

States in the Americas, with the commonwealth of nations and the United States in the Pacific, I feel it reasonably certain that should any major war break out in future we will inevitably be drawn into it, whether we like it or not, and I approach this resolution with that in mind.

The resolution calls for the approval by this parliament of the action of the government in accepting an invitation to attend the conference at San Francisco to promote world security, and it is suggested that the proposals made last fall by the big four, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States and China, should be accepted as a basis. I do not intend to go into those proposals; I am sure all hon. members have read them. As I understand them, the proposals do not vary very much from the old set-up of the league of nations. There is a general assembly, a security council, a court of justice and of course the administrative officers. There is one noticeable difference, however, with the league of nations set-up; that is in the voting. It was said that one of the weaknesses of the league was that one small nation might block any decisive action, and the framers of these proposals apparently have tried to avoid that situation in the future. They have succeeded in doing so, but it is possible that they have swung too far in the other direction, so that small nations now will not be in as strong a position as they were under the league of nations. It seems to me that may be a mistake, because at the beginning of this war a number of small nations maintained their neutrality until they were invaded. Those of us who were in the war considered this unreasonable; we could not understand their attitude, since we thought we knew they would inevitably find themselves involved in any event. Yet I wonder if their decision was not made because in the past they found that their advice to the league was not accepted, or that they were not in a position to bring their advice forcibly before the league. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to examine the proposals in detail. I am sure that by the time the conference ends they will have been changed, and I am sure the nations concerned will attempt to draw up a charter in such a way that every country will be given an opportunity to make its views known, and that proper voting strength will be decided having regard to the contributions made in this war and the contributions to be made toward maintaining peace.

To give the reasons commonly advanced, wars begin through racial and national strife, religious differences and economic disloca-

tion. At least I have always seen economic dislocation given as a reason. No doubt it is, yet I am satisfied that it is not the common man, whose economic position is often insecure, who consciously wills a war; and on no occasion that I can remember has the common man insisted on his leaders taking him into war to improve his economic position. It is true that if there is economic stress leaders may seize that opportunity to present their arguments and obtain the support of the people for a war, but usually the argument is based on some ground other than self-interest, such as racial superiority or racial improvement. I hope the plans made for the peace will include an effort to convince the world that all races have some advantages; that no race has all the ability, all the brains, all the right to live, or the right to impose its will and its ideas on others.

It has been pointed out during this debate that this is not to be a peace conference, and that is quite true. When the peace treaty is drawn up, if in fact there is one, it will be on terms decided by the countries which conquer Germany in the first instance and Japan in the second; and I suppose that when the peace treaty is finally concluded it will be the duty of this body to see that the treaty is carried out, with perhaps changes from time to time designed to promote the cause of peace. So that while nothing will be finally decided on this occasion except the actual organization, it seems to me it might very well provide the nations with an opportunity to express their opinions as to the peace of the future. I have no particular views as to the nature of the peace to be dictated to Germany and Japan; I leave that in better hands. Nor have I any particular views as to the nature of the peace which ought to be maintained in future. Yet it is a fact that peace is not something you have as a matter of course. After having been back in Canada for six months now I am afraid that people may easily fall back into the comfortable assumption that if we leave it to somebody else all will be well, and that we need not bother our heads about such a troublesome thing as Europe. I know that European politics are incomprehensible to most of us and therefore suspect; yet we must never allow ourselves to fall back into that position. Canada has made a contribution in this war out of all proportion to its size, and I have no doubt this will be recognized at the conference in San Francisco. And yet Canada must continue to make its contribution in