

A new world order will be born, not made. It will be something that lives and breathes, something much closer to the soul of man than a mere mechanical or legalistic device. A new world order needs to be worked out and have its place in the minds and the hearts of men. It should express itself in brotherhood and goodwill. It will be the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service and of mutual aid.

These words, I believe, express the spirit underlying the Atlantic charter and the united nations declaration of 1942. This spirit has found concrete expression in lend-lease, in mutual aid and in the united nations relief and rehabilitation administration. The same spirit will, I believe, guide the united nations in their deliberations at San Francisco. It is important that the machinery of the new world organization should be realistically devised and wisely planned. But no constitutional machinery, however ingenious, will be effective unless the nations of the world profit by the lessons they have learned in these five and a half years of war. The supreme lesson is that humanity should no longer be made to serve selfish national ends, whether those ends be world domination or merely isolated self-defence. Nations everywhere must unite to save and serve humanity.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what some hon. members may think, I do not rise for the purpose of continuing the debate. I confess, as I did once previously this afternoon, my inability to proceed at this time. I think I might be pardoned, however, for saying to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that he has made a very notable speech with which in great measure I find myself in agreement. There are a few outstanding points as to which perhaps we might be permitted to have some difference of opinion, and I shall advert to those on a later occasion if I find myself capable of participating in this debate, as I hope I may.

I rise primarily for the purpose of taking advantage of the kindly offer made by the Prime Minister, to permit of certain questions being asked at the conclusion of his address. I have given a good deal of thought to the setting up of this world organization, a new and enlarged league of nations, but I am puzzled over one factor as perhaps the Prime Minister is also puzzled. It occurs to me, and I suggest to the Prime Minister that he might take time to consider it, that the preservation of peace for to-morrow and for the future—and the Prime Minister was quite right when in his opening remarks he differentiated be-

tween peace-making and peace-keeping—depends not upon this new league of nations but upon the attitude of the three great powers, Great Britain, the United States and Russia, toward whatever agreement is reached among them outside the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. That is the part of the proposal that has been borne in upon me, and I would ask the Prime Minister—not now, because it is a big topic—to give consideration to that aspect of the whole position. We all desire peace; but does not the preservation of peace in the future depend upon the attitude of these three great powers? That is a vital question and a vital problem; and their attitude in that regard is not circumscribed or confined by the Dumbarton Oaks agreement.

That is the main question to which I should like the Prime Minister to give consideration, not now, as I have said, but at a later time. Then I should like to know if the government has forwarded any communications to the inviting powers or to the United States of America as is contemplated by the concluding paragraph of the Prime Minister's letter as Secretary of State for External Affairs to the United States ambassador, in which he states:

Note has been taken of the offer of the government of the United States of America to transmit to other participating governments such views or comments concerning the proposals as the government of Canada may desire to present in advance of the conference. I shall communicate with you again if the government of Canada decides to take advantage of this offer.

From something the Prime Minister stated this afternoon, though I am not quite clear about it, I gathered that representations had been made. I wonder if that is true and, if so, what they are.

Then there are a few subsidiary questions to which I desire to give attention. What instructions will be given to Canada's representatives at the London conference? Have those instructions been framed, and if they have not been framed will they be presented to parliament? I am assuming, of course, that the London conference will meet before parliament is dissolved.

Then, I should like to know why Canada was not represented at Dumbarton Oaks. Is it because we were not invited? Having regard to our contribution I regret exceedingly that Canada was not invited to Dumbarton Oaks. However, the first question is the one which troubles me, if we are going to have peace in the world. Does it not depend upon the attitude of the three great powers, outside the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks agreements? When I ask these questions I