

London, one being headed "Bevin upholds Canada's Stand. Says smaller fighting allies should have peace voice."

"Having regard to the sacrifices made in two wars by the dominions they must be adequately consulted in the settlement not merely at the stage when the treaty is being drafted but in changes now being considered," Bevin said.

Up to the present time that is the picture. Apparently it is not known how far Canada can participate when the council of foreign ministers meets one week from today.

The situation, Mr. Speaker, is very difficult. It is not just as simple as it was made to appear this afternoon, and it is a situation that will not be met by threats in this house or across Canada. I mean threats against the "Big Four". Nor will it be met by whining or by weeping or wailing here in Ottawa. That type of approach is far more likely to prevent us from getting proper treatment than it is to help. The situation is made quite difficult because this great power procedure has been accepted among the nations, including Canada. I would refer the house to a statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to be found at page 7 of *Hansard* of this year, which illustrates the point:

We are fully aware of the major interest in this settlement of those states which, because of their power or proximity, must carry the main responsibility for enforcing it.

That has been the procedure not only in the council of foreign ministers but also in the security council. All the nations taking part have recognized that there are four or five great powers. In reality there are three great powers: the United States, Russia and Great Britain, with France and China added as the other two. That fact has been recognized principally because the league of nations failed for the reason that it had no power to enforce its decisions. There was a good deal of talk, and worth-while talk, but no power behind its decisions, and rightly or wrongly the nations decided this time that there had to be power. That is why the big nations were given a preferred position.

Another great difficulty is that if there are too many sitting in there is apt to be confusion. I believe that was the situation at Versailles. There were so many nations there that at times there was the utmost confusion and great difficulty in working out the treaties. As Professor Corbett says, a town meeting cannot run a war, and I think the same is true of a meeting for the purpose of drawing up a peace treaty. I merely point out these difficulties to show that the situation is not as simple as it was made to appear this afternoon.

I make these suggestions. First of all, let

Canada get all the representation she can. I am all for that and every one in the house is for it. Let us get just as much representation as possible. But let the minister when he speaks make Canada's position clear. It has not yet been made clear. For example, do we want the conference extended from four nations to twenty-one or twenty-two or twenty-three? Is that what we want? Do we want a conference in which all the nations I mentioned a few minutes ago shall be represented on an equal footing? Do we want preference over any of the other belligerents? If so, over what group are we asking the preference? What kind of hearing do we want? What kind of participation do we want?

These are questions to which this house and the Canadian people are entitled to have answers and they have not been answered today. I would ask the minister to make these points clear. I suggest that the Canadian government should propose a procedure now. Let the Canadian government say what it thinks is fair, what it thinks these great powers should grant in the way of an opportunity for Canada to take part in the meetings of the conference.

A further suggestion is that if we are not granted the right of full participation we should take advantage of our membership in the British empire. Let us send a representative to Moscow with the British foreign minister, because Canada is a partner in the British empire, and right from the start the real fact has been that the third great power is not Great Britain alone but the British empire. Over half or approximately half of the power used during the war was empire power as distinguished from the power of Great Britain alone, and Great Britain has always been the first to recognize that fact. But our Canadian government has never been so willing to do so. That, however, is the fact, that the third great power is in reality the British empire as a whole.

There could have been, perhaps could yet be, empire discussions on these German and Austrian treaties. I see by Saturday's press that Great Britain and France are having discussions about the treaties. They are negotiating a treaty. A press dispatch states:

While it is assumed that there has been discussion between France and Britain on various problems relating to Germany which will come before the four-power foreign ministers at Moscow, it is not considered probable that Britain and France will take up identical standpoints during the Moscow conference.

But they are obviously discussing the settlements between themselves. Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and India could have met to decide what