

*United Nations Agreement*

country, apparently, is to be subject to domination by Russia. Yet we were assured repeatedly that the united nations were not fighting for any territorial gain.

I remind you that on November 6, 1941, no less a person than Stalin himself said:

We have not, nor can have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other peoples, irrespective of whether European peoples and territories or Asiatic peoples and territories, including Iran, are concerned. Our first aim is to liberate our territories from the German nazi yoke.

And again, on March 16, 1942, Litvinoff said:

We are all interested in the speediest possible ending of the war; the speediest possible conclusion of a just peace treaty, enabling each nation to develop in accordance with its own aspirations without interference from outside, and in no fear of war again breaking out.

You ask anybody in Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Rumania, or Bulgaria what has happened since those promises were made, and what is happening to the people in those various countries to-day? I would also remind hon. members of the house of the conditions under which elections are being conducted in Bulgaria and Hungary—conditions to which no self-respecting democratic country can possibly subscribe.

What justice is there in those conditions for the people who are concerned? What respect is there for the obligations arising out of recognized international law? Where is the observance of human rights or the rights of small nations?

These are questions which make it pretty clear—patently clear, that Kenneth Crawford, liberal newspaperman of the United States, was mighty close to the truth when he said this:

The charter and the organization it creates are only new crepe paper window dressing for a store that sells the same old goods—domination of weak nations by strong nations; rivalry between the big, dominant nations; potential world war.

The united nations charter was signed by the representatives of governments as a means of ensuring the future peace of the world. Since that was done the war has ended. But with each day that passes the world situation is deteriorating rapidly. And who, Mr. Speaker, but the nations that yesterday wanted peace are causing that deterioration? With the conclusion of hostilities only a few weeks behind us, there is already a growing fear of a third world war.

I should like to place upon the record a quotation from a recent issue of the daily *Herald* of England, the official organ of the British Labour party. This is a quotation

[Mr. Low.]

which, to me, strikes a most ominous note. I quote from the report which appeared in Canadian newspapers:

London: The Daily *Herald*, organ of the British Labour Party, declared Wednesday that the "world is heading with its eyes open for another war."

The *Herald* said the council of foreign ministers meeting in London has been dominated throughout by power politics, by suspicions and ambitions" and that the Atlantic and San Francisco charters "seem already to have been forgotten."

That is serious. Even in the United States, reports indicate that congress has been giving its attention to the steps which have to be taken by that country in preparation for what they call the next war. I need hardly mention, either, the military expedition that is to set out upon a long trip to do research work in our northwest territories, right here in Canada. Why?

One is struck with the fact that while the cry of "peace, peace" goes up from millions of war-stricken victims, there is no peace. Hatred, despair, suspicion, and intrigue are rampant among the ruins of what was once European civilization. Totalitarianism is as strongly entrenched as ever—only it is red totalitarianism now, instead of the black variety of the nazi-fascist axis. Where totalitarianism in any form exists, there is a constant threat of violence and aggression. And what makes all these things infinitely worse, commercial imperialism is already on the march. This can bring on a form of warfare far more destructive of human resources than is military warfare, far more destructive than it can ever be. I refer to economic warfare, which is ruthless even in so-called enlightened countries.

Now, what evidence is there in those conditions of a determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and "to practice tolerance and live in peace," as the preamble to the charter declares? The more closely it is examined, the plainer it becomes that the preamble of the united nations charter cannot be sustained. It conflicts with the world organization set out in the body of the charter, and it conflicts with the evidence of conditions as they exist throughout the world which lies smouldering in ruins but in which the old games are still being played.

Let us look at the nature of the organization which is proposed under the charter. In the limited time available to me I cannot do more than touch on one or two of the highlights.

Article 2 states that the organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all nations. Yet, as I have already pointed