

4. that this house agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. that the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to parliament for approval.

The Department of External Affairs has had printed in pamphlet form, for the convenience of hon. members, a copy of the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and I have asked that copies of this publication be placed in the boxes of hon. members this afternoon so that they will be available immediately at the conclusion of to-day's sitting.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Does this document include the report of the Bretton Woods conference?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it does not. As I recall it, the report of the Bretton Woods conference was tabled some time ago. This pamphlet contains the proposals that were considered at Dumbarton Oaks, and to which some further consideration was given during the Crimea conference at Yalta.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with this motion to-morrow. I think it important that not only our country but all peace-loving countries should know at as early a day as possible that this house approves the establishment of an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and that Canada intends to be represented at the conference. I think hon. members have had very full notice of the fact that this resolution, or something similar, would come up at this session, because I have referred to it publicly many times, and there have been other references to it. I hope, therefore, that no exception will be taken to the house proceeding with the resolution as the first order of business to-morrow. I would move that this resolution be considered to-morrow.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): It is not the desire of the opposition to do other than facilitate public business at this time. Of course we have our bounden duty to discharge in regard to the critical examination of everything brought in by the government, but subject to that there is no desire on our part, as the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) said a few moments ago, to do anything but cooperate in respect to providing money in order to carry on the war. Now, however, the Prime Minister brings up something else, the resolu-

tion dealing with the San Francisco conference, with which he proposes to proceed as the first order of business to-morrow. I should like to point out that this creates a rather difficult situation for members, a situation I should like the government to consider. It is perhaps true that some general mention has been made of a resolution of this kind which might be introduced at some stage of the session, but, if I may say so, to ask the opposition and other groups in this house to go on with this resolution to-morrow is to place quite a load upon those whose duty it is to scrutinize carefully the position of the government with respect to this matter.

I would have no objection to the Prime Minister himself going on to-morrow if that would meet his wishes and those of the government. We do not want to be non-cooperative about it, but following the Prime Minister's presentation I feel quite sure a number of hon. members of the house will desire to seek the fullest possible information with respect to the government's position. For a long time the external affairs of our country have been pretty much in the vest pocket of the Prime Minister, and I do not say that offensively. Having that in mind I am sure the house will expect him in his presentation to elaborate on these matters, to give a historical outline of the position in which Canada finds itself and the various developments leading up to it. Then, no doubt, he will give the proposals of the government, as to what is intended to be done in connection with the San Francisco conference. That being the case no doubt there will be a great deal of meat to digest in what the Prime Minister has to say to-morrow, and I suggest that it will take some time for the opposition and other groups in the house to analyse his statement. I should expect, and I am sure the house would expect, the Prime Minister's presentation to-morrow to be lengthy. We know there is a great deal to be said. Therefore, following his statement I would ask the Prime Minister to consider an adjournment of the debate to give an opportunity to digest what he has said. As I said before, I believe there is no subject to come before parliament to which more careful or more detailed consideration and attention must be given. In past sessions we have not had any lengthy opportunity to debate matters of this kind, nor have we had an opportunity to learn the government's position or the policy it intends to follow in this respect.

What provision is to be made so that questions may be asked the Prime Minister during the resolution stage? My understanding is that there will be no committee, and for