

It would seem that the approach of the government in this matter is toward a policy which would include the most cooperative of relations between Canada and the nations of the world. It is one which does not disturb existing affiliations in the Commonwealth, or with our great neighbor, but one which seems to extend these relations into yet broader fields. One need spend little time in impressing on the country and on ourselves the need for order among the nations, the need of some organization by which we shall perhaps not stop war but through which we shall certainly guarantee the peace more effectively than we have done in the past two decades. As the Prime Minister said, we made a valiant effort, but we failed in that effort. We failed, as he suggested, not only because the league lacked universality, but because we failed to recognize that you cannot have responsibility without power. There is no point in having a perfect paper organization which, when it comes to securing the peace and enforcing peace, simply will not work unless there are certain necessary conditions present.

It seems to me, then, that five principles should underlie the world security organization contemplated at Dumbarton Oaks, and which will be discussed at San Francisco. These are:

1. The world security organization must be fully equipped with necessary military force to meet its objective.
2. To bring this about there must be the closest political and military cooperation between the British Commonwealth, the United States, the Soviet Union, China and the other free nations of the world.
3. The responsibility in any future world organization should be constructed on and around the four great powers mentioned, and the other peace-loving states should play their part in the structure in a manner proportionate to their ability to contribute.
4. The world security organization should be flexible enough to permit growth by practice and experience. It should not be straitjacketed either by rigid code or rule.
5. All nations—great, middle, and small—included in the world security organization, should aim at economic and political collaboration.

These are the underlying principles which I suggest should be in the minds of the delegation from Canada when it goes to San Francisco. Certainly this is one of the most vital questions this parliament has had to face. The proposal at Dumbarton Oaks was that there

would be a world security council, an assembly, and an economic and social council, under which will be organizations to deal with functional matters. We must not overlook the fact that the essential characteristics of the structure of the league of nations are being maintained. What is being done is to place emphasis on the successful operation of the means by which force shall be employed to maintain peace. This is done by incorporating the principle of the concert of nations, the principle of a strong power bloc, if you will, within the framework of the world security council.

At first I found it difficult to reconcile the acceptance of this proposal with the convictions I have expressed in this house for many years. But while one must bear in mind what ought to be done, the fact is that in this very difficult world one must consider what can be done. The league failed because Russia earlier, and the United States throughout the league's existence, were not members. The peace of the world can not be maintained unless the great powers, those which have the greatest armed and economic force, are prepared to use these weapons. The mechanism proposed in the motion is designed to call upon these nations to use force on occasions of serious and unwarranted aggression.

A country like Canada, one of the leading middle nations, a country that has contributed billions of dollars by way of mutual aid, a country that has enlisted less than a million men, a country that has made a contribution which has won the tributes of the world, cannot in its own interests avoid careful scrutiny of the present provisions in the security council. One recognizes the position of the great powers, but if one is prepared to make a distinction between the great powers and the middle powers, should a distinction not be made between some of the middle powers and some of the lesser powers?

I recognize the difficulty of grading the potential contributing power of the middle and smaller nations, but having in mind that if aggression should occur again the middle nations will be called upon to contribute sanctions, it should not be forgotten that this means the employment of their resources, both economic and human. Therefore we cannot dismiss this question as one of mere academic interest.

It may be, and I offer this only as a suggestion, that upon the application of the principle of functional representation, a principle of which the Prime Minister is the author, a principle that has been recognized in all the functional bodies established since the war,