

day, would he therefore in the same cursory way dismiss the ten commandments as he would dismiss the great ideals enunciated in the preamble?

Again, he seems to object because there is no mention of God in the charter. I do not know why he should bring up that fact. He speaks of whose god? Would he, because there is no mention of his God, exclude from the councils of the world the 400,000,000 human beings in China and the 350,000,000 human beings in India? Would he say, with insufferable conceit, that these are "lesser breeds without the law", and that therefore we should have nothing to do with them? I think the hon. member for Peace River has piled illogicality upon illogicality, absurdity upon absurdity, Ossa upon Pelion. There was nothing constructive that I could see in his speech; only attempts to sow seeds of dissension at a time of critical international crisis, when responsible men should speak with much greater care.

Then, as the *pièce de résistance*, the hon. member said he would find it hard to cooperate with other nations because they were not perfect, as he would have them perfect. This is not a world of absolutes. It is a world of relative things, and it is in that light we must look upon this charter. I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. member for Peace River certain lessons which I hoped he would have learned from the war through which we have just passed. Let me talk simply and plainly. It is not enough to talk about preserving the peace, for peace in itself is not enough. We were at peace during the thirties, but it was an uneasy, unjust and suspicious peace, which most of us knew was but the prelude to war. I suggest that it is more important to preserve law and order and fundamental human decency than it is to maintain peace. In our own community we are ready to use force to punish an aggressor or a law-breaker. We have peace among ourselves, but only because we have a superior force to see that we behave. This superior force is collectively employed by the citizens of the community. We surrender our individual sovereignty for the good of all. We surrender our individual sovereignty so that we, as individuals, can be so much safer. Let us learn the lesson then in the field of international affairs, and surrender our national sovereignty so that all of us can have the same safety. In the same way we must use our collective force to restrain the lawbreaker on the international scene. That is what we, as members of the C.C.F. believe. That is collective security.

And yet it presents us with the most terrible paradox of our time; to preserve the conditions of peace we must be prepared and ready

to go to war. If a potential aggressor knows beyond a doubt that he will be punished, he may conceivably be restrained. To achieve such security we must accept the responsibilities, as well as the privileges, of a peaceful world.

I should like to quote these words of Archibald MacLeish:

There has been destroyed in the minds of men and women in this country the superstition that what is done beyond three thousand miles of water is not really done at all; the ignorant superstition that violence and lies and murder on another continent are not violence and lies and murder here, the cowardly and brutal superstition that the enslavement of man in a country where the sun rises at midnight by our clock is not enslavement by the time we live by; the black and stifling superstition that what we cannot see and hear and touch can have no meaning for us.

I accept this charter. I ask the house to accept the charter, with all its imperfections and with all its implications.

Mr. FRED ROSE (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Labour-Progressive party I should like to make a few remarks in support of the motion before the house. The signing of the united nations charter by the representatives of fifty nations on June 26 at San Francisco marks an historic milestone on the long and hard road to world security. The signing of the charter was made possible by the forging of unity between the capitalist democracies and the socialist Soviet Union at a time of war, and especially by the unity of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition, which combination comprises the overwhelming preponderance of military and industrial strength in the world to-day.

The meeting of the leaders of the three great powers at Teheran, the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks and the meeting at Yalta prepared the groundwork for the charter. There may have been differences of opinion, but by getting together and having discussions they were able to eliminate many of the obstacles standing in the way. On the basis of that understanding among the three, despite the prophecies of pessimists and cynics, it was possible to have the charter signed at San Francisco. The maintenance of that same form of unity which made the signing of the charter possible is most important today.

As President Truman said the other day, the battle for peace will be more difficult than the battles of the war. Understanding this, we appreciate the responsibilities connected with that battle for peace, and we work toward an acceptance of those responsibilities.

At the present time attacks are being made upon the unity of the Big Three. These

[Mr. Stewart.]