

DEBATES
OF
THE SENATE
OF THE
DOMINION OF CANADA

1945

OFFICIAL REPORT

Editor: H. H. EMERSON

**Reporters: B. P. LAKE, F. BERRYMAN,
V. LEMIRE (Sessional)**

Translators: THE BUREAU FOR TRANSLATIONS

SIXTH SESSION—NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT—9 GEORGE VI



OTTAWA
EDMOND CLOUTIER
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1945

SENATORS OF CANADA

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

APRIL 16, 1945

THE HONOURABLE THOMAS VIEN, SPEAKER

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
ERNEST D. SMITH.....	Wentworth	Winona, Ont.
JAMES J. DONNELLY.....	South Bruce.....	Pinkerton, Ont.
CHARLES PHILIPPE BEAUBIEN.....	Montarville	Montreal, Que.
CHARLES E. TANNER.....	Pictou	Pictou, N.S.
THOMAS JEAN BOURQUE.....	Richibucto	Richibucto, N.B.
GEORGE HENRY BARNARD.....	Victoria	Victoria, B.C.
EDWARD MICHENER.....	Red Deer.....	Calgary, Alta.
WILLIAM JAMES HARMER.....	Edmonton	Edmonton, Alta.
GERALD VERNER WHITE, C.B.E.....	Pembroke	Pembroke, Ont.
SIR THOMAS CHAPAIS, K.B.....	Grandville	Quebec, Que.
JOHN ANTHONY McDONALD.....	Shediac	Shediac, N.B.
JAMES A. CALDER, P.C.....	Saltcoats	Regina, Sask.
ROBERT F. GREEN.....	Kootenay	Victoria, B.C.
ARTHUR C. HARDY, P.C.....	Leeds	Brockville, Ont.
SIR ALLEN BRISTOL AYLESWORTH, P.C. K.C.M.G.	North York.....	Toronto, Ont.
WILLIAM ASHBURY BUCHANAN.....	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.
ARTHUR BLISS COPP, P.C.....	Westmorland	Sackville, N.B.
JOHN PATRICK MOLLOY.....	Provencher	Winnipeg, Man.
DANIEL E. RILEY.....	High River	High River, Alta.
WILLIAM H. MCGUIRE.....	East York	Toronto, Ont.
DONAT RAYMOND.....	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.
GUSTAVE LACASSE	Essex	Tecumseh, Ont.
WALTER E. FOSTER, P.C.	Saint John.....	Saint John, N.B.
CAIRINE R. WILSON.....	Rockcliffe	Ottawa, Ont.

Mr. 8.47 22866 (C95)

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
JAMES MURDOCK, P.C.....	Parkdale	Ottawa, Ont.
JOHN EWEN SINCLAIR, P.C.....	Queen's	Emerald, P.E.I.
JAMES H. KING, P.C.....	Kootenay East	Victoria, B.C.
ARTHUR MARCOTTE.....	Ponteix	Ponteix, Sask.
ALEXANDER D. MCRAE, C.B.....	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.
CHARLES COLQUHOUN BALLANTYNE, P.C....	Alma	Montreal, Que.
WILLIAM HENRY DENNIS.....	Halifax	Halifax, N.S.
JOHN ALEXANDER MACDONALD.....	Richmond— West Cape Breton...	St. Peters, Cape Breton, N.S.
LUCIEN MORAUD.....	La Salle	Quebec, Que.
RALPH BYRON HORNER.....	Saskatchewan North...	Blaine Lake, Sask.
WALTER MORLEY ASELTINE.....	West Central Saskatchewan	Rosetown, Sask.
FELIX P. QUINN.....	Bedford-Halifax	Bedford, N.S.
JOHN L. P. ROBICHEAU.....	Digby-Clare	Maxwellton, N.S.
JOHN A. MACDONALD, P.C.....	Cardigan	Cardigan, P.E.I.
DONALD SUTHERLAND, P.C.....	Oxford	Ingersoll, Ont.
IVA CAMPBELL FALLIS.....	Peterborough	Peterborough, Ont.
GEORGE B. JONES, P.C.....	Royal	Apohaqui, N.B.
ANTOINE J. LÉGER.....	L'Acadie	Moncton, N.B.
HENRY A. MULLINS.....	Marquette	Winnipeg, Man.
JOHN T. HAIG.....	Winnipeg	Winnipeg, Man.
EUGÈNE PAQUET, P.C.....	Lauzon	St. Romuald, Que.
WILLIAM DUFF.....	Lunenburg	Lunenburg, N.S.
JOHN W. DE B. FARRIS.....	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.
ADRIAN K. HUGESSEN	Inkerman	Montreal, Que.
NORMAN P. LAMBERT	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
DUNCAN McL. MARSHALL.....	Peel	Toronto, Ont.
J. FERNAND FAFARD.....	De la Durantaye.....	L'Islet, Que.
ARTHUR LUCIEN BEAUBIEN	St. Jean Baptiste	St. Jean Baptiste, Man.
JOHN J. STEVENSON.....	Prince Albert	Regina, Sask.
ARISTIDE BLAIS.....	St. Albert	Edmonton, Alta.
DONALD MACLENNAN.....	Margaree Forks	Margaree Forks, N.S.
CHARLES BENJAMIN HOWARD.....	Wellington	Sherbrooke, Que.
ELIE BEAUREGARD.....	Rougemont	Montreal, Que.
ATHANASE DAVID.....	Sorel	Montreal, Que.
EDOUARD CHARLES ST-PÈRE.....	De Lanaudière	Montreal, Que.
SALTER ADRIAN HAYDEN	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.

SENATORS OF CANADA

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
NORMAN McLEOD PATERSON.....	Thunder Bay	Fort William, Ont.
WILLIAM JAMES HUSHION.....	Victoria	Westmount, Que.
JOSEPH JAMES DUFFUS.....	Peterborough West	Peterborough, Ont.
WILLIAM DAUM EULER, P.C.....	Waterloo	Kitchener, Ont.
LÉON MERCIER GOUIN.....	De Salaberry	Montreal, Que.
THOMAS VIEN (Speaker).....	De Lorimier	Outremont, Que.
PAMPHILE RÉAL DUTREMBLAY.....	Repentigny	Montreal, Que.
WILLIAM RUPERT DAVIES.....	Kingston	Kingston, Ont.
JOSEPH J. BENCH.....	Lincoln	St. Catharines, Ont.
JAMES PETER McINTYRE.....	Mount Stewart	Mount Stewart, P.E.I.
GORDON PETER CAMPBELL.....	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
WISHART McL. ROBERTSON.....	Shelburne	Halifax, N.S.
JOHN FREDERICK JOHNSTON.....	Central Saskatchewan..	Bladworth, Sask.
TELESPHORE DAMIEN BOUCHARD.....	The Laurentides	St. Hyacinthe, Que.
ARMAND DAIGLE.....	Mille Iles	Montreal, Que.
JOSEPH ARTHUR LESAGE.....	The Gulf	Quebec, Que.
CYRILLE VAILLANCOURT.....	Kennebec	Levis, Que.
JACOB NICOL.....	Bedford	Sherbrooke, Que.

SENATORS OF CANADA

ALPHABETICAL LIST

APRIL 16, 1945

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
ASELTINE, W. M.....	West Central Saskatchewan	Rosetown, Sask.
AYLESWORTH, SIR ALLEN, P.C., K.C.M.G...	North York	Toronto, Ont.
BALLANTYNE, C. C., P.C.....	Alma	Montreal, Que.
BARNARD, G. H.....	Victoria	Victoria, B.C.
BEAUBIEN, A. L.....	St. Jean Baptiste	St. Jean Baptiste, Man.
BEAUBIEN, C. P.....	Montarville	Montreal, Que.
BEAUREGARD, ELIE.....	Rougemont	Montreal, Que.
BENCH, JOSEPH J.....	Lincoln	St. Catharines, Ont.
BLAIS, ARISTIDE.....	St. Albert	Edmonton, Alta.
BOUCHARD, TELESPHORE DAMIEN.....	The Laurentides.....	St. Hyacinthe, Que.
BOURQUE, T. J.....	Richibucto	Richibucto, N.B.
BUCHANAN, W. A.	Lethbridge	Lethbridge, Alta.
CALDER, J. A., P.C.....	Saltcoats	Regina, Sask.
CAMPBELL, G. P.....	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
CHAPAIS, SIR THOMAS, K.B.....	Grandville	Quebec, Que.
COPP, A. B., P.C.....	Westmorland	Sackville, N.B.
DAIGLE, ARMAND.....	Mille Isles.....	Montreal, Que.
DAVID, ATHANASE.....	Sorel	Montreal, Que.
DAVIES, WILLIAM RUPERT.....	Kingston	Kingston, Ont.
DENNIS, W. H.....	Halifax	Halifax, N.S.
DONNELLY, J. J.....	South Bruce	Pinkerton, Ont.
DUFF, WILLIAM.....	Lunenburg	Lunenburg, N.S.
DUFFUS, J. J.....	Peterborough West ...	Peterborough, Ont.
DUTREMBLAY, PAMPHILE RÉAL.....	Repentigny	Montreal, Que.
EULER, W. D., P.C.....	Waterloo	Kitchener, Ont.
FAFARD, J. F.....	De la Durantaye	L'Islet, Que.
FALLIS, IVA CAMPBELL.....	Peterborough	Peterborough, Ont.
FARRIS, J. W. DE B.....	Vancouver South	Vancouver, B.C.

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
FOSTER, W. E., P.C.....	Saint John	Saint John, N.B.
GOUIN, L. M.....	De Salaberry	Montreal, Que.
GREEN, R. F.....	Kootenay	Victoria, B.C.
HAIG, JOHN T.....	Winnipeg	Winnipeg, Man.
HARDY, A. C., P.C.....	Leeds	Brockville, Ont.
HARMER, W. J.....	Edmonton	Edmonton, Alta.
HAYDEN, S. A.....	Toronto	Toronto, Ont.
HORNER, R. B.....	Saskatchewan North ...	Blaine Lake, Sask.
HOWARD, C. B.....	Wellington	Sherbrooke, Que.
HUGESSEN, A. K.....	Inkerman	Montreal, Que.
HUSHION, W. J.....	Victoria	Westmount, Que.
JOHNSTON, J. FREDERICK.....	Central Saskatchewan ..	Bladworth, Sask.
JONES, GEORGE, B., P.C.....	Royal	Apohaqui, N.B.
KING, J. H., P.C.....	Kootenay East	Victoria, B.C.
LACASSE, G.....	Essex	Tecumseh, Ont.
LAMBERT, NORMAN P.....	Ottawa	Ottawa, Ont.
LÉGER, ANTOINE J.....	L'Acadie	Moncton, N.B.
LESAGE, J. A.....	The Gulf	Quebec, Que.
MACDONALD, J. A.....	Richmond— West Cape Breton....	St. Peters, Cape Breton, N.S.
MACDONALD, JOHN A., P.C.....	Cardigan	Cardigan, P.E.I.
MACLENNAN, DONALD.....	Margaree Forks	Margaree Forks, N.S.
MARCOTTE, A.....	Ponteix	Ponteix, Sask.
MARSHALL, DUNCAN McL.....	Peel	Toronto, Ont.
MCDONALD, J. A.....	Shediac	Shediac, N.B.
MCGUIRE, W. H.....	East York	Toronto, Ont.
MCINTYRE, JAMES P.....	Mount Stewart	Mount Stewart, P.E.I.
MCRÆ, A. D., C.B.....	Vancouver	Vancouver, B.C.
MICHENER, E.....	Red Deer	Calgary, Alta.
MOLLOY, J. P.....	Provencher	Winnipeg, Man.
MORAUD, L.....	La Salle	Quebec, Que.
MULLINS, HENRY A.....	Marquette	Winnipeg, Man.
MURDOCK, JAMES, P.C.....	Parkdale	Ottawa, Ont.
NICOL, JACOB.....	Bedford	Sherbrooke, Que.
PAQUET, EUGÈNE, P.C.....	Lauzon	St. Romuald, Que.
PATERSON, N. McL.....	Thunder Bay	Fort William, Ont.
QUINN, FELIX P.....	Bedford-Halifax	Bedford, N.S.

SENATORS OF CANADA

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
RAYMOND, D.....	De la Vallière	Montreal, Que.
RILEY, D. E.	High River	High River, Alta.
ROBERTSON, W. McL.....	Shelburne	Halifax, N.S.
ROBICHEAU, J. L. P.....	Digby-Clare	Maxwellton, N.S.
SINCLAIR, J. E., P.C.....	Queen's	Emerald, P.E.I.
SMITH, E. D.....	Wentworth	Winona, Ont.
STEVENSON, J. J.....	Prince Albert	Regina, Sask.
ST-PÈRE, E. C.....	De Lanaudière	Montreal, Que.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD, P.C.....	Oxford	Ingersoll, Ont.
TANNER, C. E.....	Pictou	Pictou, N.S.
VAILLANCOURT, CYRILLE.....	Kennebec	Levis, Que.
VIEN, THOMAS (Speaker).....	De Lorimier	Outremont, Que.
WHITE, G. V., C.B.E.....	Pembroke	Pembroke, Ont.
WILSON, CAIRINE R.....	Rockcliffe	Ottawa, Ont.

SENATORS OF CANADA

BY PROVINCES

APRIL 16, 1945

ONTARIO—24

SENATORS	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE	
1 ERNEST D. SMITH.....	Winona.
2 JAMES J. DONNELLY.....	Pinkerton.
3 GERALD VERNER WHITE, C.B.E.....	Pembroke.
4 ARTHUR C. HARDY, P.C.....	Brockville.
5 SIR ALLEN BRISTOL AXLESWORTH, P.C., K.C.M.G.....	Toronto.
6 WILLIAM H. MCGUIRE.....	Toronto.
7 GUSTAVE LACASSE.....	Tecumseh.
8 CAIRINE R. WILSON.....	Ottawa.
9 JAMES MURDOCK, P.C.....	Ottawa.
10 DONALD SUTHERLAND, P.C.....	Ingersoll.
11 IVA CAMPBELL FALLIS.....	Peterborough.
12 NORMAN P. LAMBERT.....	Ottawa.
13 DUNCAN McL. MARSHALL.....	Toronto.
14 SALTER ADRIAN HAYDEN.....	Toronto.
15 NORMAN McLEOD PATERSON	Fort William.
16 JOSEPH JAMES DUFFUS.....	Peterborough.
17 WILLIAM DAUM EULER, P.C.....	Kitchener.
18 WILLIAM RUPERT DAVIES.....	Kingston.
19 JOSEPH J. BENCH.....	St. Catharines.
20 GORDON PETER CAMPBELL.....	Toronto.
21	
22	
23	
24	

QUEBEC—24

SENATORS	ELECTORAL DIVISION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
1 CHARLES PHILIPPE BEAUBIEN.....	Montarville	Montreal.
2 SIR THOMAS CHAPAIS, K.B.....	Grandville	Quebec.
3 DONAT RAYMOND	De la Vallière.....	Montreal.
4 CHARLES C. BALLANTYNE, P.C.....	Alma	Montreal.
5 LUCIEN MORAUD	La Salle	Quebec.
6 EUGÈNE PAQUET, P.C.	Lauzon	St. Romuald.
7 ADRIAN K. HUGESSEN	Inkerman	Montreal.
8 J. FERNAND FAFARD	De la Durantaye	L'Islet.
9 CHARLES BENJAMIN HOWARD.....	Wellington	Sherbrooke.
10 ELIE BEAUREGARD	Rougemont	Montreal.
11 ATHANASE DAVID	Sorel	Montreal.
12 EDOUARD CHARLES ST-PÈRE.....	De Lanaudière	Montreal.
13 WILLIAM JAMES HUSHION	Victoria	Westmount.
14 LÉON MERCIER GOUIN	De Salaberry	Montreal.
15 THOMAS VIEN (Speaker)	De Lorimier	Outremont.
16 PAMPHILE RÉAL DUTREMBLAY.....	Repentigny	Montreal.
17 TELESOPHORE DAMIEN BOUCHARD	The Laurentides.....	St. Hyacinthe.
18 ARMAND DAIGLE	Mille Iles	Montreal.
19 JOSEPH ARTHUR LESAGE	The Gulf	Quebec.
20 CYRILLE VAILLANCOURT	Kennebec	Levis.
21 JACOB NICOL	Bedford	Sherbrooke.
22
23
24

NOVA SCOTIA—10

SENATORS	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE	
1 CHARLES E. TANNER.....	Pictou.
2 WILLIAM H. DENNIS	Halifax.
3 JOHN A. MACDONALD	St. Peters, Cape Breton.
4 FELIX P. QUINN.....	Bedford.
5 JOHN L. P. ROBICHEAU.....	Maxwellton.
6 WILLIAM DUFF.....	Lunenburg.
7 DONALD MACLENNAN.....	Margaree Forks.
8 WISHART McL. ROBERTSON.....	Halifax.
9	
10	

NEW BRUNSWICK—10

THE HONOURABLE	
1 THOMAS JEAN BOURQUE.....	Richibucto.
2 JOHN ANTHONY McDONALD.....	Shediac.
3 ARTHUR BLISS COPP, P.C.....	Sackville.
4 WALTER E. FOSTER, P.C.....	Saint John.
5 GEORGE B. JONES, P.C.....	Apohaqui.
6 ANTOINE J. LÉGER.....	Moncton.
7	
8	
9	
10	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4

THE HONOURABLE	
1 JOHN EWEN SINCLAIR, P.C.....	Emerald.
2 JOHN A. MACDONALD, P.C.....	Cardigan.
3 JAMES PETER McINTYRE.....	Mount Stewart.
4	

BRITISH COLUMBIA—6

SENATORS	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE	
1 GEORGE HENRY BARNARD.....	Victoria.
2 ROBERT F. GREEN.....	Victoria.
3 JAMES H. KING, P.C.....	Victoria.
4 ALEXANDER D. McRAE, C.B.....	Vancouver.
5 JOHN W. DE B. FARRIS.....	Vancouver.
6	

MANITOBA—6

THE HONOURABLE	
1 JOHN PATRICK MOLLOY.....	Winnipeg.
2 HENRY A. MULLINS.....	Winnipeg.
3 JOHN T. HAIG.....	Winnipeg.
4 A. L. BEAUBIEN.....	St. Jean Baptiste.
5	
6	

SASKATCHEWAN—6

THE HONOURABLE	
1 JAMES A. CALDER, P.C.....	Regina.
2 ARTHUR MARCOTTE	Ponteix.
3 RALPH B. HORNER.....	Blaine Lake.
4 WALTER M. ASELTINE.....	Rosetown.
5 J. J. STEVENSON.....	Regina.
6 J. FREDERICK JOHNSTON.....	Bladworth.

ALBERTA—6

THE HONOURABLE	
1 EDWARD MICHENER.....	Calgary.
2 WILLIAM JAMES HARMER.....	Edmonton.
3 WILLIAM ASHBURY BUCHANAN	Lethbridge.
4 DANIEL E. RILEY	High River.
5 ARISTIDE BLAIS	Edmonton.
6	

CANADA

The Debates of the Senate

OFFICIAL REPORT

THE SENATE

Speaker: Hon. THOMAS VIEN

Monday, March 19, 1945.

