

*United Nations Agreement*

One danger which I saw while meeting with delegates at San Francisco was this: It is all very well to go to an international conference, to listen to the speeches made in plenary session, and assume that the whole world is about to enter a new era of sunshine; but it is most important for those who represent a nation to make sure that, while we are lifted into international clouds of theory, we shall come down and get our feet on the ground and not forget who it is that sends us to these conferences. We have to be realists. Idealism is good, but there must be a blending of the two. As most of us took our seats at the committee tables or in the plenary sessions of that great conference, I believe the thought came to our minds that, after all, it is the people at home, not ourselves, who are to determine whether this peace will work or whether it will fail.

There is not much room now for Canada or any other nation to indulge itself in the role of an international Pollyanna. We have a real problem to face, and we shall have to face it with all the realism in the world. In this connection it may be appropriate to point out that, were another world war to break out, Canada could scarcely count on emerging from it with her own territory untouched by enemy action. Let this house and this nation realize the full significance of these words. Our experience of comparative security in that respect in the recent war is not likely to be repeated in another. We paid a heavy price in men, money and material for failure to prepare for this war. The same is true of other nations. We must not fail to profit by our experience and realize that peace will not be the lot of the Canadians of to-morrow through talk and pious hopes alone. Canada wants an opportunity of preventing wars instead of just an opportunity of fighting them after they have broken out. A peace worth having is a peace worth fighting for. Although the cost be great, this nation must join with other like-minded peace loving nations to crush aggressors who would plunge the world into another armed holocaust.

May I in my concluding remarks answer the question, what promise does San Francisco give? After all, it was not just an idle conference. It was one from which the people of the world expected and were entitled to results. In dealing with this point I wish to speak to the house as bluntly and frankly as I know how. At the time I left San Francisco, had I made this speech it might have been a little different from the one I am making in this house at the moment because, as time goes on, the seriousness of Canada's position and its vital significance in world affairs become impressed upon one more

strongly than ever. In so far as San Francisco and the charter are concerned, we cannot forget that it will not be the small nations which will start or finish a world-wide conflagration. It takes big powers to begin and end wars on a global basis. Having that in mind, I would say, let us look on San Francisco, not as a cure-all, but as a great and important advance and a great adventure in international understanding. Having that in mind, I would say in laymen's language that San Francisco is nothing more and nothing less than this. It is the table under which the nations of the world may put their feet and talk things over instead of putting rifles on their shoulders and going to war to fight it out. That is San Francisco, nothing more and nothing less. May I go one step farther in my argument. When people ask, will there be peace or will there be war? I say that if the big powers of the world stick together we shall have peace, but if the big powers do not stick together we may have war.

San Francisco in my opinion is the way to peace. There is an old saying that where there is a will there is a way. San Francisco is the way to peace; but unless the nations of the world have the will to peace the way will avail but little in the solution of our international affairs of to-morrow and the bringing of a permanent, just and lasting peace to all of us. Nevertheless the San Francisco document is an advanced attempt to create the best machinery possible for ensuring permanent peace. It is now up to the nations to use that machinery. Civilization cannot afford to resort to almost certain, yes, shall I make it more emphatic than that and say certain annihilation, which now seems attendant upon another world-wide resort to force. This time, the world, in my humble judgment, will think twice before taking any step which will lead to mass obliteration of mankind. That is what the next world war would most certainly mean. It is, Mr. Speaker, a case of do or die, so far as the nations of the world are concerned, and San Francisco goes far in providing the way to peace for a world with the will to have it.

May I close with just this observation. There is perhaps more sentiment attached to the problem of world peace and the San Francisco conference than almost anything which will be brought up in this House of Commons. At least I think we as a parliament have the right to hope and fervently to pray, in the years that lie ahead, that through the instrumentality of San Francisco, through the instrumentality of the will of the nations of the world for peace, we may look forward—I do not say we can look forward with com-