter cannot be sustained. That applies to the united nations charter at present before this house. The opening paragraphs of the preamble to the charter read as follows:

We the peoples of the united nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. . . .

I leave it at that point, because that is the part which is essential. These, Mr. Speaker, are noble sentiments to which the vast majority of the peoples of all nations doubtless would subscribe whole-heartedly. I am confident that if they were put to a vote in this house right now, these clauses would win unanimous support. Unfortunately the profession of beliefs and intentions set forth in that preamble is at variance both with the essential features of the whole world organization proposed in the body of the charter and with the facts of the world situation with which we are now confronted. The organization which is proposed concentrates all effective power in a central security council on which the five largest and most powerful nations are to have permanent seats. Any one of these nations has the power to veto any decision of the security council to take

action; thus these five large and powerful nations are placed above the law in the proposed organization. I put it to hon. members: is this an affirmation of faith in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small? Is that establishing conditions under which justice can be maintained? I contend that it is sheer cant and hypocrisy, when examined in the light of facts and reason.

I know that it is not popular to mention the Atlantic charter, but I am not seeking popularity. That charter was a solemn declaration by the representatives of the two permanent members of the security council with whom the future of Canada is most closely bound up. That charter was acclaimed with enthusiasm by the people's representatives of both those nations, Great Britain and the United States, and by the entire democratic world. The flagging spirits of millions of men in the armed forces who were locked in uneven struggle with the tyrannous wreckers of civilization took heart and were spurred on by the thought that here at last was a set of principles worth fighting for. They fought and died, glad to give their lives to secure for their sons and daughters, their mothers, fathers and sweethearts at home the freedom promised in that Atlantic charter.

Later, however, I remind you, Mr. Speaker, the charter was repudiated as being, not in the nature of a pact, but rather a guide for the democratic allies. And this, sir, in spite of the fact that already thousands of the cream of our manhood had given their lives for the objectives so clearly defined in that historic instrument, and believing their supreme sacrifices would result in a sure expansion of human freedom.

Does that repudiation reflect a determination to establish conditions under which respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained? Again, hon. members will remember vividly the solemn undertaking by treaty which Great Britain extended to Poland before the war. It was the observance of that undertaking which forced Great Britain into the war when Germany and Russia marched into Poland. Poland was an ally of the nations which finally became the united nations, and that should be borne in mind. And now, what is the price of victory for her? She is to lose a large portion of territory to Soviet Russia, a permanent member of the proposed security council. And Soviet Russia, Mr. Speaker, makes this gain with the concurrence of the four other permanent members of the security council. The rest of her