

lution, shed for the emancipation of the lower classes, already was rising a dictatorship mightier even than the one the French people had just fought to destroy. In the course of that very year 1795 the convention in France was surrendering the army control to a young general who perhaps saved the new-born republic but used it after as a stepping-stone to establish the most powerful of dictatorships, which generated into a twenty years' conflict. And still France did not want war, but her voice was choked and muzzled by the relentless desires of the emperor for domination.

No; peace cannot be maintained very long when a powerful nation bound hand and foot surrenders its whole future to a single man's authority. Later, France again experienced the same tragedy with the advent of the second empire; once more the nation lost its authority, to be decimated by another war. Other experiences and examples are numerous, and the first world war of 1914 must also be considered as an immediate result of the madness for domination of a military Prussian clique which crushed the best aspirations as well as the liberties of the German race.

Finally, we had in the terrible catastrophe, in this frightful total war which just ended a new and even more decisive proof of that principle's truthfulness. This time, it was a real battle between dictatorships and democratic institutions and nobody will contend the latter were responsible for the horrible slaughter.

How dreadful and costly can be the lessons of history! To-day more than ever, that principle should be remembered in all international discussions and conferences if the world is to succeed in establishing and maintaining peace.

On the third of October last, I was reading an interesting editorial of the *Ottawa Journal* on the London five-power conference. It said at the beginning:

So much humbug has been talked about Russia being a "democracy", many are shocked at the behaviour of Foreign Commissar Molotov at the London five-power conference; they cannot understand why, having taken up a position, he refuses to compromise by a hair.

The explanation, of course, is that Russia is not a democracy, and does not deal in international affairs by democratic methods. In London Mr. Bevin is the representative of the British government and people and Mr. Byrnes is the representative of the American government and people. As representatives, under the democratic technique and tradition, Bevin and Byrnes are free to exercise their individual judgments within the framework of certain principles. Mr. Molotov is not a representative; he is an agent. As an agent—which is far different from being a representative—he cannot exercise his own judgment, but must follow

[Mr. Blackmore.]

figidly the line given him by his masters in the Kremlin. That is what autocracy means, as distinguished from democracy.

I think these lines are very useful and they should serve again as a sound warning. Since that distant period to which I already referred, since the beginning of the eighteenth century every conflict was followed by numerous conferences in order to find remedies to the evils of the world and in order to preserve and safeguard peace.

The first conference of La Haye in 1899 grouped twenty-six nations; the second in 1907, forty-four nations; after the first world war, the League of Nations was formed. In spite of its errors, this organization has done humanity a great service and those who criticized it with such animosity forget its magnificent record and achievements.

In 1925, the Locarno pact, represented a generous attempt at reconciliation between France and Germany, those two age-long enemies. Then in 1928, the Paris peace pact or Briand-Kellogg pact was a general renunciation of war by all the important nations of the world. This was a generous attempt to strengthen efforts towards peace and a friendly settlement of international disputes.

But human achievements are always imperfect and transitory and the world once again was thrown into its most horrible of all conflicts. Humanity is very weak, but it is nevertheless constantly working toward progress and for better ways of life. So, once again, all united nations are drawing themselves up proudly and are directing their best efforts towards the establishment and maintenance of peace and social liberties.

I do not intend to discuss or even summarize the works accomplished at San Francisco, especially after the brilliant and masterful speeches delivered by those who have preceded me in the debate. I would refer particularly to the speeches of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon). All those who are giving their attention to world security and also to their children's happiness will go over and examine the reports published at the outset of this historical conference. The numerous organizations created by the charter of the united nations will help to render great service to our confused world.

As far as the charter itself is concerned it puts in concrete form centuries of ceaseless although useless efforts toward the establishment of peace. Many lessons may be derived from that conference preliminary to the organization and maintenance of security and peace. The nations which participated in the conference, if they wish real and progressive