

Let us be certain of this, that at the conclusion of a war that has so devastated the world as the present one has done, the people of the world, even the statesmen of the world, since they are human, are hardly in a frame of mind conducive to the founding of an organization that hopes to perform the great service to mankind that this united nations organization, it is hoped, will render. So that we must of necessity cast our minds some years ahead; and, thinking in terms of that future, I believe it would be wise to give to the San Francisco conference the right to include in the charter some provision whereby the united nations will recognize the necessity of perhaps periodically reviewing the set-up and making such changes as will render it more workable and better able to fit into the framework of the worlds needs.

One of the arguments raised against the proposed plan, and it is a most natural one, is the fear that the three or four or five great powers may constitute a threat to the freedom and liberty of the smaller nations. However, like other speakers who have preceded me, I do not believe that the success or failure of the new organization will depend on the authority that is given to the members of the security council. I think we must recognize that power rests somewhere in this world, and at the moment, being realistic, we must know that the combination of the power of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain constitutes that military strength either to enforce peace or to cause another war. It is the use and direction of that power that we are concerned with, and when we must impose upon the countries possessing that military strength and power a responsibility, it seems to me to follow that we must of necessity recognize the responsibility they assume; and certainly in the earlier days of this organization we must give them the safeguards that will permit them to work without too much fear of accepting that responsibility.

I am certain that this united nations organization will not fail because we have given the great powers too much authority. It will fail if, in the development of that organization, we do not win, along with the responsibilities that should go with it, the good will and understanding of all those great powers. The alternative of course—you and I know it—is that if we do not succeed in that purpose the great power that might disagree with the attitude of the united nations could walk out; and then of course we would have a repetition of the history of the past, and that power will inevitably attempt to gather about it—Germany perhaps, Japan perhaps, or some other nation—the countries that are discontented

with their lot in life. And then we shall find in truth two great groups of powers again facing one another with opposite purposes and different objectives.

That is the situation that inevitably leads to the outbreak of war. It seems to me therefore that Canada need not fear the authority that is given to the powers who must accept the chief share of the responsibility of preserving peace, because when we persuade them to join with the smaller powers in forming the united organization, if we succeed in convincing them that it is to the interest of each to continue to be a member of that united nations organization and make the contribution which each can, then I think there will be hope that the new organization will succeed where in that regard at least the league of nations failed.

Personally I believe that there was never in the world's history such an opportunity for gaining that measure of cooperation between the great powers as exists to-day. When we view the attitude of the people of the United States after the last war and view the attitude of the people and of the government of that great nation to-day; when we see Russia, great as it is in military strength, committed to the task of developing its own country's resources, I am convinced that the three powers, Great Britain, the United States, and Russia, have a common objective, namely, in their own interests to preserve peace. Relying upon that, I am not at all concerned at giving them a certain measure of authority in dictating the important decisions of the security council. I would ask the members of the house to consider this. We cannot hope to impose upon another country our political philosophy. We must take those countries as they are and seek to find a common purpose in pursuit of a common objective and somehow make them work to that objective and with that purpose in view.

President Wilson's remark that we fought in the first war to make the world safe for democracy is, I am afraid, not a correct statement of the position that we are in to-day. I think it would be more correctly put if we said that we are fighting to preserve for ourselves and others who believe in democracy, and who are capable of being governed by such a philosophy, the right to be so governed. But, I think every nation must accept within the framework of the united nations organization the principle that every country has the right to govern itself as it thinks best in its own interest.