

to form a basis of discussion and of bargaining when these delegations meet shortly in San Francisco.

The real purpose of the institutions to be set up in San Francisco is the establishment of an organization to maintain international peace and security, a consummation devoutly to be wished. To this end it is proposed that we constitute a security council of eleven nations and endow that council with the drastic and terrible responsibility of peace and war. If you will turn to page 16 of the pamphlet containing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, published by the wartime information board, you will notice that the council in question is empowered to settle any dispute which constitutes in its judgment a threat to international security. To that end it may take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary. Then if you will turn to page 17 of the pamphlet, you will note that all the members, not the eleven only who constitute the council for the time being, are expected to make available to the security council the armed forces, facilities and assistance which may be necessary. This is qualified only by the fact that the military assistance shall be in accordance with the agreements concluded among themselves. That is a powerful organization for concentrating in the hands of a few the military forces of the united nations.

But the fly in the ointment is in the constitution of the council, which you will find described on page 11 of the pamphlet. This reads:

The security council should consist of one representative of each of eleven members of the organization. Representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China, and, in due course, France, should have permanent seats.

The remaining six seats are to be competed for by the forty or fifty other united nations on a two year basis without the privilege of reelection. I do not wish to go through all the details of this constitution, with its voting privileges and so on. Sufficient it is for my purpose to say that the control of the armed forces which may be placed at the disposal of this council is to be in the hands of the permanent members of the board.

It has been urged in countless debates since these proposals were made that this control by the so-called great powers is made inevitable by the recognition of the facts of military might—as the Prime Minister phrased it, “the

[Mr. Roebuck.]

fact of might in this imperfect world.” One cannot be a realist and not recognize the logical consequence of the possession of power, but those who assume the right to make decisions should furnish the military might necessary to enforce them. There is an old saying that he who pays the piper calls the tune. I think the reverse statement should be equally true, that he who calls the tune should pay the piper.

The Canadian people, it will be found, are not prepared to be the tail of any one's kite—international or otherwise. I notice that Anthony Eden, the British foreign secretary, seemed to have recognized that fact in a statement which appeared in yesterday's paper; I read from the *Toronto Star*:

There can be no freedom in the world unless the smaller states can be joined with the great powers in the protection of their common interests. Their right to their own way of life must be respected.

Note this sentence:

They must have their due share in making great decisions.

Mr. Eden must have realized that unless the smaller nations have had their share in the making of decisions of prime importance, they will not long cooperate in carrying them out. If it is necessary that we have a number of permanent members on the security council, to the exclusion of and superior to the great body of the united nations, then I ask, why is it that Canada is not included? I have been surprised Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate to observe the readiness with which members on all sides of the house have accepted on the part of our nation the role of a second class power. I submit to you that a nation that is able to enlist something slightly fewer than a million men in its armed forces, that has a hundred ships of war upon the sea and thousands of its airmen in the skies, that is able to pour out something in the order of twenty billion dollars for the war effort before this coming year is concluded—I submit that such a nation holds no inferior place among the nations of the world. When it comes to enforcing decisions of the security council, when military action or economic sanctions are the order of the day, the concurrence of Canada will be essential to success.

I have been told that the reason we are not included among the permanent members of this board is that it is economic and military power that counts. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, how can it be said that France and China have anything comparable to the military and economic power of the Dominion of Canada?