

sick of war and we hope that it will be postponed for a long period of time. While they are at San Francisco they must think of all those who have so deeply suffered during this war, so that that suffering shall cease in the future and this country be in the position that she deserves to have in the world.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I wish to add my voice to that of those who have already spoken in support of the resolution before us; and I hope I do so with full understanding of all that is involved in it. I do not think that any sane person in Canada to-day is opposed to this country taking part in a collective security system. What has happened in the world during the past fifteen years should be sufficient to convince us that there is an imperative need for some kind of international system that will maintain peace. It is not only necessary to prevent aggression because in a certain sense that is a negative state; it is necessary that peace may be something more than just absence of war, it must be a dynamic condition promoting human welfare and human concord.

I must say that I was very much surprised at the attitude taken by the official opposition yesterday and the day before in refusing to take part in the debate until they had heard or read what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had to say. To me the resolution itself made it clear, as clear as it could be made at this time, what the position of the Prime Minister would be. For the sake of brevity I should like to paraphrase the resolution that we are discussing. It asks that the house endorse the government's acceptance of the invitation to the conference. That is No. 1. No. 2, that the house recognizes the establishment of an international organization for the maintenance of peace is vitally important to Canada and that Canada should be a member. No. 3, that the house approves the principle and purposes set forth in the proposals of the four governments and considers them a satisfactory general basis for discussion. No. 4, that the house agrees that Canada's representatives should use their best endeavours to prepare an acceptable charter for maintaining international peace and security. No. 5, that the charter be submitted to parliament for approval before ratification. To me this is well worded and I think it is a non-controversial resolution. It is clear and to the point. It proposes five things. It asks first for the acceptance of the invitation. Unless we are opposed to collective security we could not be opposed to that, and it should not give room for criticism. The second one asks membership of Canada in an international

organization for maintaining peace. I do not believe there is any room for opposition or criticism there. The fourth asks that Canada's representatives press for the best charter possible, and the fifth that the charter as approved be brought before parliament before becoming effective. Now I believe there is no room for criticism there.

Let me go back to the third one which I left to the last, namely, that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals be the general basis for discussion. I do not think they are a matter for criticism so far as this government is concerned, because the government was not implicated or consulted in the formulation of these proposals. The proposals themselves, of course, are open to criticism. It also suggests that we here make proposals that the delegation may submit at the San Francisco conference. Why should the official opposition then take the position that they could not say anything or commit themselves to anything until they heard what the Prime Minister had to say? To me the attitude of the official opposition is amazing at so critical a time and on so important an issue. It is indeed very hard to understand.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell) in putting the views of this party before the house yesterday covered most of the points in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals that we should like to have considered. I do not think he exhausted the points in the draft plan that we believe could be improved, but I am not going to take the time to-night to add to what he said in that regard. The most I wish to say is that I am in favour of an international security system because I see no way of avoiding war or of avoiding world chaos unless we bring our international relations within the rule of law. The inventions in transportation and communications of the last few decades have made of the nations of the world a community; and it is no longer a figure of speech to talk about the community of nations. As we have a community of nations I think those nations must now come under the rule of law as individuals and groups in nations must abide by the law of those nations; otherwise I can see no hope for peace in the future. In order that that may be done, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart when he spoke, nations may have and will have to give up a certain amount of sovereignty. I believe that, as is the case again with the individual who, in giving up certain freedoms acquires certain other freedoms which do not limit his opportunities but add to them, so with nations.