

policy. I think we would be willing to go so far as to say that we would like to have an expression of opinion of this house to the effect that Canada should not be bound by any treaty or agreement in matters of external relations, of which parliament has not been fully informed in a way of which all of us could take cognizance. That would be helping along the democratic control of foreign relations, and when we have that principle carried out we shall have a sense of security which at present we do not feel in the matter of our external and inter-imperial relations.

After the complete analysis by the Prime Minister yesterday of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, little remains to be said. All of us should have a clear understanding of the matters upon which the four great powers who took part in those discussions were able to agree. The aims of the united nations for the after-war period, as stated recently by the Secretary of State for the United States, Mr. Stettinius, are to obtain for the world "political stability, economic and social advancement, and a wider regard for human rights." All these achievements are subject to the maintenance of lasting peace. No plans for the betterment of humanity can be undertaken unless a system is devised under which it will be possible to prevent the recurrence of world wars whose magnitude would continue to increase, with the advances of science and the improvement of weapons and the means of destruction.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposals may not constitute the perfectly ideal solution that would lead the world to general fraternity and understanding. The will of powerful nations may not yet be such as to lead to the organization on a world scale of an ideal community life. But the proposals appear to me to be the nearest approach yet advocated to a solution of the problem of world security, if carried on in a proper spirit of cooperation between the greater powers, supported by all nations of the world. It must always be remembered, as Sir Robert Borden said in 1919 in this house, as reported at page 17 of volume I of *Hansard* for that year, when he asked for ratification of the treaty of Versailles, and explained the provisions of the covenant of the league of nations, that—

The enthronement and enforcement of international law must rest upon the faith of the nations just as ordered liberty and justice within each state depend upon the public opinion of its people. Upon each nation is imposed a responsibility commensurate with its power and influence. Unless that responsibility is accepted and fulfilled the peace of the world cannot be maintained.

The same applies to-day, after the end of another war.

[Mr. Picard.]

In the same line of thought, not earlier than November 30, 1944, Mr. Arthur Woodburn speaking in the British House of Commons expressed more or less the same views, in these words:

Peace can never be quite assured if it depends solely on its enforcement by an international police force. The first essential is that people and nations must accept and be willing to observe the law. If that is to be done, we must make laws which are generally acceptable. It is easier to enforce a law which is generally just. In this matter, I would commend the Dumbarton Oaks conversations on world organization, which I think are a step forward based on the experience and failures of the League of Nations and which can take us very far toward organization for peace.

Speaking on the same day Captain James H. Duncan expressed more or less the same views when he said:

I would just say that no form of international peace, international arrangement or international organization can be successful unless it is based on the goodwill and good faith of the nations concerned. The Dumbarton Oaks proposal suggests a security council of the great powers, but the great powers themselves have to have the will, and to continue to have the will, and, above all, the ability to enforce their will, and nothing set up in the form of an organization can succeed unless the big powers in the world have the will to peace and the will to enforce it.

Some already argue against the fact that all five great powers keep for themselves respectively the right to veto a decision of the security council and also protest against the right of the great powers to sit on the council, even if they are brought before the council. It is true that this is one of the imperfections which I had in mind when I said the proposals were not perfectly ideal; but practicability and not dreams will be the keynote of the new organization, and upon it will rest the success of the venture.

Of course the voting agreement concluded at Yalta may leave great apprehensions in the minds of many as to the dangers resulting from a rupture of friendship between the great powers. The discussion in the British parliament on Dumbarton Oaks, even before the Yalta agreement, shows that a great many British members were apprehending trouble.

To this anxiety I found a very humoristic, but at the same time practical answer in the *New York Sun*, written by the columnist H. I. Phillips, and which I cannot resist reading. He states:

Of course it would be swell if the rule was that in a showdown no Big Five nation that turned bully could vote when its own case was being acted on, but I guess the whole thing simmers down to the simple fact that if the