

the United States of America will be pleased to transmit such views and comments to the other participating governments.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

Ray Atherton.

The Right Honourable
the Secretary of State
for External Affairs,
Ottawa.

Office of the Secretary of State
for External Affairs

Ottawa, March 5, 1945.

Sir,—The Government of Canada is pleased to accept the invitation conveyed in your Note No. 293 of March 5, on behalf of the governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China to send representatives to a conference of the United Nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Government of Canada agrees that the conference should accept as a basis for its discussions the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization, which were made public in October, 1944, and have now been supplemented by the addition set forth in your Note of provisions regarding voting procedure in the Security Council.

Note has been taken of the offer of the Government of the United States of America to transmit to other participating governments such views or comments concerning the proposals as the Government of Canada may desire to present in advance of the conference. I shall communicate with you again if the Government of Canada decides to take advantage of this offer.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

W. L. Mackenzie King,
Secretary of State for
External Affairs.

His Excellency
The Hon. Ray Atherton,
Ambassador of the United States
of America,
United States Embassy,
Ottawa.

When, in September, 1939, the German army invaded Poland, Great Britain and France declared war against the Reich. Unhappily, in the early years of the war France succumbed, leaving Great Britain to carry on the fight. Later on the United States of America became involved, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics entered the conflict when Hitler directed his armed strength against Russia. It has been a long and stupendous struggle, but at last Germany is going down to defeat.

During the war years several conferences have been held between the leaders of the

Allied nations. The first, known as the Atlantic Conference, took place between Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt. The principles there laid down are well known to us all. They have a bearing on the motion now before us. Those principles were accepted in the conference at Moscow, when Prime Minister Churchill visited Marshal Stalin. Last fall there was the Dumbarton Oaks meeting; and earlier, at Casablanca, arrangements were made for the invasion not only of Sicily but Italy. There was also the Conference at Teheran, in Iran, where the two great English-speaking leaders met Marshal Stalin, and made plans for joint action against Germany on both the eastern and western fronts. The holding of these conferences has been an amazing thing in itself. During the last war it would not have been possible for the Allied leaders to travel such great distances and confer from time to time on matters pertaining to the war.

It is interesting to note that while this world war has been at its greatest height the leaders of the United Nations—I speak not only of the four great powers but all the nations that have been associated in the war—have had it in mind that there should be such a conference as is now to meet at San Francisco, a conference not to frame peace terms, for that is not its purpose, but to try to develop plans and proposals that will assure peace to the world.

I really do not know why, but into the discussion of this conference there has been introduced—particularly in the press, I believe—some question as to the attitude or position of the other British Commonwealth nations towards Great Britain. It seems to me that this is pretty much like whipping a dead horse. The promoters of that kind of controversy are not contributing much to the discussion. Some years ago a great English poet who had a thorough knowledge of the Empire and Imperial conditions expressed in poetry Canada's position within the Empire. I am not sure that I can quote the lines, but as I recall them they went something like this:

Daughter am I in my mother's house;
But mistress in my own.

That was the situation many years ago, but since then we have progressed considerably. We know of the position that was taken by Sir Robert Borden during the first Great War and afterwards, and we know that since that time the progress in the relations between Canada and Great Britain has been evolutionary in nature. At the Imperial Conferences of 1926 and 1930 a definite understanding was reached, which resulted in the Statute of Westminster. There seems to be a disposition to fear that if Canada and the other nations of