The Parliament of Canada having been summoned by Proclamation of the Governor General to meet this day for the dispatch of business:

The Senate met at 2.30 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

The Hon. the SPEAKER informed the Senate that he had received a communication from the Governor General's Secretary informing him that His Excellency the Governor General would arrive at the Main Entrance of the Houses of Parliament at 3 p.m., and, when it had been signified that all was in readiness, would proceed to the Senate Chamber to open the Sixth Session of the Nineteenth Parliament of Canada.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

At three o'clock His Excellency the Governor General proceeded to the Senate Chamber and took his seat upon the Throne. His Excellency was pleased to command the attendance of the House of Commons, and that House being come, with their Speaker, His Excellency was pleased to open the Sixth Session of the Nineteenth Parliament of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

You have been called into session for the dispatch of business which it is in the national interest to conclude before the expiration of the present Parliament.

Since I last addressed you, the war in Europe and in Asia has continued with relentless fury. In Europe, the Allied forces are rapidly advancing to what there is every reason to believe will be decisive victory. Canada is prouder than ever of the splendid achievements of her fighting forces, at sea, on land, and in the air.

The Government has accepted the invitation to Canada to send representatives to a Confer-

ence of the United Nations to be held on April 25, at San Francisco, to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security. My ministers are of the opinion that the Canadian delegation at the San Francisco Conference should be assured of the widest possible measure of support from Parliament. A joint resolution of both Houses will accordingly be submitted for your approval.

Members of the House of Commons:

The term of the present Parliament will have expired on April 17. A general election will be held shortly thereafter. You will be asked to make the necessary financial provisions for the effective conduct of the war, and to meet the ordinary expenses of government, for the period between the end of the present fiscal year and the opening of a new Parliament.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence guide your deliberations in this solemn moment in the history of the world.

The House of Commons withdrew.

His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to retire.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

RAILWAY BILL

FIRST READING

Bill A, an Act relating to Railways.—Hon. Mr. King.

CONSIDERATION OF HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH

On motion of Hon. Mr. King, it was ordered that the speech of His Excellency the Governor General be taken into consideration on Wednesday next.

COMMITTEE ON ORDERS AND PRIVILEGES

Hon. Mr. KING moved:

That all the senators present during this session be appointed a committee to consider the orders and customs of the Senate and privileges of Parliament, and that the said committee have leave to meet in the Senate Chamber when and as often as they please.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.

THE SENATE

Tuesday, March 20, 1945

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE LATE SENATORS CANTLEY AND BLACK

TRIBUTES TO THEIR MEMORY

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. H. KING: Honourable senators, before proceeding with what little business we have, I would advise the House of the passing of two of our esteemed colleagues in the interval since we last met. I refer to the death of the Senator from New Glasgow (Hon. Mr. Cantley) and the senior Senator from Westmorland (Hon. Mr. Black).

Senator Cantley died at his home in New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, on the 24th of February. He had a long and active business and public career. As a young man he interested himself in the development of the coal and steel industry in the province of Nova Scotia; and eventually became President of the Nova Scotia Mining Society. During the last war his knowledge and experience were sought and secured by the Government of the day, and he was the first member of the Canadian Shell Commission appointed in 1914. In the following year he became Chairman of the Munition Resources Commission of Canada.

Well known in the industrial world, Colonel Cantley at one time served as President of the Canadian Manufacturers Association. He was also Honourary President of the American Iron and Steel Institute, a Fellow of the Royal Society of Art, London, England, and an Associate Member of the American Geographical Society. He represented Nova Scotia on the original Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways.

He entered the political field fairly late in life, when, in 1921, he stood as a candidate for his party in the constituency of Pictou county. He suffered defeat in that election, but was successful in 1925 and again in 1926 and 1930. He continued to be a member of the House of Commons until July 20, 1935, when he was summoned to this honourable House.

On behalf of myself and my colleagues I should like to express our deep sympathy with the members of his family in their bereavement.

Senator Black was born in the town of Sackville, New Brunswick. He received his early education at public school in Sackville,

Hon. Mr. KING.

and later attended Mount Allison University. He became active in the affairs of his Alma Mater, being a member of the Board of Regents as well as Chairman of the Committee on Finance.

He engaged extensively in business enterprises not only in his county but throughout his native province. He was head of the firm of Joseph L. Black and Son, Limited, a large concern carrying on not only a general store business but also extensive lumbering operations. He was also President of the New Brunswick Telephone Company, an office from which he retired only recently, after holding it for some twenty-five years. In addition, he was a director of the Maritime Life Assurance Company, of the Maritime Trust Company, and of the Maritime Broadcasting Company. He was mayor of the city of Sackville in 1921, and represented his county in the local legislature. During the last war he served overseas as Brigade Major.

He was summoned to this Chamber in 1921, and for the last twenty-four years was one of its outstanding members, and was well known to all of us. He took an active part in the debates in the House, and was prominent in committee work, being the Chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee for many years. I am sure his services in this Chamber were greatly appreciated. He was a man of strong convictions and did not hesitate to express them when occasion demanded. He was a fluent and interesting speaker.

I desire to express on behalf of myself and my colleagues my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Black and the other members of the family.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE: Honourable senators, we mourn to-day the loss of two highly respected and valued members of this Chamber, to whom the leader has just referred, Senators Black and Cantley.

Senator Black's death came to me personally as a great shock. Although he may not have been in as good health as usual when we last saw him, nevertheless, he did not seem to be failing. I asked him during the last session if he would make a speech on the reinforcement question, and he kindly acceded to my request. Honourable members will recall the eloquent, concise and very informative speech he made on that occasion.

The honourable the leader has referred to the career of Senator Black, which is a most remarkable one. The late senator can truly be termed a maker of Canada. He started in a humble way and became an outstanding citizen of the Province of New Brunswick and of Canada, occupying a high position not only in business and financial circles but in the

academic world as well. It is really wonderful to think that during the last great war, when he was nearing his fifties, he volunteered for service overseas, where he commanded a brigade and was wounded. His very splendid record was known to Canadians generally. As the leader has so fittingly stated, he served this Chamber well for almost twenty-five years, not only in the House itself but also in committees. The passing of such an able and distinguished gentleman will be a great loss not only to his family but to this House, to Parliament, and to the country as a whole.

I join with my honourable friend in conveying to Mrs. Black and the other members of the family our most heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

I knew Senator Cantley very well indeed. As a member of the Union Government during the last war, I saw him frequently. I was glad to hear the leader of the House refer to the splendid advice which Colonel Cantley, as he then was known, gave the Government in regard not only to steel and coal but also the manufacture of shells. There was doubt in the mind of the Government at that time as to the ability of this country to produce shells; but thanks to the splendid information possessed by Colonel Cantley, which he conveyed freely to the Government and to the then Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Sir Robert Borden, the making of shells was started, and certainly it was a great achievement.

Senator Cantley lived to a ripe old age, having passed the mark of four score years. Although physically incapacitated of late, mentally he was just as alert as ever.

I join with my honourable friend and all those on this side of the House in conveying to the family of our late colleague our most sincere regret at his passing.

Hon. GEORGE B. JONES: Honourable senators, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the honourable leaders on both sides of this House with reference to the passing of a colleague and old friend of mine, Senator Frank B. Black. It has already been pointed out where he was born and educated, and what a deep interest he took in Mount Allison University. He was Regent of that University, and for years Chairman of its Finance Committee, on which he served with honour and great distinction.

Senator Black had very extensive business interests. He was not only a merchant, a lumberman and a manufacturer, but he carried on a large farming business and was a grower of livestock on his beautiful farms in and around Sackville. I was associated with him in

a number of large industries, and regarded him as one of the most untiring and best business men that I have known. The honourable leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. King) has mentioned that our late colleague was President of the New Brunswick Telephone Company, Limited, for about twenty-five years. He was also for forty-one years a director of that company, which from small beginnings grew to a large enterprise, efficiently operated and rendering excellent service to the province of New Brunswick.

Reference has already been made to Senator Black's excellent military record, and to the fact that he was wounded in the last war. I just touch on that in passing.

Senator Black also took an active part in the municipal life of Sackville. If I remember correctly, he was Mayor of the town for two terms. He served too as a member of the provincial Legislature, at a time when I happened to be a fellow-member. Though of a retiring nature, he was an active and very valuable member of the Senate, and he certainly will be missed here. He held a very important position as Chairman of our Banking and Commerce Committee, over whose meetings he presided with ability, distinction and fairness.

I wish to join with the honourable leaders in expressing sincere sympathy to our late colleague's widow, Mrs. Black, and her two sons and three daughters.

Hon. A. B. COPP: Honourable senators, were it not that I was a fellow-townsmen of the late Senator Black for nearly fifty years I should be quite content to associate myself with what has been said without making any remarks myself. Senator Black had a splendid foundation on which to start life. He was of Old Country stock which, on his father's side, came from Scotland as far back as 1774, and on his mother's side, from England. The combination of Scotch and English produced good qualities, and these have shown throughout the whole family. I cannot quite remember when his father Joseph L. Black started business. That was before there was a town of Sackville. He set up as a pioneer merchant outside of the site of the present town, without any capital, his whole assets being industry, perseverance and an indomitable will to succeed. He became very successful. I have not much personal knowledge of his early years, but from as far back as I can remember Joseph L. Black was one of the outstanding merchants in that locality. He had a large country store, and, as was said by the honourable gentleman who preceded me (Hon. Mr. Jones),

he not only carried on a mercantile business but soon became interested in lumbering and agriculture. He was one of the first in our part of the province to drain the waste marshlands and to convert them into rich soil for the growing of hay. When his family grew up—besides our late colleague he had another son—he organized his business into an incorporated company, and it has been carried on as such ever since.

Senator Black had many interests. It came to him naturally to not only carry on widespread business operations but to play an active part in politics. His father before him had been a member of the provincial legislature for at least one term, if not two, away back when I was a very small boy.

As I said, Senator Black and I were citizens of the same town for nearly fifty years, and while on some questions we did not see eye to eye, nevertheless we were always very strong personal friends. We contested several elections with varying success, sometimes one winning and sometimes the other. Senator Black was a member of the legislature from 1912 to 1916, I think, and, as was said by the honourable gentleman from Royal (Hon. Mr. Jones) he took an active part in provincial affairs at that time. He occupied many important positions. He married a daughter of the late Governor Wood, thus forming a union between two of the most prominent families in Sackville. He followed in his father's footsteps, carrying on the mercantile business, the lumbering and agriculture, as well as other industries, in some of which I was associated with him. During all those years, in spite of our political differences, we never had an unkind word: from a personal standpoint, in business and in recreation we were very close friends.

I know his family very well, and I want to join with other honourable senators in extending to Mrs. Black and the other members of the family very sincere sympathy in their loss. It looks to me as if the business that was founded by Joseph L. Black and carried on by the company of which the late senator was president will be continued by the third generation with the same degree of success it has had in the past.

I appreciate the good work that our late colleague did in the Senate, and what he was and did in the town of Sackville, and I sincerely associate myself with the tributes that have been paid to him by the honourable leaders on both sides of the House and by my honourable friend from Royal (Hon. Mr. Jones).

Hon. Mr. COPP.

Hon. WILLIAM DUFF: Honourable senators, I am sure we all have been impressed by the tributes paid to our two late friends, Senators Black and Cantley.

I was particularly struck with what was said by the honourable senator from Royal (Hon. Mr. Jones) and the honourable gentleman from Westmorland (Hon. Mr. Copp) with regard to our late colleague Senator Black. Coming as I do from the province of Nova Scotia, I should like for a few moments to refer to our late lamented colleague, Senator Cantley. Colonel Cantley was a figure in Nova Scotia for sixty years, a striking figure, not only in the business world, but also in the political world. As he was a little older than I, he perhaps looked upon me more or less as a boy. In earlier days when we were both engaged in strenuous occupations, we used to have our political differences. Of course, we business men in Nova Scotia only play politics for pleasure. Both he and I were business men, but we thought we owed it to our community and our country to take a part in the public life of the province. In those years we differed in politics, but I sincerely believe that no man in Nova Scotia was more respected by the people of that province than Colonel Cantley. For a number of years he was a member of the House of Commons and later came to this Chamber.

His business ability was well known and recognized not only in this Dominion but throughout the United States and Great Britain. During the last war he played a prominent part. As my honourable friend from Alma (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) has said, members of the Government of that day sought Colonel Cantley's advice on business matters, realizing that it was sound and well worth following.

I became particularly friendly—shall I say?—with our late colleague in 1924 and 1925. Colonel Cantley was a strong-minded man who, once he had reached a decision, was ready to fight—not to the bitter end, but to the fullest extent necessary to sustain his principles. I shall never forget our correspondence in those strenuous days. His letters to me were most encouraging and helped me to decide what I should do in another place about a very important question in which both he and I were vitally interested. From that time forward both there and in this Chamber he and I were fast friends. We steered clear of those matters on which we could not agree, and our personal relations were such that with the passing of this outstanding figure I feel that the province of Nova Scotia in particular and the Dominion as a whole have lost one of their great sons.

May I end my heartfelt tribute to my old friend by quoting these lines, which well sum up Colonel Cantley's position in the business and political life of this country:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

As a Nova Scotian and one who has known Colonel Cantley and his family for many years, I extend to his relatives, not only on my own behalf, for I think I may include my colleagues from Nova Scotia on both sides of the House, our deepest sympathy in their great bereavement.

Hon. FELIX P. QUINN: Honourable senators, I should like to add my tribute to our departed colleagues, but with particular reference to my former desk-mate and colleague from Nova Scotia, Colonel the Honourable Thomas Cantley.

As the honourable senator from Lunenburg (Hon. Mr. Duff) has said, Colonel Cantley was an outstanding figure in the industrial and commercial life of the province of Nova Scotia. And his activities were not confined to his native province; they extended throughout Canada. His contribution to the steel and the mining industry of Nova Scotia is well known, and has been referred to by the honourable leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. King) and the honourable leader of the party on this side (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne), Colonel Cantley may well be termed one of the builders of Canada. We need many Cantleys, for men of his type have made Canada what it is to-day. A man of strong convictions, he was courageous in upholding them. As the honourable senator from Lunenburg has so well said, when Colonel Cantley took a stand on any particular subject he fought for it—yes, to the end.

Colonel Cantley was also active in the political life of his native province. He entered the House of Commons in 1925—the same year as I did—and was re-elected in 1926 and again in 1930. He and I were appointed to this Chamber at the same time, and our associations have always been most pleasant. It is to be regretted that an accident and impairment of his hearing prevented his taking an active part in our deliberations. Otherwise you would have heard from him more frequently. As the honourable member from Lunenburg has said, Colonel Cantley's advice was always available, and I can assure you it was always sound.

I should like to join those who have preceded me in tendering deepest sympathy to the late senator's relatives in their great loss.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE— ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE: Honourable senators, I understand from the Leader of the Government that to-morrow, after the moving and the seconding of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's gracious Speech from the Throne, we will adjourn until Tuesday next, and that then any other honourable members who care to speak may do so.

Hon. Mr. KING: I may say with regard to the business to come before us, that it is rather limited, in fact I believe it is confined almost entirely to affairs which have made it necessary to call this session together. I refer to the International Conference to be held at San Francisco, which matter arose since we last adjourned. There is also the desire and the necessity of the Government asking for and receiving interim supply to carry the country over the period between the expiration of Parliament, and the time of the election and the summoning of a new Parliament. It is not the intention to set up Standing Committees at this session. There will be little if any committee work, I believe, and no private legislation is to be considered. I have thought it well to make this announcement as there may be some doubt as to whether private legislation will be received and considered. It is generally held wise that Parliament should devote its time to matters directly referred to in the Speech from the Throne, in order that it may conclude its work before its term comes to an end. We will adjourn to-morrow afternoon or to-morrow evening until next Tuesday, at which time I think we should proceed with the resolution of which I have just given notice.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: May I ask the honourable leader if, after the addresses on the Speech from the Throne have been disposed of and we reach the army appropriations, honourable senators will have an opportunity to get any detailed information they may require, either in Committee of the Whole or before the Finance Committee? I do not think it would be fair to this Chamber to ask us to approve, en bloc, the total amount, whatever it may be. It is quite likely that many honourable senators would like to make inquiries regarding certain expenditures, and I should be obliged if the Leader of the Government would give us some information as to how he intends to proceed.

Hon. Mr. KING: Of course we are desirous of giving any information that may be available on the matter of supply. As I understand it, there will be two bills relating to interim

supply, to provide for five-twelfths of the moneys that ordinarily would be asked for. I believe it would be advisable to set up the usual committee, which I think has been very useful in the past. I will discuss with my honourable friend in the interval between now and our session next week the advisability and desirability of setting up that committee. If it is the wish of the House that the committee be set up, I see no objection to it; in fact, I think it would be of advantage.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: It may be, honourable senators, that this Chamber is quite willing to vote whatever amount may be asked for—I understand it is over \$2,000,000—without any discussion or information, but I would be rather amazed if this were so. However, I shall be very glad to discuss the matter with the honourable leader.

There is no desire on the part of myself or of any other honourable member of this Chamber to delay the voting of necessary supply, but the sum required is a large one and there will be many items that honourable members would like to have explained. The vote may have passed the other Chamber before we meet next week, in which event the Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of National Defence might be available to furnish information to our committee.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.

THE SENATE

Wednesday, March 21, 1945

The Senate met at 3 p.m. the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

EMERGENCY SITTINGS OF THE SENATE

MOTION

Hon. Mr. KING moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Copp:

That for the duration of the present session of Parliament, should an emergency arise during any adjournment of the Senate, which would in the opinion of the Honourable the Speaker warrant that the Senate meet prior to the time set forth in the motion for such adjournment, the Honourable the Speaker be authorized to notify honourable senators at their addresses as registered with the Clerk of the Senate to meet at a time earlier than that set out in the motion for such adjournment, and non-receipt

Hon. Mr. KING.

by any one or more honourable senators of such call shall not have any effect upon the sufficiency and validity thereof.

The motion was agreed to.

HORSES IN TRANSIT ALLEGED MUTILATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. R. B. HORNER: Honourable senators, before the Orders of the Day are called, I have a matter of importance to the farmers of Western Canada, and particularly to our breeders of horses, which I should like to bring to your attention.

The Montreal Standard contains a rather humorous article on what is said to have happened to a shipment of horses. A friend of mine in the West sent eighteen horses to the East, and while en route the tails of sixteen of them were cut off very short. The farmer took action against the Canadian National Railways, and the trial judge awarded him \$12.50 for each animal injured. The Canadian National Railways then appealed to the King's Bench division of the Superior Court, which dismissed the appeal, but the company has refused to settle.

We have often had horse buyers out in the West, and we have been very glad to see them there. Speaking from my own long years of experience in shipping, I may say for the information of honourable members that in early days it was customary for the stock-grower to travel along with his carload of horses, but in later years the railways have done everything they could to discourage that practice, because it sometimes necessitated putting on a passenger coach specially for one man. The practice nowadays is to have railway employees feed and care for the horses at various stopping points, so the railway assumes full responsibility while the animals are in transit to Montreal.

It seems to me that this newspaper article is bad advertising for our publicly-owned railroad, and I have brought the matter before this House in the hope that the honourable leader of the Government will in turn bring it to the attention of the Minister of Transport. The farmer in this case has been put to a good deal of unnecessary expense. The amount awarded him by the lower court's decision, which has now been affirmed by the Appeal Court, is inadequate. He will have to keep these horses another year and a half, which is the time that it takes for a tail to grow, unless in the meantime he is willing to sell the horses at a sacrifice because they are disfigured. I should like to see this man receive the compensation to which he is entitled.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: May I ask the honourable senator if the matter to which he refers is still before the courts? If it is, then it is sub judice and cannot be discussed here.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: Your Honour will understand the position better than I. The company, I believe, is appealing to a higher court.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Then it is sub judice.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session.

