

by the Prime Minister of Canada and by other representatives of the united nations about the maintenance of security in the post-war period.

This subject is so vast that it is impossible for a member of parliament to consider every angle in the time allowed to us. It is necessary that we should ask questions, but how can we do that? The procedure in debate is such that we are prevented from directing questions to the treasury benches. We are not informed and we will not be informed unless the procedure is changed.

What would be the effect? The Prime Minister may not be anxious personally to extend the life of parliament, nor is he anxious to secure money by governor general's warrants. But he should choose the lesser of those two evils. It would be more in conformity with modern parliamentary practice to extend the life of parliament than to secure such large sums of money by governor general's warrants. If the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition, the leaders of other groups and their supporters do not agree to an extension of parliament the members of parliament will be faced with a dilemma. Either they will have to vote blindly the amounts that will pass before their closed eyes or the government will have to secure money by means of governor general's warrants.

In March, 1920, the Prime Minister said in this house: Why should we go to Westminster to amend our constitution? We should do that right here. It would be easy for this House of Commons to pass a resolution or a petition addressed to the British government if the views expressed by the Prime Minister twenty-five years ago are no longer his policy. Then this parliament could be adjourned during the conference. It would be understood that the session would continue afterward and we could come back then for a regular session. The rights of the people would be safeguarded much better by that course than they would be by following the course suggested by the government.

In his remarks yesterday the Prime Minister said that the country is interested in knowing what hon. gentlemen opposite think. He was referring to the Conservative opposition. The country is not at all interested in knowing what we think, but we are expected to know what the Canadian people are thinking, which is very different, and we shall act accordingly. We must represent the views of the Canadian people and in order to do that we must keep in contact with the people. I pay a tribute to most members of parliament for the contact they maintain with their constituents. They

[Mr. Pouliot.]

keep in closer touch with the people than do the cabinet ministers who do not live in their constituencies. The right hon. gentleman added:

I think the matter is one on which hon. members already have more or less made up their minds, and in this debate I trust there will be very little in the way of diversity of opinion or occasion for any kind of party controversy.

In answer to that may I tell the Prime Minister that there might be diversity of opinion on many occasions without there being party controversy and without any exhibition of partisanship.

What about the resolution itself? What is its purpose? It is to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. That is a very fine purpose, but there are certain things in the resolution which are hard to accept. Let us point them out. The resolution states that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization. Perhaps, but we must know more about it to be in position to decide that. Then the third clause in the resolution reads:

(3) that this house approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

Although it is not a finished product, we are asked to support it. The next paragraph reads

(4) that this house agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

After we express our satisfaction with those purposes and principles set forth in (3) we go on in (4) to try to improve on them.

Then (5):

that the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval.

Dumbarton Oaks makes a difference between the peace-loving nations and the rest of the world. Which will be the peace-loving nations? They will be precisely those which will be armed to the teeth to prevent, perhaps, the war-loving nations from ruling the world. So that the world will be divided into peace-loving nations on the one side, and on the other side the rest of the world. Will not that be a cause for another war in the near future?