

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I read the Prime Minister's speech somewhat cursorily, but I understood him to say that neither he nor the delegation nor the Government of which he is head would enter into any commitments whatsoever. How can the honourable gentleman reconcile that statement with the statement he has just made? Our representative on the Council would not have authority to commit this country to take action against an aggressor nation. The Security Council would say, "Well, Canada, we should like you to contribute so and so." Is it not a fact that an agreement has first to be drawn up?

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I understood the Prime Minister to say that neither he nor the delegation could bind this country in any way; all they could do, as the resolution itself sets out, would be to come back with the agreed proposals and submit them to Parliament for approval.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: When this country becomes a member of the organization and the Security Council is set up, then the Security Council makes an agreement with this country and every other country, providing that in future, if and when the emergency arises, this country and the other countries will make available certain military forces for the use of the Security Council.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not want to interrupt my honourable friend again, but he has gone away beyond the statement made by the Prime Minister yesterday and—

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I, too, am sorry to interrupt my honourable friend. I think in his speech yesterday afternoon in the other Chamber the Prime Minister made it perfectly clear that he was not responsible for these proposals. They are proposals agreed upon between the four great powers, and submitted by them for consultation with the other powers.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: They may be modified.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: They may be modified. He was simply saying that he was not responsible for these proposals or for anything that appears in them at present.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite so.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: If the Canadian delegation to the conference agrees to these proposals, he and other members of the delegation will have to report back to Parliament and seek parliamentary sanction of the organi-

zation as well as of the long-term agreements for the use of military force.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Every country which is represented at the conference will have to ratify any agreements that are made there before they can be binding upon that country.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: Yes.

I strongly hope that the Canadian delegates to the San Francisco conference will express the willingness of this country immediately to enter into this world organization and to make an agreement with the Security Council covering the terms and conditions under which our military forces will be available for the purposes of the Council if and when the necessity should arise. It is perfectly true that once we have signed an agreement of that kind and it is ratified by Parliament we shall have surrendered a part of our national sovereignty. We shall have bound ourselves to obey orders from this international organization—on which Canada may not be directly represented at the time—to put part of our armed forces at its disposal for the maintenance of peace and the repelling of aggression. We have got to face that fact. It is no use hiding our heads in the sand. That may mean that some day our Canadian boys will have to go to a distant part of the world to fight against an aggressor nation. It is a serious obligation to assume, but I venture to urge that we, in common with the other nations which form part of the organization, must assume it if peace is to be maintained. And surely, honourable senators, the very fact of such a pledge by Canada and all the other United Nations will have a profound effect in deterring potential aggressors in the future. It was just the very want of specific provisions of that kind and the employment, instead, of foggy and miasmic expressions of pious aspiration which turned the League of Nations into the laughing-stock which it ultimately became.

People talk of the surrender of part of our sovereignty as if it were a very terrible thing, but I contend that it is necessary for us to surrender part of our sovereignty if we are to ensure peace. In the past there has been too much insistence on the sacred right of every sovereign nation to behave exactly as it wished, regardless of the harm it might cause to others. One lesson we have learned in this war is that no nation can now afford to live by itself alone. In the United States there has been a great deal of debate on this subject of partial surrender of national sovereignty in the interests