Hon. CYRILLE VAILLANCOURT moved that an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General to offer the humble thanks of this House to His Excellency for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both Houses of Parliament.

He said (Translation): Honourable Senators, on behalf of my compatriots I wish to thank the leader of the Government who has kindly entrusted to my modest capacities the task of replying to the Speech from the Throne. Life affords tasks which are pleasant to perform but which, at the same time, entail a heavy responsibility. I should like to be equal to the task that has been entrusted to me as well as to the cause for which we are all fighting with courage and perseverance. As stated in the Speech from the Throne, "In Europe the Allied forces are rapidly advancing to what there is every reason to believe will be decisive victory. Canada is prouder than ever of the splendid achievements of her fighting forces, at sea, on land, and in the air."

Why are we so proud of our fighting forces? Why have our fellow Canadians been so valiant in combat? Is it not because their hearts and souls are buoyed up by faith in the freedom which it was desired to take away from us? Our soldiers offer their lives so that we may live. And if, after such efforts, sacrifices, and marks of devotion those gallant soldiers see, on their return home, their country divided, if they find a revolutionary flame ablaze through the length and breadth of our Canada, I wonder what our heroes will think. Yet, in this moment, perhaps the most solemn in our history, when all energies should unite in a last effort for victory and peace, there are in our midst extremists who are engaged in disrupting our great Canada. Those extremists, those fire-brands, wherever they come from, be it from the East, from

the Centre or from the West, are evil-doers, and all men of good will who love their country should unite in a spirit of staunch co-operation with a vow to silence those fomenters of discord. I shall refrain from naming any one of those individuals, because I would thus confer on them too much importance. I earnestly appeal to newspaper editors, who are still conscious of their responsibility, to stop reporting and thereby magnifying all such calumnies, slanders, and absurdities, which only stir up ill feelings and can do much harm to this country. Because a hot-head, often one who has never achieved any success in life except in destructive work—because a hot-head in some part of the country launches an attack against another race, another sect, or another religion, immediately some papers pick up such remarks uttered by a crank and spread them throughout the country. An incendiary torch is thus tossed into a building filled with inflammable material. For what purpose are newspapers reporting such utterances, which often are untrue and always are exaggerated? For what purpose are they doing that? I can see just one, which is the more or less worthy domination of fanaticism which, in dividing the people, enables a small group better to exploit others. While the people squabble, heap abuse on each other, and even slaughter one another, a handful of exploiters laugh and set up their domination upon ruins. But it does not matter, pride is satisfied. If they are sincere in the right direction, if they really love their country, newspaper editors, whose task it is to disseminate ideas, will stop reporting such subversive speeches, and instead they will fill the pages of their papers with the words of level-headed and wise men who love their country, who want to see it become great, beautiful, and prosperous, but who wish to promote its well-being by resorting to justice, charity and mutual love.

Complaints are voiced in some parts of this country about the province of Quebec. In that province, some people claim that their rights are not respected. On either side, there are people who take advantage of prejudices, who shout, and even roar. I have never seen any problem solved by shouting. But I have seen men meet each other, and sometimes exchange harsh words, but if they were sincere, they eventually came to an agreement. A thing is never wholly white nor wholly black. On closer inspection, it can sometimes be noticed that things are not as beautiful as when viewed from a distance, not so ugly as they seemed to be before being more closely examined. Freedom is not only for a group of men, it is for all men; and my freedom ends where my neighbour's begins. Through my

physical strength, making ill use of my freedom, I can kill my neighbour, but he is just as much entitled to live as I am. Let us not forget that.

It does not behoove me to defend my province which has always done its duty in the past and which is as true to-day as it will be to-morrow. But if, showing good will, some people tried to understand our feelings, if they wanted to develop the self-reliance with which we are endowed, they would notice how much easier co-operation would be. But there are always small-minded people who thrive on disunion, who are always on the watch and who seem to be encouraged in certain quarters. During my whole life I have advocated co-operation; I have devoted all my energy and my will-power to the furtherance of such a co-operative spirit. To-day, with the full conviction of my soul and the whole ardour of my heart, I appeal to my compatriots and to all Canadian citizens, urging them to practise co-operation.

One priceless virtue of co-operation is that it destroys nothing, eliminates nobody, and harms no one. On the contrary, in co-operating with my neighbour I work for his good. That does not lower me in any way, it deprives me of nothing, but it puts both the one whom I help and myself on the same plane. The task that I could not carry out alone can be fulfilled through co-operation with my neighbour. Those heights which we cannot reach alone, may be reached if we all get together. You, English-speaking Canadians, who represent the majority of the citizens of this country, have the power to do what you please, but do you think that Canada will be more prosperous and happier if beside you there is a minority which always feels oppressed?

When I was young, I had the opportunity to see one day what could be achieved by co-operation and what could be done by those who opposed co-operation. We were coming out of school; a farmer with a load of hay too heavy for his horse could not climb the hill. We rushed to his assistance; we braced ourselves on the spokes of the wheels, and by pushing all together in the same direction, we succeeded in starting the cart on its way. In the middle of the hill, one of the boys, in a jesting mood, instead of pushing with the rest decided to push in the opposite direction. Although he was alone against nine, he succeeded in bringing the cart to a stop. This is exactly what our trouble-makers are now doing.

In order that co-operation and happiness may prevail among all the citizens of Canada, there is a very simple thing to do; it is to

found our co-operation on charity and to eradicate pride from our minds.

A large number of citizens are yet unaware that Canada is still part of the British Empire thanks to the French-Canadians. In 1776, during the siege of Quebec, the governor of the time advised those who did not want to fight to take refuge on the island of Orleans so as not to handicap the defenders. However the Bishop of Quebec city appealed to the French-Canadians and pointed out to them that it was their duty to defend their country and to remain faithful to the British crown. In 1812, at Chateauguay, again the French-Canadians, who were outnumbered fifteen to one, saved the colony. Let us assume that in 1776 and in 1812 the French-Canadians had refused to defend Canada. What would have happened? Canada would not to-day be a British dominion and we French-Canadians, what would be our fate? If we who belong to the two great races of Canada give serious thought to these things, I am sure that we will be able to get together, to agree and to understand one another.

The Speech from the Throne also says:

The Government has accepted the invitation to Canada to send representatives to a conference of the United Nations to be held on April 25, at San Francisco, to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Canadian delegation will be headed by our Prime Minister who, I am proud to say, is of all the prime ministers of Canada the one who has brought the greatest contribution to the peace and harmony of our country and who will go down in history as the king of the prime ministers of Canada.

It is a fine thing to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, but it is also a very difficult task. All the United Nations will be represented at that meeting. Those nations include the great and the small powers. There are also the intermediate powers headed by Canada, and to my mind it is Canada who will act as intermediary between the great powers and the small ones. Did not the Pope state recently that "harmony between peoples cannot offer any guarantee of stability unless it is founded upon generosity"? He added that at the end of this terrible war it would be unthinkable that someone would seek to derive special advantages from the peace organization. He went on to say that "pride, ambition and greed are the cause of the present war." Turning to those who have been blinded by an extreme nationalism and by violent racial theories, he appealed to them to adopt ideals of Christian brotherhood.

Hon. Mr. VAILLANCOURT.

A rather prominent leader of modern times said: "In this world there are two kinds of men: the soft and the tough." And he added: "I belong to the second category." Well, besides the soft and the tough, there are the just, and they are the men who will bring about and maintain peace. Speaking of peace would be nothing but idle talk if the law of might were to prevail. It has been said that might is not right; however, it is through co-operation in this sphere as in others that mutual understanding will become possible, and the international co-operation which we propose to organize at San Francisco must be steeped in the co-operation which Christ taught us, twenty centuries ago, when he said: "You shall love one another."

The great powers have the right to govern themselves according to their lights, but so have the intermediate and small powers. The present war, which has lasted for so many years already, was declared by a proud dictator who wished to subject the whole world to the hegemony of his own race. We cannot conceive that those who have fought this man would allow another dictator, whoever he may be, to utilize the same means to insure his own domination.

Nations, great, intermediate or small, have the right to live their own lives. It is both necessary and useful that it be so, otherwise ours would be a sad world indeed. Differences of race, mentality, belief and culture are inevitable, but all the various races should unite to contribute to a higher standard of living for all. Is not our present Prime Minister the very man to preach this doctrine which has always guided his actions in our midst? There is a common expression that should, in my estimation, be eradicated from every spoken language. You hear about the "Struggle for life." Why not replace that phrase by one which is more Christian, more appropriate and more constructive: "Union for life."

In this living spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding, I have the honour of moving the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. W. McL. ROBERTSON: Honourable senators, the speech of His Excellency reflected, I believe, matters that are uppermost in the minds of the people of Canada—the continuation of an all-out war effort, and the preparation for the post-war future. The encouraging news from abroad and the encouraging statements from the British Prime Minister and others in authority lead us to hope and believe that the massed weight of the Allied Nations is soon to bring us victory; and as it does, I think our minds should ever

and anon go back to the splendid record of those fighting men who so cheerfully and bravely went from this country to do their share in this terrible conflict. During the last war and this one it has been to me, if not perhaps to some, a matter of wonder and a subject of justifiable pride that these boys, drawn from households and communities who knew nothing of war, from homes which hated war, were yet able with only a few months' training to render service on the battlefield second to none.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: Look at their record in the air, the daring and courage and skill with which they met the enemy, who had been preparing for years, and drove him back and swept him out of the air with almost complete mastery. Think of the boys who never saw the sea, whose nostrils had never known the tang of the salt sea air, but who with a few months' preparation took over ships and made a navy second to none, patrolling the north Atlantic with all its dangers, conquering the U-boats, and convoying our soldiers, our airmen, and all kinds of materials to the other side. Examine the record of the boys in the army, untrained in the art of war and never taught to hate, how they mastered the weapons of war, old and new, and time after time met and drove before them the trained legions of countries which for years had been preparing for war. If this is not a matter of wonder, honourable senators, it is one of justifiable pride that such blood runs in the veins of our youth and that they have been true to their tradition.

Here at home, inspired by this splendid example, our people have established during the past five years a magnificent record of co-operation in the all-out war effort. Labour has foregone many of its traditional rights, industry has given the very best of its talents and ability and has accomplished marvels of production. The farmers labouring under great disadvantages, the fishermen and lumbermen, all in their respective places, have contributed willingly and efficiently to the war effort. And the women of this country, torn as we men are never torn with anxiety for loved ones far away and with their domestic duties tremendously increased owing to regulations which are necessary for war, even though they have had little time to spare, have given willingly of their efforts. It is a splendid instance of co-operation and willingness in which the whole people have agreed to subject themselves to regimentation, which they hate, and to shoulder a burden of taxation which is not

exceeded by that of any other country. The satisfaction they have is that it has been a great effort, one in which all could share to the extent to which their consciences told them they were entitled to share. They can be prouder than ever before of the fact that they are Canadians and that in our own time Canadians in their own way have contributed so much to the welfare of mankind.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: But now, honourable senators, we turn to the question of the future. We are invited to consider the details of a proposed organization the pattern of which will be outlined at least, at San Francisco, at one of the many conferences which probably will have to be held before this world is set upon a safe and sure road for the future. It will not be easy, honourable senators, to repair the tremendous havoc of war. It will require patience; it will require tact; it will require good will. Battles and wars are won by the force of arms; indeed, for a reasonable period of time it may be necessary to maintain the peace by force. But no permanent peace, honourable senators, will come to this world by force alone. Peace, if it comes, must come within the hearts of men. And so it is well, I think, that we should be represented at the San Francisco conferences. I do not know who the delegates will be. This morning's paper intimates to us the possibility that the highly-respected leaders of the two parties represented in this House will be among the delegates. But whoever they are on that occasion, honourable senators, and whoever they may be in the future, I suggest that they will be charged with a great responsibility, because I believe that this Canada of ours is destined to exercise an influence on the world in the future to an even greater degree than it has during the present great conflict.

We will, of course, give consideration to the form of the international organization which will be charged immediately with the task of maintaining peace in the future.

May I tell you, honourable senators, what I should like to have our delegates say at those conferences—and be able to say truthfully—and what I believe the majority of the people of Canada would like them to say? I should like them to say that we in Canada do not believe that wars are inevitable. We believe that in the past wars have had their origin in ambitious and unscrupulous men seeking to exploit the passions of peoples of different racial origins and religions, and to capitalize national jealousies arising out of depressed standards of living. We believe that the Creator fashioned the unit of society the

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON.

same the world over, irrespective of colour, race or religion, and that that unit, husband and wife and children, is animated universally by the same hopes, ambitions and loves, with no desire to kill or be killed, but rather to live and let live, to get enough to eat, to have opportunity to sing and laugh, to have freedom to worship as conscience dictates, and to take justifiable pride in the contributions of the respective races to the advancement of mankind.

Further, I should like our delegates to be able to say: If you, the representatives of the nations of the world, doubt us, look at Canada. Here is a country with a population of 11,500,000, of whom less than half are of British origin; three and a half million are French, more than half a million German, 300,000 Ukrainian, and about a million and a quarter are of other racial origins from various countries of the old world, seeking refuge from the miseries of war. We have learned to live side by side in happiness and contentment. We take pride in the fact that the different racial groups composing our population have contributed to the building of our country. We say to those with whom we differ in opinion not the harsh word but the kind word, and as a result the best within us rather than the worst comes to the surface. We in this country ignore those who, living in the past, would keep alive the deep-rooted animosities of the old world. We despise the man who would seek to set race against race, religion against religion.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: And I should like our delegates to be able to say: We bring to your notice the fact that Canada is indisputable evidence of what men can do when they work together in harmony. We want you to join with us in promoting world harmony. Nature has been very kind to us. We have great resources; we grow far more food than we can possibly consume; we want you to share it with us. We want the things that you make so well, and we will trade what we can spare for what you can spare. We know your countries have been ravaged and have to be restored, and we will help you rebuild your ruined towns and cities. We are anxious and willing to help you establish a new world in which you will be happy and prosperous, as we are happy and prosperous. If you doubt your ability to do this, look at us.

Now, honourable senators, how truthfully our delegates can say what I believe we would like them to say rests with us, the people of

Canada. We in this country do not have to rebuild in a physical sense; but the impact of war has left deep wounds of another type, which I believe all men of good will should hasten to heal. No one can escape responsibility. That responsibility is on everyone, but in greater degree perhaps on the members of this Chamber. Here are men of influence in the industrial, financial and newspaper circles of Canada. A great opportunity is before us to build up, not to pull down; to say the kind word, not the harsh word—to the end that war, if it be at all within our ability to prevent it, shall never again undermine our civilization. It would be a sorry spectacle indeed if after our boys and girls of all racial origins and religious beliefs have so freely spilt their blood in our defence, those who survive should find on their return that we at home have been so remiss in meeting our responsibilities that we have permitted the country to be divided into groups, with man's hand set against his fellow man, and that once again those who died for Canada have died in vain.

Honourable senators, while I am seconding the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne I should like to pay a personal tribute to the man who by force of circumstances has discharged the heaviest responsibilities of government during the past five years. It is no easy matter to guide any democratic country through a period of total war, particularly Canada with its diverse racial elements. Successful government of such a country calls for the highest type of statesmanship. Inevitably there was bound to be criticism, and it would be amazing if some of it at least was not justified. But as we approach what we hope will be the victorious conclusion of the war, I am sure that the people of Canada can rest happy in the reflection that, under the prudent and courageous leadership of Prime Minister King, the administration has been efficient and honest, and as a result, the prestige of Canada has reached a height unparalleled in her history, so that whatever the future may have in store, in the years that lie ahead Canadians can be proud of their country, proud of their record, and can face the future with confidence.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Haig, the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 27, at 8 p.m.

THE SENATE

Tuesday, March 27, 1945.

The Senate met at 8 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from Wednesday, March 21, the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt for an Address in reply thereto.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable senators, allow me first to offer my congratulations to the mover (Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Robertson) of the Address. I was not able to follow the mover as he spoke, and did not know what he had said until I got a translation of his speech the next day. I then found that to a great extent I was in sympathy with the sentiments he had expressed. I wish to join in the tribute paid by the seconder to our soldiers, sailors and airmen. As I speak to-night on the motion for an Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne I feel very happy, because it seems to me that any man who follows the news dispatches these days must realize that we are approaching the end of the war in Europe. All who have sons or brothers or fathers or sisters over there are now looking forward to the day when they will return.

I will say nothing further about the war. We Canadians, of course, are proud of our war effort, and especially proud of our men in the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. It has been said that the Air Force does not win wars, and even though the Navy keeps the sea lanes fairly open, we have to rely on the men in the infantry to win final victory. There may be fitter places than this to discuss our war effort, but I should like to voice the opinion that every member of this House, no matter what his views on other questions may be, is proud of the men and women who left our country to take part in what we believe to be the greatest fight for liberty in the history of the world.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I am one of those who think that certain things could have been done better. I think also that some things could have been done better during the last war. After that war was over we saw a lot of mistakes that had been made. Mistakes have been made in this war as well, but I am

persuaded that they were mistakes of the head and not of the heart, and that we were wholeheartedly behind the war effort. I know that a number of people in various parts of the country have objected to certain phases of the war effort, but I believe in my heart that if they had been schooled in the matter as they will be schooled in the problems of peace, it would have been a different story.

In discussing the Speech from the Throne, speakers on this side usually say that the Government have presented a long address with nothing in it. In this instance we find the usual practice reversed; we have a short address with a great deal in it. This Parliament, unfortunately for some, expires on the 17th of April, and a new House of Commons will have to be elected. This, of course, does not affect honourable members of this Chamber. I do not think it needs a prophet or the son of a prophet to tell honourable senators, many of whom are seasoned parliamentarians and know the difficulties of getting re-elected, that no matter how good the Government's record may have been there will be a great change in the personnel of the other House. I can remember that every time there was an election for the legislature in the province of Manitoba we prophesied that there would be a fifty per cent change, and this prophecy was nearly always borne out. Undoubtedly, by reason of resignations and deaths, and the loss of conventions and seats that were thought to be safe, we shall have a much more divided Parliament following the general election which, according to the Speech from the Throne, is to be held some time in the very near future. Of course honourable members of this House are not interested in elections in the same way that members of the House of Commons are. As senators we are not interested in any one party. You may say that the honourable senator from Manitoba is interested in the Progressive Conservative party, or that the senator from some place else is interested in another party; but, fundamentally, what we are interested in is that the country should elect to Parliament men and women who will be worthy to carry on the tradition of Canada as upheld by our men and women who have given their lives for it. That is our situation, and I am persuaded that for many years to come the future of this country will to a large extent depend on the policies of the Government in office during the next five years. If those policies are sound they will benefit our people.

