

*San Francisco Conference*

of commonwealth representatives which will take place shortly in London gave no adequate explanation as to why a minister of this government had not been dispatched overseas to take part in such an important gathering. Nor was there anything in his speech to indicate what position Canada was taking with respect to close collaboration with the United Kingdom and other units of the commonwealth when the San Francisco conference is convened. This, and other points I intend to raise this afternoon, I should like to have the Prime Minister answer in due course some time before the debate ends in accordance with the arrangements made.

The Prime Minister mentioned, too, the contribution of the league of nations. In the estimates just tabled there is provision for Canada's share in the costs and expenses of that league. With the setting up of the new world peace organization I think it is a very proper question to ask now: what will then be the status of the old league and its various collateral organizations? Will they be absorbed in the new set-up, or will the old organization and its collaterals be disbanded altogether?

The Prime Minister stated in his address that the government's views on the composition and powers of the security council and on other aspects of the proposed organization have already been communicated to the greater powers. Do we understand, therefore, that the views expressed in his address of yesterday cover all of the government's policy as communicated to the greater powers? We should know whether this government has advanced views to the greater powers which have not been made known in parliament. It is evidently not the Prime Minister's intention to propose particular provisions or amendments in advance of the discussions of the conference, despite some rumours which have been abroad that already a Canadian amendment had been proposed. I should like the Prime Minister to indicate to the house, if he will, before the debate closes, what his government has in mind with respect to proposed amendments which may properly come before the conference and which have not been mentioned by him so far in this debate.

A close scrutiny of the Prime Minister's address would indicate that the government intends to take the Canadian delegation to San Francisco without any clear delineation of policy prior to arrival there. True, his speech contained some suggestions, and it gave obvious approval to the principles and purposes of the proposed charter, but evidently Canada's real position is to be left until the San

Francisco conference is held; and that, in my humble opinion, is not good enough in the circumstances.

In his address the Prime Minister dealt briefly with the proposed Canadian representation and expressed the view that it was desirable that Canada's delegation to the conference should be thoroughly representative. With that general statement I think perhaps everyone will agree, but I had hoped the Prime Minister would give a more detailed account, first as to how this broad representation was to be achieved, and second, as to the status of those who will be chosen outside of the normal government ranks. At this point I should like to say that when the Prime Minister, at a press conference prior to his departure for Washington, arbitrarily ruled out as a possible delegate our national leader, John Bracken, that was and is regarded by our party in and out of the house and by myself as an unprovoked slight, particularly in view of the fact that when the delegation goes to San Francisco there will not be any parliament in Canada at all. To rule out the possibility of choosing a prospective prime minister of Canada was going pretty far. Our party now ask that we be given by the Prime Minister the right to choose our own delegates. When this delegation goes to San Francisco, as I have said, there will be no parliament in Canada. A new parliament will have to approve the stand and actions of the delegation at San Francisco. Even the most unprejudiced observer to-day would scarcely hazard the guess that the present government is likely to be in control of the next parliament of Canada. In this respect Canada is in a vastly different position from the United States, where approval and ratification will be dealt with by the government and congress now in office. I suggest, therefore, that the delegation to San Francisco cannot be confined to representatives of parties sitting in a dying parliament. In my opinion it should be enlarged to give proper representation to agriculture, labour, veterans of the last war, service men or veterans of this war, as well as industry and business. More than that, the apparently heavy delegation of government supporters which it is rumoured will go to San Francisco will be out of balance, as far as the membership is concerned, particularly when parliament will have expired, in view of the share of public support which the government commands to-day throughout Canada.

Further in the Prime Minister's speech he states that the government itself will, of course, assume its constitutional responsibility both for the selection of the delegation and for any decisions which are agreed upon at

[Mr. Graydon.]