

Leaving for a moment the points made by the Prime Minister, I desire to tender certain views of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition relative to the resolution before the house. At the outset I would like to make it abundantly clear that the Progressive Conservative party will support the resolution.

Abroad throughout Canada is the grim and unquenchable determination that the same power and resolve which enabled this nation to make an outstanding contribution to the winning of victory on the war fronts of the world shall be with no less vigour and resolution turned to the equally difficult task of winning the peace. That widespread view constitutes an unmistakable guide to those upon whose shoulders will rest the setting up of the machinery to keep inviolate the victory which we hope this war will presently give us.

The debate on the Prime Minister's resolution affords parliament a unique and far too infrequent opportunity of discussing Canada's position in international affairs. I do not recall at the moment a full-dress debate on our relations with other countries having taken place since I entered parliament in 1936. Our government, our parliament and our people have not been kept abreast of the developments in the fast-moving world community as they should. Think well over the fact that less than twenty-six full days of parliamentary sittings in the last ten years have been consumed in discussion of this most important branch of our national business. Ponder a moment, too, the fact that during that ten-year period the appropriate standing committee of this house has not been convened once to discuss the broad matters of either commonwealth or external affairs. It will not do to forget, either, that never yet in Canada have we had a separate minister of external affairs, despite the fact that the importance of that department admittedly calls loudly for something better in the way of constant attention than one can in fairness ask a busy Prime Minister to give. The plain fact is that this government has been derelict in its duty in failing to provide a full-time minister and other essential facilities properly to discuss and handle our relations with other nations. It is pretty late to start, but this house must make the best use of this opportunity to air its view on a subject which has been kept not only in the background but almost underground so far as parliament is concerned.

Having spoken on matters internal I now turn to the conference with respect to which this resolution deals. As the Prime Minister properly pointed out yesterday, San Francisco is not a peace conference. It is a conference

[Mr. Graydon.]

to which forty-four nations are invited to create the machinery which it is hoped will perpetuate and preserve the peace that is subsequently made. As a basis of discussion the delegates to this world security conclave will have before them the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and any amendments thereto.

To the united nations there were two main avenues of approach to the problem of finding the means to make the peace stick. One was, as the celebrated columnist Walter Lippmann stated, to dissolve the wartime alliance, reassemble the separated nations and then seek to bind them by the terms of a covenant in accordance with the Wilsonian principle of 1919. The other avenue was to preserve the wartime alliance by transforming it and adapting it to the post-war world. Dumbarton Oaks represents the latter approach. Its proposals contemplate a charter drafted by the authority of an alliance which is presently in existence.

The contemplated charter is evidently to be utilized as the machinery to maintain the peace when won. What is significant is the fact that the peace is to be maintained largely by the powers that win it. Viewing the proposals with a realistic eye one must come to the inescapable conclusion that there is much to commend them, particularly on the broad basis that if the great powers stick together we will have peace. If they do not, we may have war, and in any event they have the combined power to enforce world security and avert catastrophe.

Our representatives at San Francisco must recognize this situation and face it as realistically as they can. We must not allow the desire to retain as much freedom of action as possible to prevent our playing our full part in the security pact, but must harmonize these two natural and desirable objectives.

Some analysis of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals is essential to any discussion as to Canada's possible stand at the conference, although naturally those representing us at the meeting will of necessity have to meet the specific problems with some resiliency if agreements are to be finally reached. Let us examine some of the major propositions laid down for consideration at San Francisco. I am not going to go through them all, but I want to take up four or five which I think are important.

1. With regard to the principles and purposes set out in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, I fancy that no comment is called for because Canada will be whole-heartedly in agreement with them.