As I said, the war in Europe is drawing to a close. It is generally felt that if the Allied Nations had not insisted on unconditional surrender Germany would have capitulated

months ago. It is a time of anxious suspense and in the years to come parents whose sons may make the supreme sacrifice in the concluding stages of the war on the western front may be pardoned if they feel that it would have been better had Germany been granted certain terms of surrender. But the Allied Nations are taking the long view and are determined not to repeat the mistake made in 1918—a mistake which has involved us in this second world war. As the Prime Minister stated in another place, reports from both the western and eastern fronts are so favourable as to indicate an early collapse of German military power. I am not one of those who take a very serious view of the Japanese war. True, the Japs may fight to the death on their home islands, but there is no question in my mind that the struggle in the Pacific will be concluded much sooner than at one time seemed possible, for our overwhelming superiority in both naval and air strength is bound to hasten the end of Japanese resistance.

Let me now pass to something that I desire to bring to the attention of honourable members. I do not believe that either the Government or other responsible authorities are properly prepared for peace. Both Liberals and Progressive Conservatives believe in free enterprise; another school of thought favours socialism. It may be made to appear more attractive under some other name, but always in reality it is socialism—state control. I am confident that nearly every soldier, sailor and airman on his return to Canada will be in favour of free enterprise. Dissatisfaction, even disunity, in this country, as in others, is caused by the very essence of socialism—compulsion to do certain things.

When our service men and women come home they will seek, and we will give them, every opportunity to re-establish themselves in civil life. What are we going to do with, say, a young man who returns to Canada after serving two, three, four or five years as pilot, radio operator, or gunner on one of our big bombers? I asked one of those youths, "When in difficulties do you boys pray?" He said, "I don't know, but if they do pray they pray for me, because I happen to be the pilot, and if I don't make a safe landing they won't either. I asked another pilot how he was getting on. He said, "I am having trouble with my rear gunner. He wants to marry a girl in Winnipeg and a girl in London. I don't care which girl he marries, but he had better get married very soon, for he is disturbing the whole crew." I asked, "Why not fire him and get another gunner?" He replied, "The only trouble is, he would go through hell for me." What are we going to do with those young

fellows? Some of them were junior clerks; others had just left school or had not yet completed their university courses. The same remarks will apply to our young fellows in the Navy. At the outbreak of war our Navy personnel did not exceed 4,000. To-day it numbers some 150,000 or 160,000. My honourable friend the "Admiral," across the way (Hon. Mr. Duff), will be able to give us the exact figures. Those young sailors, soldiers and airmen will soon be returning to civil life, and I fear that the country is not ready to meet the situation. It must get ready without delay. A large number of our industries are prepared to change from war production to their former businesses, or to undertake new ones. Those industries will be able to absorb a large number of our young veterans; but the home market will not take care of the increased output, and we must dispose of our surplus production in the markets of the world. In short, we must stimulate and encourage trade and commerce.

Before I go further into that subject I should like for a moment to deal with our system of taxation as it affects free enterprise. You cannot subject industrial and commercial undertakings to a tax of 80 per cent—as a matter of fact the Government takes 100 per cent, but promises to return 20 per cent—and hope to see them expand. It may be said in some quarters that the members of this House represent capitalism. They do not. I am convinced that of its membership at any time at least 90 per cent has by its own enterprise and energy risen from humble beginnings to well-merited success. Certainly any honourable members who have acquired wealth have done so by hard work and good business judgment. Heavy taxation destroys the incentive to embark on new undertakings or to develop old ones. Great Britain has found that out. British taxation is heavy, but industry is encouraged, and is given a chance to survive and develop.

Our income tax has two bad features: the exemptions are so low that it is difficult for parents to educate and train their children; the maximum rates are so heavy as to destroy absolutely any incentive a man or woman may have to earn special or extra income. Those two drawbacks must be rectified, and rectified soon.

I do not prophesy when the war in Europe will be over; nobody does; but if we can judge at all from reports, it should be over in six months from now, maybe much sooner, perhaps in six weeks. Now is the time when we ought to be getting ready for the turn-over from wartime to peacetime industry, so as to be in a position to encourage enterprise

after the war ends. The Socialists say, "If the executives do not provide employment, they are to blame, and we shall take over." If you make the burden on industry so heavy that no one cares to risk his capital, you will prevent private enterprise.

Let me give you an illustration. In the city of Winnipeg there is a man who established a business some fifty years ago, when he was about twenty-two years of age. He had a good name, he was said to be honest, and he possessed lots of energy. He is in the automobile business now. Last year the income from his business was \$186,000, but he was allowed to keep only \$40,000, and he had to pay personal income tax on that. What incentive is there for anyone to start a new enterprise when, after paying such heavy corporation taxes, one is still subject to personal income tax? Not a dollar of that man's income was made out of the war effort. That is the kind of situation we face in this country, and that is the first thing which must be rectified. So far there has been no attempt to rectify it. It is true that last year the income tax law was slightly amended with respect to valuations and write-offs, but no serious attempt has been made to give industry a chance to carry on.

In order to be able to dispose of the goods which the industry that we now have in this country will be able to produce after the war, we shall have to sell on the markets of the world. Right now our best business men ought to be in those countries where we hope to sell our goods; they should be studying the requirements there so as to be able to tell us what to do in order to meet competition successfully. I hardly like to say this, but I do not believe that committees such as the one that was headed by the Principal of McGill University are going to mean very much. True the Principal of McGill is a fine man, and has great ability; but the problem that such bodies are attacking is not the chief one that we have to face, which is: How are we going to get markets for our industry? For only to the extent that we are able to get markets shall we be able to maintain our industry.

A second great problem is this: Where are we going to sell our cattle, our grain and our hogs after the war? In Western Canada in the last five years—I see the honourable gentleman from St. Jean Baptiste (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) listening to me, so I had better be careful with my figures—in the last five years, or certainly in the last ten years, because of the development of power farming in the West, we have produced, with the same labour, twice as much grain as we did before. What

are we going to do with this great agricultural industry when those boys of ours come back? It is going to be a difficult situation. How are we going to get boys who have been in the army, say, to settle down on farms and be content to produce wheat when the price is fifty-five, sixty or sixty-five cents a bushel, and there is no certainty that they will be able to sell their crops at even those figures? Will those boys be willing to raise hogs for two and a half or three cents a pound, and cattle for five or six cents a pound? The average young fellow who has been overseas is likely to say, "I fought for something better than that, and I want it." If we do not recognize the situation and do something about it, the Socialists will get the votes without having to fight for them.

I can say without boasting that those of us who come from Manitoba know more about Socialists than do the people who live in any other part of Canada. We have had Socialists out there longer than you have had them anywhere else. Of course, they were not called Socialists at first; back in 1914 their party went under the name of Independent Labour. We had ten of them in our Legislature. Such people do not get elected because their own platform is good, but because our platform is not as good as the people know it could be. The election of the Socialists in Saskatchewan was the result of the bad times that we had in the West from 1930 to 1937 or 1938. A world-wide depression started in 1929; but even if this had not occurred there would have been bad times in Western Canada for a number of years because of crop failures, drought, grasshoppers and what have you, to say nothing of wheat prices that were so low as to make it absolutely impossible for farmers to produce at a profit. That is the kind of thing that I want this Government or some other government to prevent from happening again. When the war is over we must have markets for not only our manufactured products but for all the various products of our farms. I do not believe, honourable members, that enough attention has been paid to this matter.

I want to digress for a moment. I suppose one should not talk politics in this House.

Hon. Mr. HOWARD: It would be interesting.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I wonder why the Government did not hold an election last September. I should like to know why. Somebody may say, "The war was on." Well, the United States had an election last fall, when the war was on.

Hon. Mr. KING: An election could not be avoided over there.

Hon. Mr. HAIG.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Australia had an election while the war was on, and so did New Zealand.

Hon. Mr. EULER: So did we.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: The war had not started in earnest when we had our election. As I say, other Allied countries have had elections while the war was on. Take South Africa, for instance. I have a feeling, honourable members, that if the Prime Minister of this country could have had the opportunity over again, there would have been an election last September. I hope the honourable leader of the House (Hon. Mr. King) may be able to indicate when the election is going to take place. I do not ask for this information for ourselves alone—that would be selfish; but if he could by a slip of the tongue disclose the date, it would be of interest to the whole country. Is it to be in June, July, August or September?

At this time I do not intend to refer to the money that will have to be voted to carry on the war and the regular departments of government, for this matter will come before us at a later date. Likewise I do not consider this the proper time to speak at length on the San Francisco conference, since I believe the honourable leader of the House is to move a resolution on this subject to-morrow, but I may be allowed a word or two to-night. I believe that every one of us should study as best he can the problem of international co-operation, and I hope that what the honourable leader says to us to-morrow will encourage us all to think about the matter more seriously. We now have the greatest opportunity that any generation has ever had to assure a peaceful way of life. True, there was a great opportunity after the last war, when the League of Nations was established. I do not condemn the League of Nations, the idea was grand, but certain things were lacking to make it effective. For one thing, it lacked the co-operation of the United States, and with all respect and humility I say that the late President of that country made a great mistake, and because he did not carry his own people with him is probably as responsible as any other man in the world for the terrible conflict in which we are now engaged. The present President is doing what I think ought to be done. He is inviting leaders from the Senate and from the House of Representatives to go to California with him, and is giving them a free hand to do as they see fit in formulating a charter.

This meeting at San Francisco is not a peace conference, but a conference at which it is hoped to set up a standard so that the peace treaty, when signed and completed, will make peace possible for many years to come.

There are some things about the situation that I do not like. Again I speak with humility because I am not such an expert that I can express a firm opinion; but I think I ought to say I do not like the way the Yalta conference dealt with the Poles.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: They were overrun first of all by the Russians and then by the Germans. Poland was the first nation that stood by Great Britain at the beginning of the war with Germany. Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin may have made the very best agreement possible; no doubt they did—I have no doubt that even if I had been there I should have fallen in line and agreed with them—but in my heart of hearts there is a feeling that the Poles have not got a deal that we as freedom loving people can justify to ourselves. It is my hope that at the peace table they will get such a deal.

Coming back to the California conference, I understand the Government is going to appoint men and women from the House of Commons, and probably two members of this House. They should go to the conference dedicated to the task of carrying out their responsibilities in such a way that future generations will not have to suffer as this generation has suffered. Only those of us who have our own boys overseas know what a terrible trial we go through. We think of them all day, from the time we get up in the morning until we go to bed at night. Man or woman it is exactly the same, and if any pretend they do not, and won't admit it, they are only deceiving themselves.

Now, honourable senators, we have a chance at San Francisco. It may be a small chance; we are but a small nation. The great nations have tremendous power, maybe too much power, and the outcome may be dependent on power politics; but in my judgment anything that can get the United States, Russia and Great Britain—and probably France and China—around the table and get them to agree on a formula, will at least result in a better world than we had before the First Great War. The men and women who go from Canada to that conference will be sitting down with some of the great people of the world—perhaps not Stalin or Churchill or Roosevelt, but the regular people—and with them can work out this peace organization. Anyone can get up and criticize proposals with reference to this conference. You may find fault with this agreement by the hour. You may say it is not democratic. You may say that Canada will be called upon to provide so many men and so much money for the settlement of disputes. But that is not so

at all; there is to be a police force to deal with such cases. In my judgment each member of this Chamber believes it is a step toward world peace and a means of preventing wars in the future. I will not go into that any further, except to say that I believe the people of Canada as a whole are seized with the importance of this conference. It is not a peace conference. Those who go there will have difficulty in reaching an agreement. We may be dissatisfied. It may be that the Prime Minister, if he goes there, will not get what he wants, or that those who go from the other side will not yet what they want; but all will go with determination and hope that peace shall reign in the world forever after. I could read you an extract from a newspaper which states that in the last thousand years wars have been going on half the time. That is probably correct. But there is still the chance that this time we may be right.

Honourable members, I thank you for your attention. I hope I have said nothing that is in derogation of our great war effort. My thoughts have been animated solely by what is good for Canada. We in this House have no political interests to serve. We may have an interest such as you might find where there is a contest for mayor, and somebody is elected and somebody else is not. But by and large, to us it matters little who may sit in the House of Commons. We should think of Canada and the sacrifices she has made, firmly believing that in the future we may be one of the great nations who stand for peace.

Hon. J. H. KING: I join with my honourable friend opposite in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I think it is generally agreed that they acquitted themselves most creditably. While reading their speeches it occurred to me that those two gentlemen might easily have exchanged notes, because their speeches are fairly well along the same line. If one read what they had to say in dealing with the war one would find that they were in very close agreement. They both spoke of the value of the principles of fair play and justice and the necessity that these should prevail throughout the world at this time. I am sure that when this Parliament returns to the consideration of peace-time matters and legislation of first importance to the people of Canada, those two honourable gentlemen will be very valuable members, not only in debate in this Chamber but in the work of committees of this House.

My honourable friend who has just taken his seat (Hon. Mr. Haig) has refrained from controversial discussion. May I say that in this I think he was wise. It is of course well

understood that in ordinary circumstances this Parliament would have been dissolved last January, at the end of its fifth session, for a sixth session is virtually without precedent.

The successful landing of our troops in Normandy, followed by the lightning drive across France, encouraged hope not only in this country but among all the allied nations that Germany would be forced to give up the struggle some time last autumn. Unhappily that hope was not realized. But to-day the German army is on the run on both the eastern and western fronts, and is disintegrating so rapidly that the Reich may be forced into unconditional surrender within a few weeks—the sooner the better. But even before these decisive events I think the Prime Minister had in mind that the war might have reached such a stage that it would be possible to hold an election early this spring and have the new Parliament assemble in June or July. Two events, however, intervened: first, the invitation to the Government of Canada to attend the San Francisco conference on the 25th of April, to which my honourable friend has referred, and the impending Victory Loan.

In view of the delay that must of necessity now take place in arranging for a general election, the Government decided in their wisdom—and in my opinion they should be commended for it—to summon Parliament for a sixth session, for two particular purposes. The first is to discuss the invitation to attend the San Francisco conference; the second, to pass interim supply to meet war and civil expenditures during the period which must intervene between a general election and the summoning of a new Parliament. I shall not venture to prophesy what changes the next election may bring about in the other House. I have attended quite a number of prorogations, and they are always occasions for sadness, as members who have been associated in legislative work for four or five years take leave of one another. On this occasion that sadness is intensified by the knowledge that some members will not seek re-election, others will fail to secure nomination, and still others will suffer defeat at the polls.

Only by extending the life of this Parliament can an election be postponed, but the Prime Minister's views in this regard are well known. He is strongly opposed to any such extension, in order that the Government may carry on the business of the country, and I fully agree with him. The whole situation should be canvassed in a general election, so that the electorate may have an opportunity of registering its desires. The new Parliament, as my honourable friend has said, will in all proba-

Hon. Mr. KING.

bility have to lay down policies that may affect Canada for many years to come, because those policies will deal with peace-time problems, the satisfactory solution of which will be of very great importance to this country.

I do not intend to-night to go into the respective merits of Socialism, Conservatism, or Liberalism. They will be discussed on the hustings, and I have implicit confidence in the judgment of the Canadian people.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. KING: My honourable friend has stated that the people in his province know more about Socialism than those in any other part of Canada. I happened to be a member of the legislature of British Columbia which met in Victoria in 1903,—

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I said the four western provinces know more about it than any of the other provinces.

Hon. Mr. KING: Then I concur in what my honourable friend has said. I remember very well when I attended the provincial House in Victoria in 1903—forty-two years ago. That was the first parliament of the province in which we had a party government. Sir Richard McBride was returned with a following of twenty-one Conservatives, and the Liberals mustered seventeen members. The member for Nanaimo, a Welshman, knew more about the doctrines of Karl Marx and could preach them better than those who to-day are preaching them in this country. He had six or eight colleagues, all very firm in their beliefs and well able to present them to the legislature. They at that time preached the doctrines that are being preached to-day. I am not so much disturbed by those in Canada who preach Socialism, if they will only stick to their text. Let them tell the people what Socialism means—regimentation and control of industry, banking, and business generally, and that the property of the individual will become the property of the State—and I am confident that our people will reject Socialism.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. KING: But if our people are told only that the co-called big interests are to be controlled, they may fail to understand that once the process of socializing our great industrial, commercial and financial institutions is put into effect it will not stop there but will most certainly extend to all private interests, and the people will become merely servants of the State, with freedom only to do what a Socialist government orders them to do.

I have drifted from what I wish to say.

My honourable friend opposite thinks that in the matter of taxation we are not yet prepared for the return to peacetime industry. It can be readily understood that one of our great problems in the war period has been how best to finance Canada's war effort. I believe that all who have studied finance and taxation in other countries at war are agreed that Canada has done very well. We have paid for about fifty per cent of our actual war expenditures, and the balance has been loaned by the people. It cannot be denied that Canada stands to-day in a very strong position for a nation which has gone through five and a half years of war. A day or two ago Mr. Graham Towers, the Governor of the Bank of Canada, issued a statement from which it can be seen by anyone who reads it that we have done well, not only in the matter of taxation but also in our borrowings, and by financing within Canada the full burden of our war effort.

My honourable friend made some reference to industry and trade. It is only natural that we should have some discussion on this. He will recall that during the last session of Parliament the Government took steps to assist exporters. There has been set up a financial organization that will materially aid business concerns which undertake to dispose of their goods in countries where at present buyers are probably unable to pay cash. A great opportunity has been given to industry in this way. Furthermore, the Government has been active in extending Canada's representation in foreign countries, and to-day this country has able men, either as ambassadors or ministers plenipotentiary, in many parts of the world. These men are in a position to keep the Government advised as to opportunities for trade, and I have no doubt that the information thus obtained is one of the services made available to Canadian exporters. We also have our trade commissioners. I believe that during the war this branch of our foreign service has not been extended, except to some South American countries. The European countries have of course been "blackened" out and there has been no opportunity for development of trade with them.

If the war should come to an end within a few weeks the Allied nations would be faced with a great problem in providing necessities for the people of the countries that have been overrun. Unless everything possible is done to render relief in those countries serious disturbances may develop, and what is worse, many people will probably starve to death. I

am sure we are all conversant with this fact and know that our people are desirous of doing their share towards providing relief. Fortunately we have in the Allied nations a great organization for making relief effective. If ever there was in the world an organization capable of relieving the needs of stricken countries it is the one that exists among the Allied powers to-day.

I do not intend to speak to-night on the San Francisco conference, but I hope to have an opportunity to-morrow of moving a resolution dealing with the matter. As my honourable friend has said, it undoubtedly will be the desire of all members of this Parliament and of all the people of Canada to support to the utmost of their power an organization that will give an assurance of peace and of better conditions for all the nations of the world.

As to supply, I feel there will not be occasion for us to debate that in this Chamber. The Government simply intends to ask for certain sums of money to provide for financial needs from the 31st of March until the assembling of a new Parliament. There are only two matters to be dealt with at this session. One is the request for concurrence in the Government's action in accepting the invitation to attend the San Francisco conference, and the other is the request to provide funds to carry on the war during the interval between the end of the fiscal year and the assembling of the next Parliament. I am sure that these two matters will be dealt with expeditiously by the members of both Houses, and that the nineteenth Parliament will not be concluded by a political session. After all, there will be plenty of opportunity on the hustings to talk politics.

I have no more to say. It is hoped that if other honourable members desire to speak—and the field is one in which many speeches could be made—they will proceed some time this week or next week. It is difficult to decide when the Senate should adjourn, but to-morrow we may have information that will enable my honourable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) and me to arrive at an agreement with regard to our work for the remainder of the session, and to make proposals that will best serve the interests of the Senate.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Howard, the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.

