

member of the Council because she appears as part of the British Empire." He tells us in his book that he only withdrew from that position when he got Clemenceau, Wilson and Lloyd George to sign an undertaking as to what they understood to be the true construction of Article IV. It will be found at page 961 of Sir Robert's Memoirs. They said in effect: "We think the meaning of this document is clear,—notwithstanding that Canada appears as a part of the British Empire, she has the right to be elected a member of the Council," which is another way of saying that Great Britain was signing for the United Kingdom only; therefore Canada, Australia and the other Dominions signed as independent nations and as such were entitled to be elected to the Council. Honourable members, if I had time I would quote what Sir Robert said in his speech in the other House on the motion to ratify the treaty. In September, 1919, Mr. Fielding had suggested that Great Britain could sign the treaty and bind Canada, whether Canada consented or not. Sir Robert replied: "If that is your interpretation, you are just a hundred years out of date." Since that time another twenty-five or twenty-six years have gone by, and the interpretation is even that much more out of date.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: All members of this assembly who cherish the British Empire, who have its ideals at heart, and who want to do everything to perpetuate this great family of nations, should be a unit in their desire and insistence that there be no complicated clause in respect to this Council which will require Great Britain each time she casts a vote to seek the advice of every part of the Empire.

If she could not get accord on that basis, then I do not know what the solution would be. I have never yet heard anybody who objects to the proposal I have given as an alternative who has any intelligent solution of the question.

Now, honourable senators, in this connection how essential it is that this greatest League of Nations which has ever existed, the British Commonwealth of Nations, be not tangled up with agreements that can breed discord, dissension and misunderstanding. General Smuts, when addressing a conference of the Empire nations in May, 1917, said:

Talk about a League of Nations, you are the only League of Nations that has ever existed!

How can we as Canadians in the British Commonwealth of Nations—for we can speak as a family voice, if not as a political voice—

how can we best serve this great ideal effort for peace? There are dangers, honourable senators, in the suggestions I have made that some of the big powers might not live up to the solemn obligations they are now undertaking; the United States might become isolationist—certainly there is no indication of it now, but it might happen; Great Britain might get the germ of pacifism again—even we in Canada might get it; Russia might decide that her destiny lay in world supremacy rather than in co-operation with the other free nations. If any of these things happen I see no solution which will bring about a permanent peace. But there is every indication that these things will not happen and this time our constructive efforts for peace may succeed. What can we do to help? I think the first essential is a better and more continuous and clearer understanding of each other as between the United States of America and the British Commonwealth of Nations. I do not mean—to use an expression I have heard in this debate—that we should "gang up" on Russia. Far from it. But I believe the closer the English-speaking peoples are together, the more we understand each other, the more all these false issues are wiped out, the more unwarranted statements are explained away, the easier it will be to come to a real nation-like man-to-man understanding with Russia.

And when, honourable members, we stop to think of it, there never was anything in the history of the world that ought to be easier of achievement than a close association between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: We speak the same language; to a large extent we have come from the same stock; we have the same traditions of government; we both believe ourselves to be leaders in democracy and the application of the principles of democratic government; and, what to my mind is even more important, we both have the same principles of justice; our literature, our religion—everything that ought to be the basis of real co-operation between one nation and another—are common to the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Let me say this, honourable senators. In this debate I have been surprised that my colleagues in the legal profession have not said more about the International Court of Justice. As you know, war has always been the court of last resort in international disputes. If you are to take away