

4. To enter into agreements with the security council placing facilities at its disposal, under specified conditions, and providing methods of implementing its decisions.

5. To endeavour to maintain high standards of living, full employment, and a high level of cultural development.

6. To cooperate with other nations in the solution of economic problems.

7. To accept the jurisdiction of the international court of justice.

8. To register all international agreements with the organization and to accept the principles outlined in the charter as the basis upon which such treaties must be based.

Let me, in passing, offer this one observation. These principles must guide us not only in our international relations but also in our internal policy. We have given our national pledge that we subscribe to this charter, that these are the ends we shall seek to serve not only in the external sphere but in our internal relations as well.

In the matter of fulfilment I offer this observation, and it is not an idle observation having regard to the history of the past two decades. If we do not fully subscribe to these commitments, if we do not mean to carry them out to the letter, it would be far better if we rejected the charter now. Far better to administer a quick *coup de grâce* than slow poison.

Let us for a moment look back over the unhappy history of the past two decades, and it is well that we should have this in mind because I hope we are taking a realistic point of view in our approach to this charter. In the first place we watched treaty after treaty, solemnly entered into by many nations, broken, and not only by aggressor nations—Versailles, the pact of Paris, the Kellogg-Briand pact, Locarno, and Munich. We have seen, too, apart from outright breaches of treaties, situations where it was found impossible for nations to agree. Let us remember the failure of the disarmament conference which sat from 1932 to 1934, sixty-one states of the world meeting together with the highest object and being unable to enter into an agreement. The situation we have seen in the recent meeting of foreign secretaries of the great powers is not a new one, and we do not need to be overly alarmed. We regret it, but it is not new in international relations.

With respect to the League of Nations—and I offer no apology for saying a word concerning the League of Nations—there is a fundamental similarity of aims and objects between this charter and that of the league. The League of Nations covenant was intended to provide machinery to prevent war and to punish aggression. It could have prevented war if it had been used. It was based on collective security, and that must be our ultimate

hope of lasting peace. The same things which reduced the League of Nations to impotency to prevent war can do the same thing with respect to the united nations organization. It rests with the member nations and, in the last analysis, with the peoples of the world to say whether this machinery shall be used for the purpose for which it was intended, or whether it shall be allowed to atrophy, as was the machinery provided by the covenant of the League of Nations; and with us Canadians there rests an obligation in that respect no less than the obligation resting upon any other people the world over.

It is very easy to blame other people and to say that they are responsible for the failure of the league, but a review of history would not do us any harm. The last thing that we Canadians ought to do is to adopt in this field a "holier than thou" attitude toward other nations. I do not profess to be one of those Canadians who conceive patriotism in such terms as to overlook everything that has not done honour to our country. Canada after the last war, in the twenties, through her delegates at Geneva did on many an occasion lift her voice in the direction of weakening the covenant.

Let us not forget that the voice of this nation was not raised in denunciation of Japan in 1931 when the Manchurian episode was before the League of Nations. Let us not forget what happened in the fall of 1935 when the League of Nations, through the committee of eighteen, was getting machinery under way to apply economic sanctions to Italy to deny her the coal, oil and iron which she so badly needed to wage aggression on hapless Ethiopia. It remained for the government of Canada, our country, to instruct its delegate to have nothing further to do with the proposals for the application of sanctions against Italy.

Canada, our country, led the retreat from the sanctions front that had a chance of that time of beating back aggression. Yes, let us not forget, too, that this nation went on selling to Japan all that country wanted while it was waging aggressive war upon the Chinese for four and a half years before Pearl Harbor; and much of the lumber that went into those Zero aeroplanes came from Canadian forests.

Let Canadians have a full realization of the seriousness, the gravity of the commitments that parliament is proposing to take to-night on their behalf. Let us not throw away the great work done by the League of Nations in the fields of economic and social cooperation. I can only mention the work of the international labour organization. That was not set up