

behind it public opinion in Canada, the resolution provides that before the charter adopted at San Francisco can be binding upon or accepted by Canada, the Canadian parliament will have an opportunity to discuss the complete proposal, and to pass judgment thereon. So, as I say, I am particularly pleased with the way in which the resolution appears before the house, in respect of both its subject matter and its wording.

There are some issues which in their very nature transcend party lines, or which do not develop that cleavage of opinion which generally divides the different parties and groups in the house. Surely if there ever was an issue before the House of Commons worthy of the united support of all hon. members it is the one now before us. The history of Canada in the present generation must make clear to all of us the fact that there is one issue on which we should stand united, namely that of preventing if possible a recurrence of war and the sacrifice and suffering that follows in its wake. Canada cannot stand aside from seeking a solution to this age-old problem.

As hon. members know, this country is as peace-loving as could be imagined. In my lifetime I have not known of any responsible leader of any political party in Canada, or any other person prominent in our public life, showing any desire to embroil Canada needlessly in a war. So I say the people of Canada are whole-heartedly behind anything that may bring hope of permanent peace and security to a world in which Canada forms a small but very important part.

I join in the hope already expressed in this debate that we will find that degree of unity in the House of Commons, in the editorial pages of our press, over the radio and in the hearts and minds of our people which may in its turn enable the delegation from Canada to promote unity among the nations of the world in the setting up of this organization, which holds out such high hopes to the whole of the human race.

In this connection I think it proper to call to the attention of hon. members an expression used in May of last year by the Prime Minister upon his return from the conference of prime ministers in London. On that occasion the house paid him a well-deserved tribute of friendship, and in replying he said that if the speech he made in London had any value it was because he recognized that the things that unite us are so much greater than the things that divide us. That is what prompted him to make the appeal, not only to the members of the British commonwealth but to the nations of the world, for support of those

principles that will lead us to a better world, a world in which there would be some hope of permanent peace.

I am not sure that all of us recognize the immensity of the task we have embarked upon. There are those who, with some justification, do not believe that there is any hope of setting up an organization that will be able to outlaw war. If one were a pessimist he would have to agree that the history of mankind, particularly the history of our own day and age, would justify that attitude. I do not class the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) as being one of these, yet he gave to-day an indication of a line of thought that is understandable when he suggested that the position of the world depends, not upon the contribution that Canada and the smaller countries can make, but upon the good will and the purposes of the three great powers, the United States, Russia and Great Britain. We must however rise above these fears and set ourselves to the task, no matter how great the difficulties.

From our viewpoint, if perhaps not from the viewpoint of others, one of the cornerstones of any such organization must be a sufficient degree of unity, a great degree if you will, between the two great English speaking democracies, our mother country, Great Britain, and our neighbour to the south, the United States. Canada has done and can do much to cement their friendship and cooperation. These countries are joined together by a common language, a common political philosophy, by aims and objectives which are the same because of their history; and yet if one considers the aftermath of earlier wars he finds that even those two great democracies, if they so desired, could find issues upon which to divide or which would create sufficient dissension to make it impossible for them to cooperate in a world security organization. To illustrate, I need only direct your attention to the position in the Pacific and the trade rivalries that of necessity exist between those two great countries. If it is difficult for those countries, and our country, to find a unity of purpose sufficient to bind them together as united nations, when one thinks of other nations not so bound together by ties of language and of common philosophies it is easy to be overwhelmed by the difficulties of the task that lies ahead. Again I say we must look upon these difficulties as but a challenge to overcome them.

The third great power of to-day, Russia, is just as important in the final outcome of the setting up of this organization. Unity between Great Britain, the United States and Russia