

(b) that no satisfactory policy has been advanced for the elimination of extravagant governmental expenditures;

(c) that no adequate provision has been made for the immediate relief of the people in the lower income brackets from excessive taxation.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, after the very clever and witty speech we have heard this afternoon I feel that it would be wrong to introduce any other note into the debate this afternoon; therefore, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

UNITED NATIONS

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT SIGNED AT SAN FRANCISCO, JUNE 26, 1945

The house resumed from Thursday, October 18, consideration of the motion of Mr. St. Laurent:

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the agreement establishing the united nations and constituting the charter of the united nations and the statute of the international court of justice signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, and that this house do approve the same.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, referring last night to the San Francisco conference I said very plainly, voicing the sentiment of the people of my riding, that they wanted me to vote strongly for the passing of the resolution. I also expressed the wish that the resolution would pass unanimously in this parliament. In an able speech last night the hon. member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges (Mr. Beaudoin) properly said that Canada should be true to the covenant she made at that conference. I agree with that statement. I believe that Canada should undertake her commitments and implement her undertakings diligently, but not blindly. I was speaking last night in a practical way. I believe I was voicing the sentiments of the people whom I represent. There was a certain amount of glamour in the San Francisco conference, but at the same time there were certain features of the big assembly that were not apparent on the surface. They are bound, however, to come forward at some time. When we go to the future peace conference there should be no getting away from realities. Those realities will have to be faced eventually as some were faced during that conference.

Last night I mentioned briefly the attitude and the state of mind of the delegates of the United States and Great Britain. I now want to say a word about France. She was present at that conference under very curious conditions. She had not been at Yalta, and she had felt that she had been slighted. She also

declined the honour of being one of the inviting powers. It was thought for quite a while that France might develop into a leader of the small nations, but she did not think that that role would be fitting when she took into consideration her great past history and her great traditions. Eventually through the fine work of her delegates, particularly Mr. George Bidault, she won her points. It was a natural and spontaneous desire to assume once more her role of a great power that the prestige and influence of her past warranted.

These questions are bound to come up in the next peace conference. As I said last night, there are bound to be some severe and critical discussions. However, we shall have to face these realities again as was done in past conferences. France has tried to recapture her past glory that had become increasingly elusive. Her situation was both pathetic and moving. She still had in her mind the rebuff, if we may call it that, that she received from her own allies on the Syrian question. These things were all in her mind. She unquestionably increased her influence and won the essential point of immediate admission to the councils of the great five. It will go a great way to rehabilitating France, and it has been one of the great causes of the political stabilization of France at the present moment.

I now wish to say a few words about China, that great, big, practically unknown and almost mythical country, which has such a fluctuating frontier, the far northern section of which is living cheek by jowl with the great republic to the north. It was easy to see, after reading the careful speeches of Doctor Soong and Doctor Koo, that they were to some extent favourable to the Soviets. They played craftily and cleverly between the two sides. At that time the war against Japan was not over. She needed the help of the United States, and were reasonably successful in getting it.

May I say just a word about Russia. Of all the nations represented at San Francisco she was the most enigmatic. From my point of view of all the delegates present she put far too much emphasis—I say this sincerely, as I believe in putting the facts before parliament as they were put before the conference at San Francisco—on force, strength and power, and much too little on justice, humanity and pacific relations. Too much attention was paid to security as such against justice. The general line adopted by the Soviet Union, which became the theme song of the conference, was that power and strength justifies the power of authority. The conference was in reality to be a perpetuation of the grand alliance of the united nations.