

council is to endure, it must be subject to democratic control by all members who participate in the dangers and the costs of its decisions.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, the resolution under debate to-day provides for endorsement by this house of the acceptance of the invitation extended to the government of Canada to attend the conference at San Francisco; it provides that the house shall recognize that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada and that she should become a member; further that the house approves of the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, known as the Dumbarton Oaks and the Yalta proposals, and considers that such proposals provide a basis for the discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization. The resolution does not provide that by accepting it this house shall be taken as approving all these proposals as distinguished from the purposes and principles; it merely states that the proposals are to be considered as a basis for discussion. Then it provides that the representatives of Canada shall be instructed to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization, and finally that such charter shall, before ratification, be submitted to the Canadian parliament for approval.

Anyone in this house or elsewhere in Canada who believes in world peace must approve this resolution. Surely it is obvious now that there can be world peace only if there is some effective world organization. So there is in my opinion nothing controversial about the resolution itself.

But the case is different with the proposals that were submitted to this house and to the nation by the Prime Minister (Mr. King) in his speech of two days ago. He outlined some of the changes which this Canadian government will ask in the proposals, and gave us some idea of the policy of the government with regard to an international organization. It is true that he did not give us as many details as some of us would have liked, but he did give a rough outline of the proposals which the present Canadian government will present at San Francisco. To-day I propose to criticize some of these proposals. I shall try to do that, not for the sake of criticism, but having always in mind the aim that Canada may make the greatest possible contribution to world peace.

[Mr. Roebuck.]

International peace and security cannot be attained or kept by passing resolutions or by junketing trips to international conferences, whether they are at Geneva or San Francisco or any other place. It cannot be attained or kept by speeches at such conferences, but only by each nation being prepared, in the first place, to cooperate on friendly terms with all other nations, and, in the second place, to combine at once with other nations to fight any aggressor. That is another lesson we should have learned from this second world war. I have always thought that the basic principle in considering how world peace may be attained and kept is very clearly set out by Sir Norman Angell in his book entitled "Let the People Know". At page 50 he gives that principle as follows:

It is this exceedingly simple and basic social principle: unless the community—whether it be a community of persons or of states—is prepared to use its combined power for the defence of the individual member who is made the victim of lawless violence, there can be neither law, nor peace, nor justice, nor stable civilization.

Therefore for Canada it all adds up to this: she must be prepared to furnish fighting men for service abroad. It is to be hoped that there will never be fighting on Canadian soil. Surely Canadians should hope that any fighting which takes place will be as far away from our shores as possible. This means that we must be prepared to furnish fighting men for service anywhere in the world; it means, putting it on a personal basis, bringing it back to the Canadian father or mother in the home, that Canadians must be prepared to have their sons die abroad to protect some other nation; because we realize that only in that way can peace be maintained. It follows as surely as the night the day that only in that way can our homeland of Canada be secured. The Canadian House of Commons, the Canadian people, had better face that fact, had better realize that there may be a price to be paid in Canadian blood for world peace. I believe that Canadians will face it and will be prepared to pay that price. But it did not help to have the Prime Minister use these words in this speech of March 20, 1945, as reported at page 26 of *Hansard* of that date:

As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council.

I realize that that statement can be interpreted in two ways. It can be said that what was meant was that in the first agreement between Canada and the new world organization which provides for the forces that Canada must furnish, there would also have to be special provision if these troops