

into ashes. We hold to the hope that the years and the lives that our men have spent in fighting this war will have a reward at the end of the war. Reports of the Atlantic charter, of the UNRRA conference, of Moscow, of Teheran, of Crimea were significant—doubly so when related to the profound desire of the millions that out of this victory might come a peace that would last.

I do not speak officially for women; I cannot do that. But I do know that women throughout this land will feel that a world security organization is an answer in some measure to their longing to have done with war. Victory in itself is wonderful. Even if we accomplish no more than preserving for ourselves our right and our freedom to work out our own destiny within our own borders, the war would not have been fought in vain. But with what confidence can we face the future if we have little hope that reform will endure, that progress will continue with the threat of another war hanging constantly over us? No, we want something more than a military victory. We want some guarantee that a real and a new attempt will be made to build and preserve human freedom, social justice, economic progress and political security. So it was with hope and fear that we concentrated our vision on proposals made at Dumbarton Oaks.

The wartime information board is to be congratulated on printing and distributing last fall the pamphlet dealing with their proposals to all who were interested. It is a good sign of the times. The covenant of the league was not available to the public beforehand. The proposed charter was in our hands some months before this conference was called at San Francisco. The Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Stettinius, wrote an article which appeared in February's issue of the *Reader's Digest*. It was several pages long and set forth the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks. I hope that not all hon. members of this house have missed reading that article. He is to be congratulated on putting before the public in a popular way some of the proposals that will come before the conference that is to meet in San Francisco.

These proposals are not in their final and completed form. Indeed there have already been modifications of them. At the Crimea conference, for instance, the great powers answered one objection, that they were keeping too much power in their own hands, by a slight change in the method of voting in their proposed security council. After all, the success of our democratic processes is based on a system of checks and balances. If they have altered it in one way there may also be other

[Mrs. Casselman.]

instances in which after discussion, after negotiation, they may limit their power to some extent. But with responsibility there must be power. If the great powers have the responsibility for underwriting the peace of the world they must see to it also that it is maintained on a just basis, that the cultural integrity of the people is supported, that interference in domestic affairs is limited to the minimum consonant with the rights of the majority.

Great powers may be bound only with their own consent. We might as well face that. There is nothing that I can see but naked force, or conscience, to bind the great powers of the world—force, war, facing perhaps a combination of powers, or conscience or reason or willingness to be bound. We, the peoples of the world, are fortunate that the most powerful nations, the United Kingdom, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and China, have expressed their willingness to assume obligations such as those set down in the purposes and the principles of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. They say they want to develop friendly relations among nations, to take broader measures to strengthen universal peace.

After the meeting in the Crimea, this statement was issued by the three leaders, Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin:

Our meeting here in the Crimea has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action, which has made victory possible and certain for the united nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our governments owe to our peoples, and to all the peoples of the world.

There is our hope that conscience will bind the great powers and the small in the fulfillment of the longing of the world to have done with war. We have said that one of the chief reasons for the inability of the league of nations to prevent war was that the United States was not a member. Here then is the promise of participation by the United States and the other great powers. We feared their isolation more than we fear their participation in world affairs. We hope for much from the methods of consultation and discussion.

These proposals are not the perfect solution for which theorists and idealists look. Neither was the magna charta, the bill of rights or the habeas corpus act. But these were living charters, and so must this be. If we have the spirit of cooperation and the desire to understand each other's viewpoint the organization will grow into a living thing, a vital wall against the agony of war, the misery of frustrated hopes and the anguish of injustice. We must understand that the relinquishment of