

war and adjusted to peace-time requirements. A plan has already been drawn up. It is not a question of Bretton Woods or chaos as we are told so often by certain leading bankers. Other alternative plans have already been formulated, and perhaps the best known one is that sponsored by the London chamber of commerce.

I was speaking to one of the highest officials of the Department of Finance on this matter and I asked him whether or not the London chamber of commerce proposals would be satisfactory. After studying them he said he thought they would be good proposals but the difficulty would be to get other nations to agree to them. I asked him what nations. I said: "Would Russia agree?" He said, "Yes, he thought so".

It finally boiled down to the fact that he did not think the United States would agree. Of course the United States hold eighty-five per cent of the gold reserves of the world and are, therefore, anxious to get the gold back into circulation. But should we turn down a scheme just because the United States will not agree to it and support a scheme which we know to be fundamentally unsound and which may very well wreck the peace organization?

In closing, I would again say that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals might form the basis for a discussion, but I certainly think that when the Prime Minister speaks in closing the debate he should tell us clearly and unequivocally whether or not endorsement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals means an endorsement of the Bretton Woods final act.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes, and prove his case.

Mr. QUELCH: We may not have assurance from other nations but at least we are entitled to that assurance from the Prime Minister. It is quite a while since the final act was formulated and we were promised a debate on the question in this house. We were promised that Canada would not agree to the final act until it had been agreed to by parliament. Up to the present time we have not had an opportunity to debate the question in this house. Now we are being asked to endorse proposals for a certain international organization of which we are told the Bretton Woods final act is the corner-stone.

I believe that under a sound economic policy Dumbarton Oaks could lead us to peace, but under an unsound policy, such as the final act of the Bretton Woods agreement, whilst we might possibly prevent an international war, we would on the other hand make civil war inevitable.

Mr. A. G. SLAGHT (Parry Sound): In addressing the house on this very important subject may I preface my remarks by saying that I believe this resolution and the San Francisco conference should receive the unanimous support of the people of Canada and the hon. members of this house. Before I deal directly with the resolution may I say a word with reference to the attitude of the hon. the house leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon) as disclosed in his very able address to-day. I enjoyed that portion of his address which constituted an analysis and somewhat provocative and proper questions as to the interpretation of the proposed charter which we have before us as a basis. But I was somewhat surprised that the hon. member, despite the virtuous assertion of his desk-mate that the debate should be conducted without partisan or political prejudice creeping in—and I think it should—to hear him this afternoon as the house leader of a party bidding for power to whom these proposals have been available since last December, assail the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and our supposed lack of government policy in the language which he used. I am going to give you, sir, three or four sentences to which I take distinct exception. The hon. leader of the opposition said that there was nothing to indicate what position Canada was taking with respect to close collaboration with the United Kingdom and other commonwealth nations as to San Francisco. Surely the sending of an able representative to England to participate in commonwealth discussions prior to the journey to San Francisco makes that criticism purely one made for political purposes.

His second complaint is that the Prime Minister and the government ruled out John Bracken, as he put it, as a delegate and that conduct or ruling was regarded by his party as an unprovoked slight. I want to deal with that in a moment. Then the hon. gentleman went on to say that this government was derelict in its duty in failing to provide a full-time minister and the essential facilities properly to handle and discuss our relations with other nations; and he said that his party made its views known on this subject which he suggested had been kept in the background and in fact almost underground as far as the policies of the government were concerned. That is all very delightful language to be heard in a non-partisan address. Then he charged our government with pursuing an ostrich-like course in time of peace, only to pull its head out of the sand at the last minute and find this country involved in a war.