

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Let us look at our own experience as a nation, or at that of any other civilized nation that we know. How do we maintain—to use the words of our own constitution—"peace, order and good government" in this country? Well, honourable senators, we maintain it by an organized society in which there are a Criminal Code, criminal courts and police forces. If there should ever come a time in our history when we decided that psychology was better than the Criminal Code and that psychiatrists and various other officials should supplant police officers, we know what would happen to organized society. Even though only a very small minority in the community are criminally minded, I believe that these requirements, which we have proved to be necessary among individuals, are equally necessary in international relations.

I have referred to the peace-loving powers. There are three great world-powers to-day. There are other great powers, but the United States of America, Russia and the British Commonwealth of Nations are the great world-powers to-day. China is a power but she is not a world-power. France, which has been a great power, and will be again, is struggling at the moment to recover from her prostration. When we come to deal with the Dumbarton Oaks scheme, I think it is a fine thing that France is one of the permanent members—not for what she is to-day, but for what she has been and what she will be.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: But speaking for the moment of what I consider to be the basic idea, the foundation, I should like to see an agreement between the three great nations.

Anthony Eden said this last May:

The responsibility for any future world organization for peace should be constructed on and around—

I emphasize these words as being in accordance with my ideas.

—on and around the four great powers,—

He included China.

—and all other peace-loving states should come in and play their part in the structure.

Now, honourable senators, I do not want to be accused of defeating the very thing I am advocating—the practical—but I would like to see, as the basis of all that is to follow, a simple agreement such as this:

The United States of America.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The British Commonwealth of Nations.

Recognizing that enduring peace is necessary for world welfare and the maintenance and growth of civilization,

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

And believing that this pledge is an essential prerequisite on which to found an association of free nations and build a successful world administration based on justice and equality before the law,

We do solemnly pledge one to another, and to all other nations of the world as follows:

(1) That we ourselves will keep the peace;
 (2) That we will individually, collectively and in co-operation with other like-minded nations take adequate measures—

(a) to control and restrain any aggressor nation from preparing for war;

(b) to prevent any nation from beginning a war; and

(c) to stop any aggressor nation from waging a war so begun.

And to these ends we will provide and use as may be required all our available power and forces.

I would have that treaty signed by the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Hon. Mr. LEGER: May I ask, is that a quotation?

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: It is a quotation from what I wrote. This is a treaty that I am merely suggesting as indicative of the line of thought that I am offering to the Senate.

Hon. Mr. LEGER: It is very good.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: If I could convert this theoretical proposition into a reality I would have it signed by every member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. With respect to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals other considerations apply, but there would be no more complications in the way of having this treaty signed as I have suggested than there was in having the Treaty of Versailles signed in the way that was insisted upon by Sir Robert Borden.

There is, of course, no such treaty as I have suggested, but I have a feeling that there is the next best thing, namely, an understanding between those three great powers. Whether you have a treaty or an understanding, you must have a foundation before you can have a superstructure. In the proposal we are now considering there is a foundation and there is a plan. Let us look at that plan just as if we had heard nothing at all about Dumbarton Oaks. After all, this is a peace plan that we are considering. Well, what is peace? It is freedom from war. A straight line is defined as being the shortest distance between two points, and the shortest way to peace is to stop war. I should therefore hope to see three things incorporated in this plan with a view to giving effect to the basic idea: an organization