THE SENATE

Wednesday, March 28, 1945.

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

MOTION

Hon. J. H. KING moved:

That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the following resolution:

Whereas the Government of Canada has been invited by the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of 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 in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and

Whereas the invitation suggests that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization which have been made public by the four governments which participated in the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and

Whereas the Government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference,

Therefore be it resolved:

1. That this House endorses the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference;

2. That this House recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. That this House approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization;

4. That this House agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to Parliament for approval.

He said: Honourable senators, it will be recalled that in the Speech from the Throne there was a paragraph indicating that a resolution of this character would come before both

Hon. Mr. KING.

Houses of Parliament. I need not attempt to influence honourable members in favour of the objects set forth in this resolution. I am confident that it is the desire not only of Parliament but of the people generally that Canada should be represented at the proposed conference called for the establishment of a general international organization to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. The Government of Canada has accepted the invitation of the Government of the United States to attend the conference on the 25th of next month, and is now asking Parliament to concur in its action.

Doubtless all honourable members are familiar with the terms of the resolution, so I will not delay our proceedings by reading it. I should like, however, to have incorporated in Hansard the correspondence relating to the invitation and its acceptance which passed between the United States Ambassador to Canada and the Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. This is the correspondence:

Embassy of the
United States of America,
Ottawa, Canada

March 5, 1945.

No. 293

Sir,—The Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China, invites the Government of Canada to send representatives to a conference of the United Nations to be held on April 25, 1945, at San Francisco in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The above named governments suggest that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization, which were made public last October as a result of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and which have now been supplemented by the following provisions for section C of chapter 6.

C. Voting

1. Each member of the Security Council should have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under chapter 8, section A and under the second sentence of paragraph one of chapter 8, section C, a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.

Further information as to arrangements will be transmitted subsequently. In the event that the Government of Canada desires in advance of the conference to present views or comments concerning the proposals, the Government of

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

this great Commonwealth act in the light of their responsibilities of nationhood, the great Empire to which we are all so proud to belong will be destroyed. Well, my belief is that it has been demonstrated to the whole world that the ties that bind the peoples of the overseas Dominions to the people of Great Britain are not breakable. Whenever the occasion arises the whole Empire will respond as one. Yet Canada is mistress in her own house, in all her own affairs. That is agreed to and conceded, not only by our own statesmen and our people in general, but by the people and the Government of Great Britain.

For the purpose of clarifying my statement a bit I would read into *Hansard*, from the proceedings of the last Imperial Conference which the present Prime Minister had the honour and privilege of attending, a few brief portions of the deliberations as to this very question of the position that the Dominions and Great Britain should properly take in the event of an international assembly such as the one about to be held. On that occasion Mr. King had this to say:

The terrible events of 1940 revealed how great was the menace to freedom and how suddenly freedom might be lost. So long as freedom endures, free men everywhere will owe to the people of Britain a debt they can never repay. So long as Britain continues to maintain the spirit of freedom and to defend the freedom of other nations, she need never doubt her own pre-eminence throughout the world. So long as we all share that spirit, we need never fear for the strength or unity of the Commonwealth. The voluntary decisions by Britain, by Canada, by Australia, by New Zealand, and by South Africa are a supreme evidence of the unifying force of freedom.

He continues:

This common effort springing from a common source has given a new strength and unity, a new meaning and significance to the British Commonwealth and Empire.

Without attempting to distinguish between the terms "British Empire" and "British Commonwealth," but looking rather to the evolution of this association of free nations, may I give to you what I believe to be the secret of its strength and of its unity, and the vision which I cherish of its future.

And he quotes these words:

"We . . . who look forward to larger brotherhoods and more exact standards of social justice, value and cherish the British Empire because it represents, more than any other similar organization has ever represented, the peaceful co-operation of all sorts of men in all sorts of countries, and because we think it is, in that respect at least, a model of what we hope the whole world will some day become."

The words which the Prime Minister quoted at that time were words spoken by Mr. Churchill in 1907, and they became part of his great speech.

Hon. Mr. KING.

We in this country are not doing any great service, but possibly a disservice, to Canada, and to the Commonwealth as it is organized to-day, by raising doubt from time to time as to the loyalty of the Canadian people to their association with Great Britain and the Commonwealth. Such a doubt should not enter the minds of the public of this country. We have demonstrated on many occasions our loyalty and our desire to co-operate with Great Britain in every way, not only in war, but in peace, and I hope that throughout this conference and through the years to come co-operation will continue between all the nations of the Commonwealth. If it does continue, as it has heretofore, we shall be a great power in this world and a great example to the world of what nations can do if they act in the spirit of justice and co-operation.

We have before us a booklet that was distributed not long ago which contains certain proposals that came out of the conference held at the instigation of the four great powers last August and September. From that meeting, as I have already said, emanated an invitation to Canada to be present at the coming conference in San Francisco on April 25 of this year. Those who represented the four governments at Dumbarton Oaks succeeded in agreeing on about ninety per cent of the matters that were discussed, but some matters were referred back to those who originated the conference. At Yalta only a few days ago those matters were again under consideration, and additions, dealing largely with the Security Council, were made to the proposals arising out of the Dumbarton Oaks conference. These have been agreed upon between the four great powers. It has been indicated by the Prime Minister that although we were not a member of the Dumbarton Oaks conference, we were furnished with full reports of its proceedings, and the booklet to which I have already referred sets out proposals for the establishment of a general international organization. Among other things, it states:

There should be established an international organization under the title of The United Nations, the Charter of which should contain provisions necessary to give effect to the proposals which follow.

The first chapter sets out the purposes of the organization, as follows:

1. To maintain international peace and security; and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes which may lead to a breach of the peace;
2. To develop friendly relations among nations and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international co-operation in the solution of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems; and

4. To afford a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the achievement of these common ends.

Chapter II deals with principles and reads:

In pursuit of the purposes mentioned in Chapter I the Organization and its members should act in accordance with the following principles:

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

2. All members of the Organization undertake, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the Organization, to fulfil the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter.

3. All members of the Organization shall settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security are not endangered.

4. All members of the Organization shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Organization.

5. All members of the Organization shall give every assistance to the Organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

6. All members of the Organization shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which preventive or enforcement action is being undertaken by the Organization. The Organization should ensure that states not members of the Organization act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Chapter III deals with membership, and provides that:

Membership shall be open to all peace-loving states.

Chapter IV sets out the organization as follows:

- (a) A General Assembly.
- (b) A Security Council.
- (c) An international court of justice; and
- (d) A Secretariat.

The booklet then proceeds to deal with that organization in detail.

Chapter V deals with the General Assembly. It is so important that I would ask permission to place it on Hansard. It provides:

Section A: Composition.

All members of the Organization should be members of the General Assembly and should have a number of representatives to be specified in the Charter.

Section B: Functions and Powers.

1. The General Assembly should have the right to consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member or members of the Organization or by the Security Council; and to make recommendations with

regard to any such principles or questions. Any such questions on which action is necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion. The General Assembly should not on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which is being dealt with by the Security Council.

2. The General Assembly should be empowered to admit new members to the Organization upon recommendation of the Security Council.

3. The General Assembly should, upon recommendation of the Security Council, be empowered to suspend from the exercise of any rights or privileges of membership any member of the Organization against which preventive or enforcement action shall have been taken by the Security Council. The exercise of the rights and privileges thus suspended may be restored by decision of the Security Council. The General Assembly should be empowered, upon recommendation of the Security Council, to expel from the Organization any member of the Organization which persistently violates the principles contained in the Charter.

4. The General Assembly should elect the non-permanent members of the Security Council and the members of the Economic and Social Council provided for in Chapter IX. It should be empowered to elect, upon recommendation of the Security Council, the Secretary-General of the Organization. It should perform such functions in relation to the election of the judges of the international court of justice as may be conferred upon it by the statute of the court.

5. The General Assembly should apportion the expenses among the members of the Organization and should be empowered to approve the budgets of the Organization.

6. The General Assembly should initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international co-operation in political, economic and social fields and of adjusting situations likely to impair the general welfare.

7. The General Assembly should make recommendations for the co-ordination of the policies of international economic, social, and other specialized agencies brought into relation with the Organization in accordance with agreements between such agencies and the Organization.

8. The General Assembly should receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council and reports from other bodies of the Organization.

Section C: Voting.

1. Each member of the Organization should have one vote in the General Assembly.

2. Important decisions of the General Assembly, including recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security; election of members of the Security Council; election of members of the Economic and Social Council; admission of members, suspension of the exercise of the rights and privileges of members, and expulsion of members; and budgetary questions, should be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting. On other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, the decisions of the General Assembly should be made by a simple majority vote.

We all remember the peace organization set up after the last war. It is a matter of deep and widespread regret that the League of Nations did not effect the purpose for which it was brought into being.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. KING: We cannot blame its failure on those who associated themselves with the organization. It failed because it lacked the support of the one great power whose head had initiated the proposal for its formation. But, apart from its failure to maintain world peace, the League of Nations did much useful work of international scope in regard to labour conditions, and control of narcotics and white slavery. No doubt that work will be continued by this new organization.

Chapter VI is devoted to the Security Council and is divided into four sections, covering composition; principal functions and powers, voting, and procedure. It is proposed that the representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China, and, in due course, France, shall have permanent seats. The General Assembly is to elect six states to fill the non-permanent seats. These six states are to be elected for a term of two years, three of them retiring each year, and they will not be immediately eligible for re-election.

I may say, in order to allay the alarm felt in certain quarters, that it is not proposed that the peace of the world shall be controlled by force; but primary responsibility will rest on the Security Council to take whatever steps may be necessary to check aggressive action by any nation. It must be gratifying to the peoples of the world to know that the great Allied nations are prepared to continue their association in the post-war period, to the end that their joint efforts shall ensure international peace. A glance at the map will show that the geographical location of these great powers places them in a peculiarly advantageous position to maintain international peace and security.

In this respect we on this half of the hemisphere are very fortunately situated. We have as our immediate neighbour the United States, a major power of great military, industrial and economic strength, and enjoying high standards of living. Further removed we have the republics of South America, united in the Pan-American Union. Those republics at a recent meeting in Mexico unreservedly endorsed the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization for the main-

Hon. Mr. KING.

tenance of international peace and security. Their representatives will attend the San Francisco conference.

For over a hundred years Canada and the United States have lived together in uninterrupted amity under the Rush-Bagot treaty, and during this war they entered into a pact for mutual defence. Canada and the United States have set an example to the whole world in the amicable settlement of disputes and misunderstandings which from time to time arise between nations. An outstanding tribunal for this purpose is the International Joint Commission, composed of members representing our two countries. That commission has resolved many difficult problems affecting the United States and Canada, and its members have contributed largely to the maintenance of friendly relations between these two great nations. This surely is an example to the world of what can be done to maintain international good will, if there is a desire for good will.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. KING: Some doubt has been expressed as to the voting powers of the General Assembly. These are dealt with in section C. I am advised that the eleven delegates, five permanent and six non-permanent, can vote on all questions before the Security Council, and that on matters of procedure there must be an affirmative vote of at least seven members.

Hon. Mr. EULER: May I ask the honourable leader a question, prefacing it in this way? I have always believed that one of the defects of the League of Nations was the absence of any power to enforce a decision. Apparently that power is now to be created. This is my question. Can that power be exercised against all the constituent nations of this proposed international organization, or is an exception made in respect of the five great powers?

Hon. Mr. KING: I had intended to deal with that when discussing the powers of the organization. If there should fail to be unity among the five Great Powers, the Security Council, exercising its voting strength, could intimate its policy to the Assembly, and the question of the commitments to be made by the Assembly would be decided. The decision might be for war or it might be against war.

Hon. Mr. EULER: I do not like to interrupt the honourable leader, but from what I have heard and read I am under the impression that if a dispute should arise which would affect one of the Great Powers, no action could be taken against that power.

Hon. Mr. KING: I should say that is not so.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: The answer is no.

Hon. Mr. EULER: That was very clearly the information issued at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Some change must have been made in the meantime.

Hon. Mr. KING: I do not believe that is the intention. A great power will be subject to the same treatment as a secondary power. The action taken will, I suppose, depend upon the ability of the other nations to proceed against the delinquent nation.

Chapter VII describes the constitution of the International Court of Justice. It would function in accordance with a statute to be annexed to and forming part of the charter of the organization. This court would deal with international problems and would be either a continuation of the present Permanent Court of International Justice or a tribunal based upon it.

It is proposed that the Security Council shall be composed of five members, one from each of the five great powers, these representatives to be elected from the Assembly, as I have already stated. I have already mentioned the system of voting in the Council. Naturally there will have to be a secretariat, and the suggestion is that it should function continuously.

A question that has been disturbing the minds of some people is: What will the Canadian delegation do at San Francisco? What power will it have to enter into any agreement or undertaking? We are going there as a body, made up of representatives of political parties in Parliament, to represent the people of Canada, and I take it that the delegation will meet from day to day and decide what position Canada should adopt on matters that come before the Assembly. Any undertakings made by Canada's representatives will have to be submitted to Parliament for ratification.

As regards the question of whether or not Canada would be satisfied to allow a delegation from Parliament to enter into contracts with the Security Council for our participation in future wars, if there should be any, I wish to explain what is proposed. Our commitments to the Security Council will be submitted to the Parliament of Canada for approval. What I mean is that if the Security Council says that it would like to have from Canada a certain number of aircraft, of airmen, of troops and of ships, and certain quantities of food products, munitions and so on, the matter will be discussed, and the decision that is reached will be expressed in a separate agreement which will come before Parliament for ratification. So there need be no worry at all

on this score. We know the attitude of the Canadian people towards war. They have never gone to war just for the fun of it; they have gone to war only when convinced there was no other way of defending those principles of justice and fair play in which they believe. I repeat that any undertakings made at San Francisco by the Canadian Government or delegation will be submitted to Parliament, and there be finally endorsed or rejected.

In closing I just wish to express my belief that the people of Canada hope the invitation to attend the San Francisco conference will be accepted unanimously by Parliament, and that those who are entrusted with the duty of representing us at the conference will keep in mind the Canadian viewpoint in regard to war. We are not interested in war as a means of conquest. We will not become participants in war unless that seems to us to be the only way of defending that freedom—freedom of religion, freedom of the Press, and so on—which exists not only in Canada, but virtually throughout this hemisphere. We regard freedom as the most highly prized thing in life; and if it is to be extended to other nations, as we trust it will be, it is important that there should be a fairer distribution of the world's riches among all peoples and a greater opportunity for unrestricted trade. Let us hope that with the extension of the benefits of freedom to other lands there will be increased support for those great principles which we are determined to maintain.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE: Honourable senators, we are living from hour to hour and day to day through most thrilling and momentous times. We all feel and realize that Germany, which forced this cruel, devastating, barbaric war upon us, is nearing ultimate defeat and unconditional surrender. How fitting it is, then, honourable senators, that forty peace-loving united nations, or maybe a greater number, are called to meet at San Francisco on April 25 to lay plans for the prevention of wars and the future peace of the world. Almost the whole of Europe has been devastated, and famine and pestilence prevail everywhere on the continent. The world has never witnessed in the past, and I hope it will never witness in the future, such a conflict as is now drawing to a close in Europe. Naturally, in common with all other members of this House and, I hope, with every Canadian, I am delighted to know that the United Nations are about to hold a meeting devoted to furthering international good will and preventing war, and that this meeting of the United Nations is going to take place in the very near future. I am happy to state to the honourable leader,

who is a minister of the Government, that everyone on this side of the House heartily endorses Canada's acceptance of the invitation extended to her by our friendly neighbour to attend this very important conference. The very fact that people of different creeds and colour are to meet there will have a tremendous influence not only at this time but for generations to come. I sincerely trust that the high expectations of the delegates will be fulfilled.

A charter is to be prepared. I do not know what that charter is going to contain, but certainly it will be directed towards peace and the prevention of wars. I hope that the agreements that would become necessary, should Canada and the members of the United Nations ever be called upon to contribute their share to sanctions or armed force, will be drawn at San Francisco. There is a feeling on the part of people who have followed the proceedings of Parliament thus far that if the five big powers and the six non-permanent members, after long and thoughtful negotiation, should decide in favour of sanctions or armed enterprise, too long a period would elapse before their decision could be submitted to the Canadian Parliament. If Parliament were not in session, several months might pass before approval could be given.

I hope the honourable the Leader of this House is going to San Francisco, and I would suggest to him that all preparations should be made to expedite agreements providing for assistance to threatened nations, so that there shall be no delay in meeting any request for assistance, no matter what government may be in power. Such a request might be for sailors or ships, as the honourable Leader has stated; and everything should be in readiness so that Parliament could act promptly.

It has been truly said that there will be a great difference between the Assembly to be created at San Francisco and the old League of Nations. I am in favour of the Security Council, and I am sure that when the delegates go to San Francisco they will have the strong support not only of the Parliament of Canada but of the people as well.

I do not need to go into the details of the organization of the Security Council. That has been dealt with very well indeed by my honourable friend opposite. There is, however, a certain weakness in the fact that if one of the great powers was considered an aggressor—my honourable friend has just raised the question—and the other powers wanted to intervene, after all grievances had been well ventilated, the accused power could say "No," and no further action would be taken.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE.

An Hon. SENATOR: That would be the end of the Security Council.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, I would not say that. It would be better if what I have pointed out were not so, but we have got to accept this whole scheme in good faith. The three great powers have fought gallantly shoulder to shoulder in this war. They have done wonderful things together and, as I said a moment ago, in a very short time we are not only going to defeat Germany, but also Japan. We have trusted our allies in war; we must also trust them in peace. If we do not have the Security Council I do not know what other organization could be set up to take its place; so naturally we must accept it.

May I return for a moment to the delay that might occur between the time that Canada would be called upon for certain assistance and the time when Parliament would meet? I failed to mention that my honourable friend and one of his colleagues do not take exactly the same view. As I have it from the press, the Honourable Mr. Crerar had this to say:

Commitments for quick and certain punitive action against an aggressor nation must be written into the charter of the world peace organization if it is to be effective.

And in another place he said:

The aggressor will have to be dealt with quickly and effectively. It is much the same as a fire brigade in a municipality. If a fire were to break out on one of the streets of Ottawa, it would be poor business if the City Council had to be called together to decide whether or not the fire apparatus should be sent out.

So I hope that if my honourable friend goes to San Francisco he will exert his great influence to try to bring about quick action in case of necessity. I have nothing more to say on that question, except to express the hope that the results of the conference will fulfil our expectations.

There has been considerable talk in certain quarters about the United Kingdom emerging from this war a weakened nation. I do not altogether agree with that view. From a financial point of view and from the point of view of manpower that may be so; but as honourable senators well know, she will come out of this war without having lost an inch of her vast territory. If she gets the loyal support of the overseas Dominions, and of India and the colonies, she undoubtedly will make up the export trade and the domestic trade that she has lost. She will not lose her position as a great power, and in time to come will be, I hope, greater and stronger than ever.

Our delegates to San Francisco will, as always, desire to stand by the United Kingdom, the Commonwealth and the Empire in every

way possible. At the same time friendly relations with our neighbour to the south and our other gallant allies must be maintained.

