

*San Francisco Conference*

is of course one of the true keystones of any organization that may be set up. Russia has emerged from a great revolution which occurred some twenty-five or more years ago. She has been engaged in the tremendous task of consolidating her position as a world power and of developing the economic life of a great self-sustaining empire. We know that if the united nations organization is to be fruitful in its results it must be established on an appreciation of the things that unite these three great powers, the United States, Great Britain and Russia and not upon the things that might possibly divide them.

Let me read a statement made by Sir Norman Angell which I think illustrates what I have in mind. Referring to the place of Russia and our relationship to Russia, he says:

The issue this time will not depend so much on guarantees to France as to Russia. For obvious geographical and military reasons, Russia will have the last word concerning future treatment of Germany. Again the same point arises: the outcome will depend, not so much upon whether we can trust Russia, as upon whether Russia can be brought to trust us, to trust that we of the "capitalist west" will not combine against her "in defence of capitalism," and that we will, if she is attacked, come to her aid just as twice within a quarter of a century we went to the aid of France.

We should be realistic in our approach to the task that lies ahead. We must approach this problem so that we shall be able to count on that degree of cooperation between all the powers that will be necessary to make a success of any organization we may hope to set up in San Francisco.

I need not recall the other difficulties, such as the Polish question, and the place that France will understandably seek to gain in this world. One could go over the continents of this earth and in each he will find problems that require the utmost degree of tolerance, the utmost of understanding, the utmost of friendly help if solutions are to be found for the problems that exist, and if the causes of war are to be removed so that this new organization may have some possibility of success.

The history of Canada is to no little degree a lesson in the wisdom of tolerance and understanding. I hope the Canadian representatives at San Francisco will have in mind some of the lessons that we have gained throughout our history. I recall the brief session of this house last November. The issue then before the house was one that excited, not only a great deal of controversy but considerable heat in some portions of the house. After everything that could be said seemed to have been said, the debate still continued. I remember a friend of mine coming to sit beside me. He

[Mr. Graham.]

asked me if I did not think it was an imposition that the members had to listen to the hon. member who was then speaking, and who insisted on making his contribution to that particular debate. While I would have liked the house to get through its business and permit us to go home, I said to him: "Instead of complaining we Canadians should be thankful indeed that we have in this House of Commons an institution that permits us to settle our disputes, and any crisis which may arise in the nation's history, in the manner in which we met that particular crisis, if you care to call it that. How blessed are we that, instead of bullets and armed revolutions and unexpected clashes of armed forces, we have found in our democratic institutions a safety valve of expression which permits our people through their elected representatives to speak their minds, to claim the opportunity to present the viewpoints of their constituents in this House of Commons, and after what is on some occasions a lengthy debate, to accept as a nation the verdict of the majority." So as I say, in Canada's history surely we have learned some lessons which those whose duty it will be to represent Canada not only in the San Francisco conference but in the subsequent organization, may bring to that organization and help to build up and strengthen it in the work it proposes to do.

Still more so is this true of the British commonwealth of nations. I recall the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in the speech which he made in London last year, when, addressing both houses and referring to Britain and the commonwealth, he used these words:

So long as Britain continues to maintain the spirit of freedom, and to defend the freedom of other nations, she need never doubt her pre-eminence throughout the world. So long as we all share that spirit we need never fear for the strength or unity of the commonwealth. The voluntary decisions by Britain, by Canada, by Australia, by New Zealand, and by South Africa are a supreme evidence of the unifying force of freedom.

The British commonwealth of nations is of course the earliest league of nations, if you care to call it such, of which the world has record, and in its over-all results, I think all of us must agree, its success has made, time and time and time again, a great contribution to the freedom of all nations, not only those that are partners in the commonwealth. When I think of the British commonwealth I always have in mind some of the examples which are afforded by the history of this group. One is the history of Ireland, particularly southern Ireland; the other is the history of the Union of South Africa. I believe that it is a great