

big powers don't hang together for keeps and get along without having to put their troubles up to the small nations, no voting arrangement is ever going to make much difference.

Any time the Big Five let's things go that far it will be too late for anything but jet planes and rockets and they will be flying through the air before anybody starts balloting on the question, "Is you is or is you ain't a world nuisance?"

Only the Big Five will have the wallop, the dough and the draft lists to fight another war. Ecuador, Iceland, or Guatemala ain't going to start the next global shindig. And if the Big Five can't keep the peace among themselves without no Gallup polls, then it can't be kept.

An appropriate answer to those who fear granting too much authority to the great powers can readily be found in the fact that if they are not given that power the peace of the world would be as much in the danger as after Versailles. This idea was supported in the British House of Commons by Mr. Daniel Chater, in the following terms:

If these proposals are to mature it seems likely that a great deal of criticism will centre on the enormous power that is to be placed in the hands of the security council. But I accept the giving of that power as a logical necessity if we are to have effective means of preventing world aggression.

Let us remember that these four nations will have the power to prevent another world war, inasmuch as they will have to bear the great burden of preventing or punishing aggression. If it should be found impossible to obtain agreement among the members of the united nations . . . then these four powers could constitute the nucleus of an instrument which will be strong enough to prevent or punish aggression. There is no reason why other nations should not congregate around that nucleus.

As to the composition of the security council I think the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have failed to take into account the role played by certain nations in this war, and their importance for the maintenance of peace.

I think the Prime Minister had the right approach to the question when he said in this house on July 9, 1943:

In the view of the government, effective representation on these bodies should neither be restricted to the largest states nor necessarily extended to all states. Representation should be determined on a functional basis which will admit to full membership those countries, large or small, which have the greatest contribution to make to the particular object in question.

And on August 4, 1944, still before the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were made known, the Prime Minister said this:

In determining what states should be represented on the council with the great powers, it is, I believe, necessary to apply the functional idea. Those countries which have most to contribute to the maintenance of the peace of the world should be most frequently selected.

I am sure that in the forthcoming conference efforts will be made by Canada to have a readjustment of chapter VI, section A. A country that has contributed as much as Canada has done during the crisis, not only in men serving in her armed forces, but in supplying to other nations such vast quantities of weapons of war and in feeding our allies by our enormous shipments of food, has the right to expect that in any organization devoted to the maintenance of peace it will have a place proportionate to its efforts in time of war.

No consideration, Mr. Speaker, of a world security system will be complete by establishing a machinery intended to make an aggressive war impossible, because the peace of the world is hinged to the economic security of nations. In a recent interview Mr. Stettinius, United States Secretary of State, declared:

"Unless there is economic security in the world, we are bound to have trouble; but in order for a nation to have economic security it must be able to produce and trade profitably with other nations. Each nation can help the others, and in so doing it will increase its own prosperity. All of them need more production and more trade if each is to maintain employment and increase the living standards of its people. There are many ways in which this can be done.

"Above all, we must try to facilitate the means by which nations can trade and carry on financial operations among themselves for their mutual benefit. Obstacles that stand in the way of this react on the country establishing them."

Among these obstacles Mr. Stettinius listed excessive tariffs, quotas, exchange controls, discriminations and many others, all of which, he believes, can be remedied or removed by international agreements. Through such agreements we can also obtain for our own business men reasonable conditions for the conduct of their affairs in other countries.

"In that connection, we have learned that industry can no longer restrict its objectives to commercial objectives. In managing its affairs it must be kept in mind the whole field of human relations—labour, capital, consumer and public must be considered. This is as true in international affairs as it is in national ones."

With this expression of opinion, and with the recent joint statement of President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister I am fully in agreement as should be the house.

I should like here to make clear that in economic matters Canada's future policies should be based on our economic interests, and not on sentimental impulsion.

Canada should envision its interests in regard to world economic policies and not base them solely on regional or imperial bases. Great Britain has given us examples of the course