I do not want to touch on post-war trade, but if you will allow me only a word or two I should like to say that export trade will no longer be done "cash on the barrelhead" as it formerly was, but rather by exchange of goods—

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:—and I hope that whatever Government is in power during the post-war period it will use every endeavour to favour the Mother Country who, in 1940, saved not only herself but Canada, the whole British Empire, and all the freedom-loving democracies who have suffered untold losses. Even now, day after day, poor unfortunate women and children are being killed by the robot bomb in England. Therefore, it is only right that we and the other self-governing Dominions, and the Empire as a whole should do everything we can to assist the Mother Country as a slight token of our appreciation for the magnificent sacrifices she has made. I am proud to be a Canadian—

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am proud to be a British subject.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am one of those who firmly believe that the success of Canada in the past and in the future—free and independent nation as we are—is due to the fact that we are part and parcel of that vast Empire on which the sun never sets.

My good friend to my left in his very eloquent and interesting speech of yesterday congratulated the armed forces of Canada. At this time I should like to add my tribute. Canada has played a very important role in the war—on the sea, on land and in the air. To those who are fighting so gallantly for us on foreign fields I want to say how proud we are of them, and assure them that when they return nothing we can give will be too good for them. I should like to extend my remarks a little further and include the women in the services. I also want to thank the nurses, the Red Cross, and all those who have helped in the munitions factories, and who have laboured in the mines and forests.

Hon. Mr. QUINN: And the mercantile marine.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: The mercantile marine is included in the services I mentioned.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: That is taken for granted.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: There has been a great combination of loyal Canadian effort from one end of the country to the other, and the representatives of Canada will go to the San Francisco Conference with their heads held high.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Canada has every right to be proud of her magnificent record in this war, and proud also of the privileged place she holds as the senior Dominion within the British Commonwealth of Nations. What our Prime Minister and the delegates who accompany him will say and do at the San Francisco Conference will carry a great deal of weight.

Before I sit down let me say once more, Mr. Leader, that we wholeheartedly endorse the resolution. We wish you and your associates every success at the conference. God bless you!

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Honourable senators, I think I am right in saying that probably never has a more important matter come before this Chamber than the one referred to in this resolution. The fact that Canada has received an invitation from the great republic to the south to attend the San Francisco Conference shows conclusively to my mind that Canada is taking her place in world affairs. That the United States and Canada have lived alongside each other in amity for upwards of a century is an outstanding example to the world of how peace can be maintained when the relations of nations are based on good will.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: I do not object to what my honourable friend the leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. King) and my honourable friend the leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) have said about what might or should be done at the San Francisco Conference; on the contrary, I commend them for their splendid speeches; but I say let us pass this resolution, let us send our delegates to San Francisco in order that they may learn the views of the great nations there represented, and then state the views of Canada. Let our delegates never forget that, while Canada is proud of her position as the senior Dominion of the British Commonwealth, she is mistress in her own home. Both the British Empire and the United States recognize her status and realize that in future Canada's views must be considered in matters of peace and war.

Although forty-four nations are to be represented at the conference, Russia, Great Britain and the United States will, as the

honourable leader opposite has said, be the dominant powers. And why should they not be? They in the last five years have borne the heat and burden of the war. But Canada also has played a noble and impressive part in the struggle. This is recognized by Great Britain, the United States and Russia, and is, I venture to say, the reason why Canada is invited to send representatives to this conference of the United Nations.

We can do nothing more to-day than pass this resolution and wish our delegates God speed. We must give them full discretion to express their views in reply to the views advanced by the representatives of the other powers with respect to certain principles which no doubt will be presented for discussion. When our delegates submit their report the Parliament of Canada must decide how far this country is to participate in the setting up of an organization to ensure, as far as humanly possible, the outlawing of war and the preservation of peace throughout the world. So I say, let us wish our delegates God speed. Surely the world has already been too much tormented by war, and any action which will put a stop to future aggression is certain of a hearty reception, particularly by the peace-loving people of this great Dominion. I am not much worried whether one country or another may object to some of the proposals to be discussed at the San Francisco Conference. There can be little doubt that after this tremendous expenditure of energy, money and blood, and the appalling havoc of the last five years, no representative of any of the great powers will dare stand up in that conference and declare: "We will not agree to the settlement of international disputes by arbitration." I am confident that I voice the sentiments of our people when I say that they need have no fear as to the part Canada will play in this conference in helping to assure the future peace and security of the world.

Hon. IVA C. FALLIS: Honourable senators, in rising to say a few words on this resolution, I do so without any idea that I can contribute anything new to the discussion, since the ground has been pretty well covered in the debates in the two Houses of Parliament. I rise rather as one of the two representatives of Canadian women in this Chamber to emphasize the great interest which the women of Canada have in this coming conference, because if there is anyone who is deeply interested in the abolition of war and the preservation of peace it is the Canadian wife or mother who has known the agony of the past few years.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DUFF.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: The sufferings endured and the sacrifices made by so many of our women have burned deeply into the hearts of all Canadian women, until to-day they say with one voice: "Let there be no more war!" Especially is this true of the younger women of our country, who naturally are longing for an era of peace and security in which they can establish homes and bring up families without any lurking fear or dim foreboding of what the future may hold for their children. So while the women of Canada have done everything in their power to help win this war, and while no one will rejoice more fervently than they when the last shot is fired, they are even now looking beyond that great day of victory, wondering whether it will bring to them an assurance of international peace and security in the future.

I think I can speak for a great many Canadians when I say in connection with this conference that what they most earnestly hope for is some guarantee for future peace, something more than mere lip service.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: We have had too much lip service to the cause of peace and security in this world, and not enough action to bring it about.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: It is perhaps because of the latter situation that some of us perused with a little misgiving the address of the Prime Minister when he presented this resolution to the other House. That point has been touched on by the honourable leader on this side (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne). I find myself heartily in accord with his views and with what the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources said in another place, because after all we are looking to our Canadian delegation to give leadership. We recognize with pride that outside of what we commonly call the Great Powers, Canada stands head and shoulders above most if not all of what we usually designate as the secondary powers, in at least three outstanding respects: first, the contribution she has made to winning the war; second, the contribution she can make to the preservation of peace; third, the influence she can exert both upon Great Britain and upon the United States. It is because of the unique place which Canada occupies in this regard that her attitude at the conference will be watched with the greatest interest by the secondary powers and the example which she sets will, I think, have great and far-reaching influence.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: If there is any one thing on which we Canadians are in agreement, I believe it is this, that no other nation in the world more sincerely desires to avoid another war. Then, it seems to me, it is only simple and intelligent reasoning to assume that the more anxious we are to avoid another war, the more wholeheartedly we will support any decision taken at the conference, any machinery which may be set up, any instrument which may be fashioned, which will be effective as a means of preventing wars in the future.

We have heard it stated several times to-day, and we all know it is true, that the prime condition upon which world peace and security will be founded is the continued solidarity of the Big Three. Without that foundation we know there will be no peace and security for the world in the days to come. But, I submit, it is also necessary now to bring as quickly as we can a measure of hope and present security to the liberated areas of devastated Europe. That cannot be done unless the people are first fed and clothed and housed. I realize, honourable senators, that since this does not come within the scope of the motion before us I may be slightly out of order, but I would ask the indulgence of the House because it is something that is very much upon my mind at the present time. We read in the papers statements like that made the other day by the Archbishop of Canterbury about conditions in Northern Holland, that all the horrors of war through which the people of that country had passed were as nothing compared to the horrors of slow death from starvation which they are going through at the present time. I felt on reading that and similar statements that if they make the impact upon us that they should, if we have not already become hardened by war's brutality and suffering, it is a time for the searching of our national conscience to ascertain whether we are doing everything within our power to help the peoples in those war-ravaged countries.

I know that this matter is under consideration by the Government. We all know that the extent to which we can help by sending supplies is governed largely by the shipping space available; but from day to day there have been rather disquieting items in the press saying that the Government hesitates to impose food rationing because it might be unpopular, or words to that effect. That is not official, but just common report.

Of course, we all know that in every community there are some selfish people who object to self-denial, but I think I speak for the great majority of Canadian women when I say that if the matter were properly explained

they would be not only willing but glad to have the strictest kind of food rationing imposed in this country, if thereby we could send more help than we are now sending to the people of those devastated areas. Honestly, when I read in the papers of individuals in England setting apart a portion of their scanty daily rations and sending it in parcels to the people of Holland and other countries where starvation is rife, I am almost ashamed to look at the tables to which we sit down in Canada. On behalf of the women, whom I represent in this House, I should like to repeat that I am sure they would be only too glad to have the strictest kind of food rationing imposed upon them if that would help to alleviate the sufferings of people in lands that have been overrun by the enemy.

I come back to the resolution before us. Honourable senators will recall that after the Prime Minister made his speech in moving the resolution in another place there was a good deal of comment on his failure to make more than a slight passing reference to Canada's relations to the other members of the Commonwealth. The honourable leader of the Government in this House (Hon. Mr. King) has replied to that comment to-day and quoted very reassuring statements, which we accept unreservedly. At the same time we have only to cast our thoughts back over the debates of the last week or so in another place to realize that if one ventures to suggest the sincere opinion that Canada can best fulfil her destiny by working in closest co-operation with Great Britain and the other members of the Commonwealth, one runs a decided risk of being lectured for having Tory Imperialistic tendencies or accused of wishing to see Canada return to her "colonial status". I believe that was a strong point in one speech made in another place.

I always think that people who talk of Canada going back to her "colonial status" must be suffering from an inferiority complex, because they base their argument upon conditions which no longer exist, except in the realm of their own imagination. Surely any discussion which takes place on this matter to-day should be founded upon facts and conditions of to-day rather than upon those of two or three decades ago. I was much interested the other day to see how one writer expressed his opinion on this. He said:

Just as the War of Independence between Great Britain and the United States left its mark upon the United States to such a degree that many people there still do their thinking in the mental surroundings of nearly two centuries ago, so here in Canada much of the discussion and argument is in attempting to provide against the dangers which disappeared years ago.

I think that is very true. Of course there may still be in England a few prominent men who yearn to see an Empire with all power and authority vested in an Imperial Government, but they are as out of date as the people in Canada who refuse to realize or recognize the complete sovereignty which Canada has over her own affairs.

The situation was aptly summed up by Mr. Churchill in a speech made in the British House of Commons two or three weeks ago, when he said:

Without freedom there can be no Empire, and without the Empire, no guarantee of freedom.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS: I think that, as Canadians, we should do well to ponder that, and remember it in all our deliberations.

In conclusion may I say that I join heartily with those who have preceded me in wishing our representatives at San Francisco good luck and good judgment. We on this side of the House shall be perfectly satisfied if they do these two things: (1) work in the closest possible co-operation with Great Britain and the other members of the Commonwealth; and (2) not merely give lip service to the cause of peace, but unreservedly support any decisions which are deemed necessary by the Security Council for preserving the future peace and security of the world.

Hon. W. RUPERT DAVIES: Honourable senators, I intend to be very brief. I am glad indeed that Parliament was called to consider this resolution, which has been freely discussed in another place and is now being freely discussed here. Clause 5 of the resolution says:

That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to Parliament for approval.

I think it is far better that those who are going to represent Canada at the conference should know our views now, rather than be told when they come back with a finished product that they have made mistakes. Once the conference is over, whatever is decided will become effective, whether we approve or disapprove.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: There are one or two questions in my mind. I am sorry to say that when the honourable leader (Hon. Mr. King) was speaking I could not hear him clearly. The acoustics of this beautiful Chamber are such that unless he speaks louder than usual we who sit back in this corner are often unable to catch his words. Therefore I may raise one or two points with which he has already dealt. I also was unable to hear the

Hon. Mrs. FALLIS.

question asked by the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler), and the answer given to him by the honourable senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig). I take it that the question had to do with something that has given me a great deal of concern, namely: if it is decided that action ought to be taken against one of the five great powers, can such action be taken without the full sanction of those powers, and can one of them prevent its being taken? I understood the honourable gentleman from Winnipeg to reply that that was not the case.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: No; I said it was the case. I said that one of the Great Powers could object, and that in such event you could not go to war.

Hon. Mr. EULER: That was not the answer the honourable gentleman gave to me.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: That is the way I understand it.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: That is as I understand the situation, and I must confess that I do not like it. I quite agree with the honourable leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) that as we have trusted our great allies in war, we must also trust them in peace; but I have grave doubts as to whether international peace can be established and maintained if a great power is to be allowed to veto a decision made against it by the Security Council.

Hon. Mr. KING: I do not wish to interrupt, but I cannot recall having said anything that would give my honourable friend that idea.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: I am very glad to be reassured on that point.

Hon. Mr. KING: What the honourable gentleman says is news to me.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: Then let me go further.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Will the honourable gentleman allow me? In regard to any question that comes before the Security Council there cannot be war unless the five great powers are in favour of going to war. That is what it says in the proposals.

Hon. Mr. KING: I do not think so.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: As I understand it, if four of the great powers decide that the fifth great power should be disciplined, that fifth great power can say, "No, you are not going to discipline me."

Hon. Mr. EULER: That is exactly it.

Hon. Mr. KING: I do not know where you get that.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: That is the way I understand it. Let me go further and ask the honourable leader of the Government if I interpret clause 3 of the resolution correctly. That clause states:

That this House approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four Governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

As to the proposal that no one of the five great powers could be disciplined unless the five were unanimous, I should like to ask the honourable leader if he understands that this proposal can be discussed and changed at the conference?

Hon. Mr. KING: I should think so.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: I am very glad to hear that, because it has been giving me some concern.

I do not think it is any great secret, honourable senators, that many people of this country have been deeply troubled over the Polish settlement. I freely admit that perhaps the deal was the best that could be made; nevertheless I repeat that it has been the subject of anxious consideration on the part of many Canadians.

There is another point which I should like to raise. Is it proposed that the economic and financial set-up of the various governments will be discussed at the conference?

Hon. Mr. KING: Yes, I think so.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: Some six weeks or two months ago I attended a small dinner at which were present two prominent Canadian economists. While I do not understand all the ramifications of the statistics on which they based their conclusions, I recall that one of them said it was probable that after the war is over there will be set up a sterling block of which Great Britain will be the head, and that Canada may not be included in it. The speaker—one of our most noted economists—went on to say that if this country was not included in that sterling block the people of Canada would have to become reconciled to continued taxation at the present high rates, because it would be necessary either to subsidize the three Prairie provinces or to liquidate them and move their people to other parts of the country. That statement was made in the presence of some twenty-four persons of more or less prominence. I am very glad to hear from the honourable leader that financial matters will be discussed at the conference, for I am sure that if this is done the Canadian delegation will look well after the interests of this country.

Hon. Mr. KING: I do not want to be misunderstood. The function of the conference is to set up machinery whereby these matters can be considered within the Assembly after the organization is established.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES: It is possible that they may be discussed, I hope they are, because I must confess that when I hear Canadian economists talk about liquidating the three Prairie Provinces it becomes a very serious matter. This man was very serious when he was discussing it.

Before I sit down I want to join with the honourable senator from Peterborough (Hon. Mrs. Fallis) in her tribute to those countries which have suffered during the war, and I want to pay particular tribute to the people of Great Britain. I happened to spend a month in Great Britain during the latter part of November and the beginning of December, and I must confess that I was almost ashamed of myself. I came back and said that everyone over there should have a medal pinned on him. One night I was invited to sit down to supper in a splendid home, a beautiful home where at one time they had had three servants but now have none. All the heat they had came from a little bit of fire in the kitchen. This was Friday night and they were having sausages for supper. They were delighted because they were going to have a lamb chop each on Sunday. That struck home to me. Their meat allowance was one shilling-twopence per week, that is all, but there was no grumbling and no grouching. I found them carrying on and taking everything as a matter of course. Their fuel was rationed, and they were sitting around little bits of fires, all wrapped up in sweaters and rugs, but they were not complaining in any manner, shape or form.

I should like to pay my tribute to the people of Great Britain during this discussion, not only for what they have done in providing men and munitions, but for the way in which they have contributed to the success of the war on the home front.

Before sitting down I want to join with the speakers who have preceded me in wishing the delegates to the San Francisco conference every success. Whoever they are, I am sure they will represent Canada nobly and well, and we shall all be satisfied.

On motion of Honourable Mr. Hugessen the debate was adjourned.

THE SENATE—ITS PURPOSE AND FUNCTION

ADDRESS BY HON. MR. BENCH IN HAMILTON

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. J. DONNELLY: With your permission, honourable senators I should like

to bring to your attention a pamphlet which I and every other member of this Chamber received through the mail this morning. It is entitled "The Senate of Canada, its Purpose and Function." I opened the pamphlet with the intention of reading one or two pages, but I found its contents so interesting and informative that I continued on to the end. It is a reprint of an address by the Honourable J. J. Bench, K.C., our colleague from Wentworth, delivered to the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Hamilton, and I feel that honourable members of this House should thank the honourable gentleman for the work he has done in preparing the information which this pamphlet contains.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY: I also wish to impress upon honourable members that I think it is their duty to give this pamphlet as much publicity as possible. Unfortunately, the people of our country know little, if anything, about the duties and functions of the Senate, and do not have sufficient knowledge of parliamentary institutions generally. I am convinced that the honourable senator from Wentworth (Hon. Mr. Bench) has a very thorough knowledge of all branches of our parliamentary institutions. He has prepared his material in such a way that it is not only interesting but very instructive; and it certainly is not partisan. While honourable senators no doubt will be interested in the information which the pamphlet contains, I feel that it would be of much greater use if it could be communicated to the general public.

It is rather unfortunate that occasionally public speakers, and sometimes members of the press, when short of copy and short of thought, start to abuse the Senate, even though they know little or nothing about it. They seem to think they are doing a favour to the public who are listening to them. I have heard men of pretty high standing refer to public men of this country as "politicians," with emphasis on that word, as if we were a group of self-seeking individuals. I am satisfied that such is not the case. I came to Ottawa as a member of the House of Commons forty-one years ago. For forty years I have had the privilege of associating with the public men of Canada who have come to Ottawa and, from what I have found during those forty years, I have no hesitation in saying that they are honest and upright, and as anxious for the well-being of the people of this country as any other class—and I make no exceptions.

I want to thank the honourable senator from Wentworth for the work he has done in the preparation of this pamphlet.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DONNELLY.

Hon. Mr. KING: I think the remarks by my honourable friend are very appropriate, and I am sure they are appreciated by the members of this House. Senator Bench is the youngest member in point of age in this honourable House, and we owe to him our thanks for the work he has done on this pamphlet and the manner in which he has prepared and delivered this address at various meetings throughout Ontario. I am satisfied that if people generally had the opportunity of knowing more of the work of this body there would be fewer derogatory references to the Senate by those who do not know or do not want to know the purpose and functions of this honourable Chamber. We owe a debt of gratitude to Senator Bench. I am sure that he will continue not only to enlighten the public in regard to this Chamber but by his contribution to the work of the Senate will also do much to bring its endeavours and labours to the attention of the people of Canada.

Hon. Mr. MORAUD: I wonder if it would be in order to suggest that this pamphlet of Senator Bench be placed on Hansard so that we can have a translation of it.

Hon. Mr. KING: I think it is quite in order. (The pamphlet referred to follows.)

THE SENATE OF CANADA Its Purpose and Function

An Address delivered by the Honourable J. J. Bench, K.C., to the Junior Chamber of Commerce, Hamilton, Ontario, November 20, 1944.

