

San Francisco. This raises at once the question as to the status of the delegates the government will choose outside of its own supporters. Will they go as full-fledged delegates? Will they go as advisers, or what will be their capacity? Will they have the same freedom to express their views at San Francisco as is claimed by the representatives of the Republican party in the United States; and will there be any prior consultation among the delegates who will go to the conference? I raise this point because certainly in the past there has been no disposition on the part of the government to take the official opposition into its confidence with respect to external affairs.

I can find no reference in the Prime Minister's address to a very important matter which has been raised from time to time regarding the scope and field of the united nations charter. In his reply in this debate I would ask him, if he will, to make clear his interpretation with respect to the powers of the new security organization, particularly with reference to the question of the revision of any part or all of the peace treaties which may be made prior to the united nations charter going into effect. On this point, as well as others, this house would like to know if any other governments have sent in proposals or amendments relative to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. If they have done so, has Canada received copies of them? If so, such proposals or amendments should be made public or tabled in this house.

I now come to another rather important part of the Prime Minister's address, in which he spoke of military agreements. To use his own words, at page 26 of *Hansard* for March 20, the Prime Minister said:

Under the present proposals, members of the organization would not be required to place forces under the control of the security council except in accordance with special agreements separately entered into, setting forth the number and types of the forces, and the facilities and assistance which they are prepared to provide.

The agreements would limit the military aid, pledged by members, to what each member was ready to give of its own volition. The agreements might include provisions governing the circumstances in which any forces could be called upon to serve abroad. These agreements would need separate approval in accordance with the constitutional processes of each country. In Canada that would mean approval by parliament before such agreements were ratified.

There is at present a good deal of obscurity about the methods by which this part of the proposals would be developed in practice. One point, however, is clear. As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council. If any such commitment were sought, it would be

embodied in a later agreement, freely negotiated by the government of Canada, and coming into effect only after it had been approved by parliament.

With respect to these points I should like the Prime Minister to make clear when the agreements which are mentioned in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, and referred to in his speech yesterday, are likely to be entered into by the states subscribing to the charter, and this is what I mean by that statement. Will there be any agreements entered into at San Francisco, or will the agreements be entered into after approval and ratification of the charter have been given by the respective governments, or will the agreements be entered into only after the peace treaties have been signed?

It would appear that the extent of our contribution with respect to force will be governed by the agreements rather than by the charter itself. We should be told whether there will be one blanket agreement covering all our contributions in this regard or whether there will have to be a special agreement covering each particular operation in which the organization may require men and equipment and, if so, will each of these special agreements have to come before parliament for approval and ratification in each instance?

To my mind these agreements are going to be of vast import so far as this country is concerned, and I feel that the Prime Minister has not dealt with them and their import as fully as he should have done. There will be ample time, however, for him to do so when he replies in this debate, and I ask him now to clarify this point at that time.

World peace and world trade are inseparable partners. The success of the new international organization will depend to a very large extent upon the degree to which it is possible for world trade to expand. Conversely, we know it is equally true that world trade can flourish only when the international political climate is favourable. Too little was said by the Prime Minister and too little has been said in this debate on the question of opening the channels of trade. This nation must have trade. Without it all the internal palliatives will be ineffective to make or keep our people employed and prosperous. One of the major jobs of the economic and social council of the new united nations organization will have to be centred on methods to be applied in extending international commerce. When the Prime Minister replies I suggest he give his views with respect to the possible functions and powers of the economic and social council in this regard.