

power which may be wielded by the security council to take combined international enforcement action, which is a terrible and grave responsibility. In May of 1939 the league council authorized a committee to study fundamental questions of economic and social welfare, questions that are part of the causes of war. That committee met under the chairmanship of Right Hon. R. M. Bruce, high commissioner for Australia in London. In December of that year it made a report of far-reaching significance. This suggested international commission for economic and social cooperation may be an outgrowth of the work of that former committee, since it has as its purpose the promotion of respect for human rights and fundamental freedom. It would have much to do with removing the causes of war. This proposed commission is to consist of eighteen members elected by the general assembly. There is no domination by the great powers there, for the decision is to be by a simple majority of those present and voting.

There are many ways in which these suggestions show more promise than did the covenant of the league. Some of them extend former duties. There is the power of investigation, as outlined in chapter 8, section 1, as a means of forestalling war. It will be noticed also that the following clause states that any country would have that right. Any state, whether or not a member of the organization may bring any such dispute or situation to the attention of the general assembly or to the security council. The enforcement action provided under section B of chapter VIII goes a step beyond that of the former league, placing responsibility upon the great powers and the security council. There will be close scrutiny of these proposals, with the middle powers, of which Canada is one, no doubt making suggestions. I am glad to see that paragraph 3 of chapter X gives the secretary-general the right to bring to the attention of the security council any matter which in his opinion may threaten international peace and security.

I have not sufficient time to discuss many of these details. But, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) told us this afternoon, they will require careful study, in order that our position will be sound, and that the delegation may have in its hands the conclusions of experts and of those well versed in international affairs.

To my mind the five paragraphs in the Prime Minister's resolution merit widespread support. Canada should go to the conference after the best preparation that can be made, and after the most expert and careful scrutiny of the proposals; and we should go having in

[Mrs. Casselman.]

mind what we want not only for ourselves but for the other nations of the world. Canada should go with the purpose of cooperating, and of making this basis for discussion a vital document for the strengthening of world ties.

I think the house will give unanimous consent and support to the resolution, because this is a matter which touches all of us individually and nationally. The United States has made a united stand, through both its great parties. For instance Senator Austin of the Republican party, speaking on Lincoln's birthday last month, had this to say:

Every opportunity should be employed to strengthen the faith of our chief executive that he has the moral power of this nation to support his position and give effect to his advocacy of the organization for security and peace. We advocate as a party the development of international law, including a bill of rights for men in their international relations and the establishment and use of international tribunals of justice for their administration.

Let us uphold a non-partisan stand, and unite for the establishment of an enduring peace. Let us be confident that from these small beginnings will grow a great undertaking. Hon. members will recall the words of Arthur Clough quoted by Mr. Churchill in a broadcast he made some years ago:

For while the tired waves vainly breaking  
Seem here no painful inch to gain,  
Far back through creeks and inlets making  
Comes silent flooding in the main.

Very small beginnings—and these are not small beginnings—grow to things that at last may give us security and peace.

Mr. R. T. GRAHAM (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I desire first of all to record my whole-hearted and unqualified approval of the resolution introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Not only do I approve the principle contained therein, but my approval extends particularly to its wording. On this particular occasion the wording of the resolution is important because, in general terms, it indicates the instructions from the government and parliament of Canada to the delegation which will go to San Francisco to speak for the country.

You, Mr. Speaker, and other hon. members, will have noted that while in general terms the resolution approves the Dumbarton Oaks agreement as a basis for discussion, its terms are sufficiently flexible to permit of improvement, and to permit of the Canadian delegation doing all within its power to improve if possible the agreement reached at Dumbarton Oaks. Then, finally, in recognition of the fact that Canada is a democracy, and that no agreement reached at San Francisco could in the long run be efficacious or useful unless it had