I propose to speak to you on the subject of "The Senate of Canada." My chief reason for so doing is that this topic was suggested to me with the receipt of your generous invitation for to-night. Other considerations which impel me to talk about the Senate are that I believe there is a need for more general knowledge concerning it and because I also think that an audience of young men especially should be interested in this branch of our parliamentary system.

Parliament itself is an ancient institution and, at times, I fear, people take it too much for granted. They forget the upheavals and trials which went into making it what it is and what it means to the preservation of liberty and the orderly conduct of public affairs. When a thing comes to be taken too much for granted, it stagnates, and there must be at all times intelligent public interest to maintain its vitality. So it is in matters of government. Since free men usually differ in their views, where there is intelligent interest there also will be found constructive criticism and suggestion. No scheme of government in existence to-day has endured so long as the British parliamentary system which, with a few modifications suited to our special conditions, is the one under which we operate in Canada. Those nations which live under British parliamentary institutions have come through roughly the same changes in social and economic structure as other countries, but without the violent revolutions which frequently

go with advances in the basic principles of government. It seems to me the reason for this lies in the fact that our parliamentary system always has been able to meet the needs of the day, even if sometimes in a groping and dilatory fashion. The need of constantly cultivating our British type of democracy cannot be over-emphasized. Compared with ancient forms of government, our parliamentary institutions are relatively young, and it might be ventured as a truism that people do not yet know how to appreciate freedom. The totalitarian forms of government such as Italian Fascism, German Nazism and Russian Socialism, all are reactions from democracy to the ancient autocracies. So it is, I say, that there is a real need of consciously and continuously cultivating our democratic institutions, of trying to improve and better them, if they are to survive, and if freedom as we know it is not to perish.

We are now living in a time of great changes—changes brought about by war, by science, and by vast increases in man's ability to produce wealth. It is about some of the things which the Senate, as one of the two federal Houses of Parliament, does and can do to meet the special needs of our day that I propose to speak to-night.

First, however, let me say a word about the Parliament of Canada and the place in our system of government which is occupied by the Senate. I have said that we follow the pattern of the British governmental structure. There, Parliament consists of the King, the Lords and the Commons. Here it is the King, the Senate and the Commons. You all know that members of the House of Commons, sometimes called the Lower House, are elected, while the Senate consists of men and women appointed by the Crown. The House of Commons is constituted on the principle of representation according to population; and so it is that, out of today's membership of 245 in that Chamber, 147—more than one-half—come from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The Senate is constituted on the principle of representation according to territorial divisions. For this purpose, at the time of Confederation, Canada was regarded as consisting of three separate areas, Upper Canada (Ontario), Lower Canada (Quebec), and the Maritime Provinces. British Columbia and the other Western Provinces subsequently were constituted a fourth territorial division and given equal representation with the other three. Accordingly, our full Senate now consists of 96 members, with 24 being nominated from and representing, respectively, the Western Provinces, Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes. If time permitted, it might be useful to make some detailed review of the historical background and the reasons for the differences in the constitution of our two Houses of Parliament and the reason that the House of Commons, on the one hand, is elective, and the Senate, on the other hand, is nominative. However, as I prefer to address myself particularly to the present-day function and purpose of the Senate, I will be content with one or two brief observations regarding the reasons which prompted the Fathers of Confederation to lay out the pattern of our national parliament as they did. I think that I can best do this by stating two simple propositions and then making a few comments on each.

The first is that if there had not been provision for a Senate or "Upper House," as it sometimes is called, there could have been no Confederation and no Dominion of Canada as

we know it to-day. The importance attached to the constitution of the Senate by the Fathers of Confederation can be gathered from the fact that practically the whole of six days out of a total of fourteen spent by them in discussing the details of the Confederation Pact, were devoted to this branch of our parliament. A perusal of the Confederation Debates of 1865 makes it clear that the Maritime Provinces and Quebec declined to enter the scheme of union unless there was a Senate. They anticipated the situation which, in fact, obtains today, where only two of the regions of Canada, on the basis of population, could control the deliberations of the House of Commons. As was said at the time by Sir John A. Macdonald: ". . . In order to protect local interests and prevent sectional jealousies it was found requisite that the three great divisions into which British North America is separated, should be represented in the Upper House on the principle of equality."

The provinces, and especially those which I have mentioned, in joining a union in which they were to surrender a large measure of their independence, wanted to be sure that a parliamentary majority, supported in some sections of Canada but perhaps not in others, could not legislate against their interests, local or racial, without the balance-wheel of a second chamber; a sort of court of review in which the respective territorial regions of the country were to be equally represented and which would be less dependent on the passing fancies of the electors than the House of Commons. Thus, in the same speech to which I have already referred, Sir John A. refers to the Senate as "the sober second thought in legislation." There is an important piece of evidence that the sentiment as expressed by Quebec and the Maritimes then has not changed since 1867. As recently as 1927 a Dominion-Provincial conference was asked to consider the subject of abolition or reform of the Senate. The provinces were unanimously opposed to abolition and there was no suggestion for reform of sufficient merit to warrant a conclusion of the assembly.

I have said that without provision for a Senate there could have been no Confederation. The second proposition which I would now state is that, without a Senate, even now it is doubtful if Confederation could long endure.

While my first submission is easily established from the records of the past, my second may not be so obvious. It rests on the conviction that the need to safeguard the minority and sectional rights and interests of Canada is as great today as ever it was. In recent years, we have seen new parties spring up—often on a local or provincial basis. To-day there is one party which dominates in Alberta and enjoys little support anywhere else. There is another that is now powerful in Saskatchewan with limited support elsewhere. There are at least three parties in Quebec contending for support which have no backing in the other provinces. The possibility of a House of Commons dominated by a party or combination of parties composed of members from only two of the four great regions of Canada cannot be dismissed. Absence of the guarantee of "sober second-thought" for legislation by a body conscious of the interests of all parts of the country would give rise to anxiety and, possibly, in time, would result in a demand for separation. Even without any unusual party situation such as I have stipulated, in these days when legislation

so often touches the personal rights and interests of the people, the demands we hear put forward on sectional grounds from time to time would assume more weight and might constitute a much greater menace were there not the Upper House.

With this brief and wholly inadequate explanation of the reasons founding the creation of the Senate and some of those bearing upon the need for its continuance as an integral part of our parliamentary system, perhaps I might pass to some observations as to how the Senate does its work. To-day you will find amongst its membership many men with long experience in Parliament and a good number who have served in federal and provincial cabinets. Others have been leaders in various fields in private life—labour, farming, business and the professions, including the army. I can assert with confidence that to-day's Senate membership constitutes a very real representation of the various occupational, racial and economic characteristics of the Canadian people. Occasionally one hears the Senate referred to as an assemblage of "old fogies" or "the haven of 'worn-out politicians'". Let me state that such a conception of the membership of the Upper House could not be further from the truth. As a young man and one who does not regard himself either as "an old fogie" or a "worn-out politician," the first impression which I received on entering the Senate was the high standard of experience and business and political intelligence of the men with whom I found myself associated. Of course, there are some Senators who are in the evening of life. All of them are older than I, but, speaking as I now am to an assembly of persons born mostly in the twentieth century, I think that you will agree with me that without the wisdom which comes of long years of experience, leadership in Canadian government might be expected to follow a rather uncertain and perilous course. In times of stress and of national emergency, I will take, any day, the legislative sagacity of the wrinkled and white-thatched brow in preference to the inexperienced and sometimes reckless self-assurance of youth. Certainly, let us have more younger men in government, but let us also retain the tempering influence of the older statesmen.

Notwithstanding that the Senate has vested in it co-extensive authority with the House of Commons regarding the initiation of legislation—excepting any bill resulting in a tax—most Acts of Parliament start in the Lower House and get second treatment in the Senate. For this reason, our Chamber frequently has nothing before it in the early stages of the session and is obliged to take many adjournments. In the later stages it puts in a great deal of intensive work, both in full session and in committees, considering and revising a rush of legislation from the Lower House. Unhappily, the public is not really alive to the very considerable volume of work which is done by the Senate. Unlike the House of Commons, very few bills are considered in Committee of the Whole House but are referred to one or other of the special standing committees for consideration. This committee work is of a highly prosaic nature and does not furnish much meat for the gentlemen of the press. Consequently, it does not get into print. In the result, the Senate gets little or no credit from the Canadian people for the long hours of drudgery which its members undertake in hearing evidence and in re-

viewing and recommending amendments with regard to bills which come before the committees. For instance, very few people know that during the session of Parliament which was adjourned last August the Senate effected amendments to some fourteen bills coming from the House of Commons. Some of these changes were important; others less so, but it is clear, even from this recent experience that there is need in our parliamentary system for a body of review and revision. How many Canadians are aware of the fact that the Senate in the past has effected numerous and substantial savings to the taxpayers of this country by rejecting legislation which originated in the Lower House? In this connection, not long ago, I found an interesting statement by the late Senator Charles Murphy, made in the course of a debate referring to the work of the Senate. It was not by any means an exhaustive review of the record of the Upper House, but, by mention of only some ten bills which had been rejected or amended by the Senate, having to do with the appropriation of moneys for public works, the construction of railways and similar undertakings, he was able to show that the taxpayers of Canada had been saved in excess of one hundred million dollars. There are people in this country who to-day complain that an annual expenditure of some five hundred and fifty thousand dollars required to maintain the Senate is not justified. If a comparable proposal were made to save the expense of maintaining our courts of justice, it could expect to receive no public support. Yet, in reviewing and revising federal legislation at its source, the work of the Senate in protecting the rights and liberties of our people can be regarded to be equally as important as the function of administering the criminal and civil law of the land.

The wide experience of the senators of which I have spoken and their ability to take a detached view results in many improvements in the detail of the legislation as well as, occasionally, some important changes in principle. Many members of the Senate, myself included, would like to see more legislation introduced in the Upper House so that there would be a better balance of work between the two houses with a consequent possible shortening of the very lengthy sessions which recently have been the rule. For various reasons, however, governments seem to prefer to get the bills through the House of Commons first and, as I have said, this not infrequently results in leaving the Senate with nothing to do. Especially in time of war, the responsibility for formulating legislative policy must rest almost exclusively with the executive, that is, the Cabinet. As all of the Ministers, with one exception (and he without portfolio) have their seats in the House of Commons, it is natural that the situation which I have just mentioned is aggravated under existing conditions.

Now, even apart from the fact that Bills usually go to the Commons first and often move slowly to the Senate, it is to be expected that the Upper House will not spend as much time in session as will the House of Commons. In this connection it is important to remember that there are only 96 Senators at the most, and there are 245 members of the House of Commons. Naturally, 245 persons are bound to do a whole lot more talking than 96. The members of the Commons, moreover, represent the people directly and they are charged by their constituents with the special responsibility of airing their complaints and suggestions.

Long silence on the part of a member of the House of Commons, or refusal to champion a cause close to the hearts of his electors, may be fatal to his future aspirations. As an indication of what I have in mind in this respect, let me refer to the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne and the debate on the budget, which are two major discussions taking place in the normal session. At these times, members may discuss almost any subject under the sun. In the Commons these debates often take many weeks. In the Senate, they ordinarily occupy only a few days. As I have said, speeches in the Commons, to a large extent—and very properly so—are made for the purpose of expressing what members conceive to be the views and wishes of the particular constituencies which have sent them to Ottawa. During the past session, for instance, there was a very lengthy debate relating to the controlled price of strawberries in British Columbia, and another warm discussion regarding the policy of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board respecting the collection and distribution of empty beer bottles in Nova Scotia. The War Appropriation Bill of this Session was under consideration by the House of Commons for more than four months and it required 1,333 pages of the printed House of Commons Hansard to report the members' speeches; but when the Bill left the Lower House not a single dollar of change had been affected in any departmental appropriation proposed by the Government.

I have purposely mentioned these debating practices in the House of Commons, not because I am out of agreement with them—on the contrary, I believe them to be essential to our democratic system—but chiefly because the Senate occasionally is criticized on the ground that it does not sit as many days or do as much speech-making as the other House. Such criticism, like a good deal on other grounds, ignores the Senate's real function, which is essentially different from that of the House of Commons. As once was said by a former leading member of our Chamber "the Senate should be a workshop and not a theatre."

In referring rather summarily to some of the charges levelled at the Senate, I have no desire to dismiss the question of reform. For instance, I have heard suggestions that the Senate should be elective or that appointments to that Chamber should be made on the recommendation of provincial governments or the provincial legislatures. With regard to the suggestion for election of Senators, I might point out in passing that this proposal was very carefully considered by the Fathers of Confederation, who rejected the idea after having had some considerable experience with an elective second chamber in the old Province of Upper Canada. Whatever may be one's individual views regarding proposals for reform, constructive suggestions are both practical and legitimate subjects for discussion in a democracy which wishes to keep its institutions alive and in tune with the times.

There is no true democracy, however, in the talk of a politician who undertakes to abolish the Senate if, on achieving power in the Commons, he finds the Upper House will not do his bidding. To abolish the Senate is to make a fundamental change in the political structure of the federated provinces of this Dominion. We have only to recall the demands of the Confederation conference for the institution of the Senate and of the Dominion-Provincial con-

ference of 1927 for its continuance, to realize that its abolition would remove the safeguards which it was intended to provide. Politicians who glibly talk of abolishing or changing the Senate in some arbitrary or summary fashion are proposing a course of action which would destroy one of the main pillars of our federal state. Irresponsible declarations of the kind I have just mentioned spring from an attitude of distrust of the Senate entertained by some people who have what might be called advanced or radical views. This distrust has its root in the belief that, in a given set of circumstances, the Senate might stand as a last bulwark and instrument of the vested interests; that it might attempt to stifle reforms demanded by a majority of the people. My submission is that those who would like to see the Senate act in that fashion are doomed to disappointment. Genuine reformers who carry the considered support of a majority of the people have nothing to fear from the Senate.

It is certainly possible for a bill to pass the House of Commons and be rejected by the Senate. Therefore, it is possible for a radical party, after winning an election, to propose a measure which might meet defeat in the Senate. It is well that this is so because elections usually are not won on single issues; and because one party might win an election, it would not necessarily follow, for instance, that the people would want to nationalize all financial institutions. They might merely have preferred Mr. Coldwell's fine head of hair to Mr. King's sparse gray locks and Mr. Bracken's photogenic smile.

Earlier I used the words—"second-thought". That was not to say that the Senate merely is a place where legislators give things a second thought but rather, on important issues to say that the Senate is a means of giving the people a chance to think twice. The Senate would be entirely justified in rejecting a government bill of major importance involving a vital government policy if, in its view, the bill was unsound or unjustly affected the rights of individuals or groups of individuals. The Government could then, and undoubtedly would, at the first opportunity, hold an election in which that particular bill would be the issue. If it were returned to office on that issue and should re-enact the bill, the Senate, while still legally entitled to reject it again would, in point of fact (at least in my opinion) have no choice but to pass it. Unsound and dangerous political doctrines must be fought by argument among the people. They cannot be checked in the Upper House. The Senate may give the people a chance to think twice but it cannot be expected to do more.

I have been a member of the Senate for only two sessions, but, even during that limited time, I have had an opportunity to appraise the great service which that branch of Parliament renders in the legislative process of Government. However, in addition to its established functions, which, I say, it discharges thoroughly and well, I venture the belief that the Senate might be made of greater use in solving some of the special difficulties of our age. If I were asked my opinion as to what is the greatest general problem of government at the present time, I might state it as being the adjustment of parliamentary democracy to the employment of experts. Many people rage about bureaucrats, but we get more and more of them! An eminent English jurist a short time ago warned against

what he termed "the new despotism," the ruling of the lives of the people by boards, commissions and departments of government. Somehow, we must find a way of preventing experts from leading politicians around by the nose and, at the same time, of enabling politicians to secure for mankind the benefits to be derived from the skill and knowledge of men who have become experts and specialists.

Governmental activities are becoming increasingly complex. Government has become a regulator as well as an umpire in human affairs. It concerns itself with the well-being of the individual in the widest possible sense. Canadians now first see the light of day entitled to the benefits of the Family Allowances Act, and, if they are needy in their old age, they may secure a pension. Then too, with the growth of public ownership and the increase in public debt, government has become, in fact, the administrator of a large part of the national wealth. Administration becomes more important and law-making less important. It is in the field of administration that the expert is necessary, call him what you will—bureaucrat, brain-truster or something else.

Governments are composed of ministers who, generally speaking, are not themselves experts, but who have the time and ability to direct the employment of experts intelligently. Ministers are responsible to Parliament which, in turn, is composed of persons who are not experts. Parliament is the link between the people and the government but—and this applies especially to the House of Commons—frequently it has neither the time nor the opportunity to dig into the work of experts and pass intelligent judgment upon it. Yet, if popular representative government is to remain a reality, Parliament must find a way of coming to closer grips with the processes of administration. A few moments ago, I referred to the debates in the House of Commons during the last session regarding the strawberry situation in British Columbia and the beer bottles in Nova Scotia. I tried to convey the opinion that this type of discussion is justified under our democratic system of government. These were two attempts by elected representatives of the people to assert some element of control over the controllers.

Committee investigations at one time provided the House of Commons with an opportunity to examine into matters of administration. Under present-day conditions, members cannot conduct enough individual committee hearings to cover all the subjects. If a flagrant abuse comes to the notice of Parliament, it is investigated; but I suggest that public confidence could be enhanced by some parliamentary device which would provide a continuous scrutiny of the activities of the administrative side of government and furnish a forum for discussion where public views and criticism might be heard.

Probably because of the difficulty in having made by parliamentary committees the kind of investigations frequently required, there has grown up in recent years a governmental practice of referring problems to Royal Commissions for inquiry and recommendation. Sometimes such commissions are set up to examine into charges of impropriety or incompetence as in the case of the Bren Gun Inquiry of 1938. More often they are set up to conduct a research into some particular condition with a view to recommending a new policy, as in the case of the inquiry into wage rates and working

conditions in Canada, conducted by the National War Labour Board. There are presently pending investigations by two Royal Commissions limited to certain features only of our income tax law.

These commissions usually include one or more judges chosen chiefly because judges enjoy the confidence of the public as a class of men without ulterior motive. Now, judges and senators have some things in common. Both are independent of political party favour. In the main, both have had successful experience in public affairs and in the practice of their particular callings. I acknowledge that there is a limited field for inquiry in respect of which the public conscience would be satisfied only by the employment of a judicial commission. On the other hand, I submit that the general employment of judges in matters of this kind is open to objection. Amongst other reasons, it disturbs the function of the courts and sometimes involves judges in political brawls. It seems to me that committees of the Senate or commissions composed of senators could handle much of this work. In addition to serving as a body of review and revision of legislation, the Senate could act more and more as the eyes and ears of Parliament on the more complicated phases of governmental activity. The functions of the House of Commons as a critical body could be performed to better advantage if committees of the Senate were permitted to do some spade work in digging into the facts. Both Parliament and the Government would enjoy greater freedom of action in dealing with reports from Senate committees than with reports from Royal Commissions.

The investigations of which I have been speaking are more or less special and occasional. However, I suggest that there are other fields for investigation in which committees of the Senate might be found very useful.

The more extensive the regulatory and administrative activities of government become, the more important is it that confidence in the honesty and integrity of public officials be maintained. Irresponsible charges based on inadequate information or misapprehension may do real damage to the public interest but, at the same time, it is essential that errors and defections be brought to light and, if necessary, be punished. It seems to me that the Senate could maintain a permanent committee of inquiry to look into allegations of impropriety and inefficiency. This practice is not unknown in the Upper Chamber of the United States. An example of the type of thing which I have in mind is the charge made some months ago that the manufacture of the Douglas D.C.-4 aircraft was transferred from a Malton plant to a Montreal factory in order especially to favour persons friendly to the Government and having a financial interest in the Montreal undertaking. Still another instance of this sort of thing was the advertisement of the Joy Oil Company which charged impropriety and inefficiency in the administration of the office of the Oil Controller.

If some public body, detached from the partisan interests of the Government and of opposition parties, and vested with parliamentary authority, as a Senate committee would be, could call before it in summary fashion the authors of such indictments as well as all other interested parties, there would be fewer irresponsible charges and speedier correction of abuses in those cases where the allegations are well-founded.

There are also other subjects which are ripe for investigation by impartial but responsible committees of Parliament. Without attempting to be exhaustive I could mention several topics in respect of which committees of the Senate might undertake investigations for the purpose of giving opportunity for direct public representations with a view to the formulation of recommendations of policy for the assistance of the Government and Parliament.

One of the questions which one frequently hears discussed to-day is that of post-war immigration. This is a very live question, but, under the stress and strain of working out our immediate wartime problems, it yet remains to be given any consideration by Parliament. In the Senate, we have a standing Committee on Immigration and Labour. I submit that a very useful purpose would be served if there were imposed upon this or some other special committee of the Senate the duty of inquiring into our immigration laws and making recommendations concerning the future policy of Canada with regard to them.

The revision and modernization of our election laws is another problem which requires study. It is true that the Senate is not the elective branch of Parliament but, surely, much good could be done and much progress made by an open and impartial investigation by a Senate committee of the federal election machinery. Time after time, one hears suggestions that we should have in this country an electoral system incorporating the use of the single transferable ballot. Only a short time ago another suggestion was made to me proposing the perpetuation of our system of National Registration for the purpose of providing a current, up-to-date register of persons entitled to vote in each electoral district. If this could be done, it might avoid the heavy expense of frequent enumerations and compilations of voters' lists and, at the same time, preserve for many other purposes the advantages of this standing census of our adult population. These suggestions come from the roots of our national thinking, but there is no parliamentary forum in which they can be given free expression. Consequently, nothing is done about them and there develops a stagnation which could be avoided.

There is still another matter which, I venture to suggest, might usefully be made the subject of inquiry and study by a committee of the Senate. It is one which, I fear, would necessarily be very extensive and protracted as to the time involved. I refer to the suggestion frequently made for an intelligent inquiry into and review of the machinery and administration of the Income War Tax Act and, if we are to keep it on our statute books, the Excess Profits Tax Act. The Income War Tax Act was first enacted in 1917. At that time, it was regarded as emergency legislation and was designed to subsist only for the then war period. Since then, like Topsy, it has just "grewed." There has never been any full review or revision of the Act, but in almost every session since 1917, it has been patched and added to until, to-day, it is one of the most complex and difficult of interpretation and application of any of our laws. In a recent issue of the Canadian Bar Review is a reprint of an address delivered

before the last convention of the Canadian Bar Association relating to the confusion and uncertainties arising from the administration of these two Acts as they are now framed. As an example of what the speaker there had in mind, he told his audience that in the Income War Tax and Excess Profits Tax Acts, the Minister of National Revenue, in one form or another, is vested one hundred times with a discretionary authority to determine the rights and liabilities of the taxpayer. I need not go into all of the objections which can be raised to the mechanics of income tax assessment and collection as provided under these two statutes, but to indicate that there is a demand for the kind of inquiry I am suggesting, permit me to quote briefly from the address of the learned King's Counsel who addressed himself to the Canadian Bar Association on this important subject. He says: ". . . The Act should be re-framed at the earliest opportunity to eliminate such discretionary authority, except, of course, in respect of forms and minor administrative matters. The provisions of the Act should be based upon accepted principles of income tax law. The rights of the taxpayer should be protected by an independent Board of Tax Commissioners or Tribunal standing between the Crown and the taxpayer. This Board or Tribunal should hear appeals from the assessments of the administrative officials rather than having the appeal go, in the first instance, to the Minister (as it now does) which means that the officials who prepared the assessment pass upon the appeal".

I trust that you will not interpret the suggestions which I have been making as indicating a view on my part that our system of representative government is falling into decay and is not measuring up to its job. On the contrary, I have wanted to impress you with the fact that the great advantage of our present system of parliamentary democracy is that it works. The proposals to which I have ventured to give utterance are designed to the end only that the system be utilized to fuller measure in the national interest. Our two Houses of Parliament pulling together, the one complementing the work of the other, undoubtedly can solve the future problems of this vigorous and promising country of which we are citizens.

Just before I close, let me tell you of an instance which took place during the last session in which the House of Commons and the Senate did complement the work of each other. The House of Commons passed a bill dealing with taking the votes of service personnel at general elections. Probably intent on the main purpose, they overlooked a clause which would have struck at one of the foundations of our democratic system—that of universal suffrage. It might have disfranchised a great number of Canadian citizens merely because they are descended from the races with which we are now at war. The point was noticed in the Senate where the bill was amended and sent back to the House of Commons. In the meantime, public opinion was aroused through the discussions which took place in the Upper Chamber and in the press. The House of Commons, dealing with the bill again, produced a still more liberal and satisfactory amendment than the one which the Senate had adopted.

In our governmental plan, the Senate and the House of Commons are the working parts. In the latter we have expressed that principle of democracy which holds that the will of the majority should govern. The former represents that other equally important principle of democracy that the will of the majority shall be governed by considerations of justice. As has been said by Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen, a former senator and one-time Prime Minister of Canada, the principal function of the Senate "is to see that those great principles upon which the Dominion has reposed are carefully reflected in its statutes, to design legislation so as to meet the realities of business, to review and temper proposals of the other House so as not unnecessarily to discourage enterprise or restrict the area of employment; to oppose the ravages of partisanship from whatever source they come, and at least to give public opinion time and opportunity to be deliberate and to be understood; to be governed not so much by emotional appeal or fleeting spasms of popular fancy but to listen to the accountant, the operator, the employer, the employee and the unemployed and to make sure that legislation when finally passed will work with fairness and facility. . . . For this function the Senate was created, and this function it must with thoroughness and fearlessness perform."

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE— ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: May I ask my honourable friend to inform the House when we are going to adjourn, and for how long? I understand there will not be any more speakers on the Address, and that after we have dealt with the San Francisco conference we will have the Army appropriations.

Hon. Mr. KING: I have it in mind to move when we adjourn to-morrow that we stand adjourned until next Wednesday evening. I think we would be quite safe in doing that. As we all know the main work of Parliament at this session relates to supply. The debate in the House of Commons on the subject which we have been discussing to-day will be completed in the near future, and I would hesitate to delay the meeting of this House beyond next Wednesday. Matters may move more rapidly than we expect. The debate on this resolution may go over until next week. To facilitate some honourable members in getting away to-morrow, I would suggest that we meet to-morrow at two o'clock. I do not believe that would inconvenience other honourable members.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 2 p.m.

THE SENATE

Thursday, March 29, 1945.

The Senate met at 2 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

GERMAN CAPITULATION—PRESS REPORT

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. H. KING: Before the Orders of the Day are called I should like, on a question of privilege, to make a statement. I notice in the Ottawa Evening Journal of Wednesday, March 28, I am reported as saying:

Capitulation in Few Days, says Dr. King. Dr. J. H. King, government Senate leader, said last night in the Senate that war developments might result in German capitulation "within a few days."

I would not have called attention to the report had it not been followed by this comment in this morning's Journal:

The Government leader in the Senate, Dr. King, suggests Germany may capitulate "within a few days". Our generals are not nearly so optimistic—or at least not nearly so outspoken.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. KING: I have really no complaint regarding the press report, but I have taken the precaution of checking what I did say as it was recorded by the official reporters of this Chamber. In view of the comment I have just cited and of other comment I have heard in various quarters, I do not desire to be placed in the ridiculous position of one who, without intimate knowledge of what is happening on the western front, has the temerity to state that the war will end "within a few days." I am quite prepared to have my statement published, for I think it bears indication of having been made with some care and thought. I said:

The successful landing of our troops in Normandy, followed by the lightning drive across France, encouraged hope not only in this country but among all the allied nations that Germany would be forced to give up the struggle some time in the autumn. Unhappily that hope was not realized. But to-day the German army is on the run on both the eastern and western fronts, and is disintegrating so rapidly that the Reich may be forced into unconditional surrender within a few weeks—the sooner the better.

It seems to me that that statement is justified by the reports that we receive from the war centres. Field Marshal Montgomery and

General Eisenhower, who are probably best qualified to speak on the matter, have indicated that the German armies are disintegrating and are now on the run. I am hopeful that a few weeks—this does not mean one week, two weeks or three weeks, but a few weeks—may bring about the complete defeat of the enemy.

I have no complaint to make about the Canadian Press, which I am sure tries, under difficulties, to report accurately what is said in this Chamber as well as in the other House, but I feel I am justified in calling attention to the item in this morning's Journal with a view to correcting the statement made by the press.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from Tuesday, March 27, the consideration of His Excellency The Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt for an Address in reply thereto.

Hon. NORMAN McL. PATERSON: Honourable senators, I desire to say a few words in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. First I wish to associate myself with honourable members who have congratulated the mover (Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Robertson) of the Address, on their splendid speeches.

As I have not as much ability as many honourable senators have for public speaking, and as I intend to quote a good many statistics in the course of my remarks, I trust I shall be forgiven if I make frequent references to notes.

Europe is to-day the dark continent. It has become a problem to every human being. The world's leaders plan its future and their task is more difficult because Europe is entering now its darkest phase.

These are the words used in a report made by one of the New York Times' representatives abroad; and for the purpose of expanding the point, I hope honourable senators will bear with me while I quote him further.

Hatred can be a meaningless word to one who has not seen the things that breed it. A Serbian corpse being hacked to pieces by Croatians. French Maquis bodies mutilated by the Gestapo. A Russian sergeant picked up wounded by a German patrol and tortured, beaten and shot; but not killed. A Greek woman beating her head on the ground because her brothers and parents were killed by other Greeks. Italians killing Albanians. 300 bodies of Italians in the Catacombs in Rome, shot in cold blood by Germans. A Dutch naval officer described

watching, while helpless in hiding, a Nazi truck driver deliberately smash a small boy's arm.

These things engender hate, lasting hate. Military deaths have topped ten million; but direct and devious German brutalities, designed to reduce inimical populations either by slaughter or planned famine and disease, have caused the deaths of two or three times this number—and the end is not yet.

Whole populations have been moved so that they do not know to what nation they belong. Millions of well-fed Nazi prisoners in Allied hands will be returned to their country not by any means indoctrinated by democratic ideas; and when a battalion from an American prison camp returns to the conquered Reich it will possibly be far less convinced of the disaster of Hitler's philosophy than those who were able to see doom roll forward from the East and the West and the skies.

The problem of supervising the return to their various homes of millions of prisoners within the Reich—either captured soldiers or seized slave labourers—is enormous in itself. And what authority will arrange their return? Who will employ them to rebuild their shattered homes, and who will help them find their scattered families?

When one thinks of Europe's economic problems as they exist to-day, one can only describe them as a statistician's headache and a humanitarian heartache. Added to disrupted and almost paralysed transportation and confusion is hunger and homelessness; the fact is that there is not a single land, either in Europe or bordering it, which is not suffering from varying and tremendous degrees of inflation.

The cost of living, if living is possible at all to the masses, is exorbitant. Most national currencies are valueless, except where they are propped up by Allied financing. Wages, in relation to prices, are wholly insufficient. Markets do not exist in large areas because of ruined communication systems. Raw material and machinery shortages make consumer goods unavailable. In France, official prices rose 120 per cent between 1939 and the liberation; while black market prices rose anywhere from 1,000 to 1,500 per cent. About sixty per cent of Italy's industrial capacity has been destroyed and production is virtually at a standstill.

Prices are spiralling upward—except on Allied-controlled ration markets. An ordinary Fiat car previously costing 40,000 lire is now held at 350,000 lire. Italian currency circulation has increased 1,150 per cent, and the country faces complete bankruptcy. In Belgium prices have advanced far beyond wages,

creating a dangerous gap. The Allies are employing over 800,000 Belgians, but there are nearly half a million without work. In England wholesale prices have risen seventy per cent. Note circulation has doubled and gold coin has almost vanished—inflation is a dangerous threat.

All these miseries have stimulated a craving for a new social order all over Europe, and this craving has strongly expressed itself in Communism. The rapidly crumbling industrial colossus of Germany is to add to this threat.

Great Britain and the United States recognize this threat and all its implications, and have agreed on partial relief, such as that furnished by UNRRA. But few of us really appreciate the enormous task ahead: first, of feeding these people quickly to head off revolution—for which there is no greater cause than hunger—and then of restoring responsible government. To date, the distribution of food has been followed by black markets in both Italy and Greece. Certainly many people will look to the new world in the hope of coming over and starting life again. To avoid lapsing into complete pessimism, one should remember that the continent of Europe recovered from the Thirty Years War, from the Black Plague, from the War of 1914-18; and while this surely is the worst disaster ever to have been faced, we must face it hopefully.

Now let us look at our own ability to help. The President of the United States said:

It is a matter of justice or rather of decency that the American people should tighten their belts to keep others from starving, maintaining and ever adding to present restrictions.

This equally applies to Canada. The United States statistics show that civilians are eating 19 pounds more meat per person per year than in 1939. In 1944 the average was 145 pounds per person per year as against 126 pounds in 1939. The 1945 figures may show a sharp reduction to 120 pounds. Canada in 1944 used 157 pounds per person per year. Great Britain used 107 pounds. Soldiers and sailors are getting 350 pounds. The drought in Australia is making it necessary for the Allies to draw on the United States to a greater degree than contemplated, and a cut in pork production has further depleted the domestic larder, which also complicates the shipping situation.

Statistics show that food is the first thing purchased by an individual when his income increases. Supplies of wheat available for export in Canada, the Argentine and the United States on January 1, 1945, after allowing for domestic consumption and carry-over, are estimated at about 850 million bushels. The United States carry-over of wheat at July 31 is esti-

mated at from 350 to 375 million bushels; that of Canada at 476 million. Let me say here that it has been a matter of great comfort to the Allies to have this surplus as a back log. Because of the necessity of keeping adequate supplies for possible emergencies at home, not all of this wheat is available for export. In the present crop year from August 1, 1944, to March 16, 1945, we have exported only 155 million bushels as compared to 200 million bushels exported for the same period a year ago; and I would suggest that the cause of this falling off might be England's increased production and the shortage of shipping to other places.

I should like to try to explain to this honorable body why, in the face of starvation in Europe, we are trying to curtail wheat production. You will already have gathered from what I have said how near to insuperable are the difficulties of transportation across the oceans and through the war-torn countries. To fully appreciate the position one must remember that the damage done in Europe has been done to cities not to the agricultural fields. Already in France and Italy, Belgium and Rumania, as well as in parts of Poland and other countries, spring seeding is in full swing. In war-torn Germany the people may miss the seeding time and be forced to eat their seed potatoes; they will then be in the worst position of any of the peoples of Europe. To France, Canada has just shipped a boatload of seed potatoes.

With the unprecedented demand for food and widespread unemployment, together with high black-market prices, every available acre in Europe will be put to crop, and another year of good production of wheat on that continent will leave our crop here in storage, and Canada, if not careful, may find herself with a very embarrassing surplus. It is only by using the best information available and by forward thinking that we can, perhaps, make the way a little easier. This year we have a terrific demand for barley from the United States and from Australia. Eastern Canada is feeding a great deal of livestock and hogs, so that the market for oats is very good. Therefore, from the information at hand it would appear to be advisable to put more acres in feed and less in wheat. It seems strange that as income increases food purchases should be the first to increase, and that as income declines the consumption of food is the first thing to be affected by economy in the daily budget. Undoubtedly, our national income will decline with the decline in our huge war expenditures, and we must take this into consideration.

By and large, looking at world conditions from a distance, we can hardly expect to main-

tain our high standard of living while that of millions in Europe is reduced to a very low level. Everyone in North America must realize that in order to avert another war we may have to come down in our standard of living while we raise that of Europe. We will certainly fight against lowering our standard of living, but inevitably, if we manufacture more than we can sell, we must sooner or later either curtail production or find new customers. Much will have to be accomplished at San Francisco before Europe and Asia will be stabilized and in a position to take the surplus products of our agriculture and labour, and we shall avoid disappointment by not expecting immediate results from the conference.

The task of stabilizing Europe is stupendous: to satisfy Poland may mean war with Russia; to satisfy Hungary may mean more trouble with Bulgaria. This critical situation can be met only by the best brains and by the exercise on all sides of the utmost patience and toleration. The most hopeful feature is that every thinking person is alive to the gravity of the situation and is following it with sustained interest. A way will be found, but we shall all have to contribute our part. We may take comfort from the fact that a start has been made; but let no one forget that we are fighting the greatest war in history and that the first call on our shipping space is for the transport of ammunition and food for our troops. This is more important than feeding civilians on the continent, and when shipping is available I would say Canadians are prepared to tighten their belts and do their full share.

On motion of Hon. Mr. McRae the debate was adjourned.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. King:

That is it expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the following resolution:

Whereas the Government of Canada has been invited by the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of 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 in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and

Whereas the invitation suggests that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment

of a general international organization which have been made public by the four governments which participated in the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and

Whereas the Government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference,

Therefore be it resolved:

1. That this House endorses the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference.

2. That this House recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. That this House approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization;

4. That this House agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to Parliament for approval.

Hon. A. K. HUGESSEN: Honourable senators, in resuming the debate on this resolution I may say I am struck, as I think every honourable member must be struck, by its extreme importance. I do not imagine that any more important resolution has ever come before this honourable body than the one which is now under consideration. It comes to us, honourable senators, with a very sombre background. Some aspects of that sombre background have been discussed this afternoon by the honourable senator from Fort William (Hon. Mr. Paterson) in another debate. It is a background of two devastating world wars within the course of one generation. This resolution reflects the hope—some people say it is the only hope—that in future the world will be able to avoid the desolations of the past twenty-five years.

Now, what is this resolution? It refers in the preamble to the proposals for a new organization to maintain international peace and security, as tentatively agreed upon by the four great powers at the recent Dumbarton Oaks conference and slightly modified at the Yalta Conference of a few weeks ago. Then it refers to the invitation extended to this Government by the Government of the United States to take part in a conference to be held in San Francisco for the purpose of considering these proposals.

The body of the resolution consists of five paragraphs. First of all, it endorses the acceptance of that invitation by our Government. Secondly, it recognizes the vital importance to Canada of an organization for the maintenance of peace in the world, and that Canada should be part of that organization. Thirdly, it approves the purposes and principles of these proposals as set out at Dumbarton Oaks, without of course approving every detail of them. Fourthly, it suggests that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the organization of this international body for the maintenance of peace. Fifthly, it says that any organization ultimately set up at the San Francisco Conference must be submitted for the approval of the Parliament of Canada.

The proposals are set out in the pamphlet distributed to honourable members, who, I am sure, have read them with the greatest of care. Let me repeat, these proposals are not final. It is quite clear that they may be modified, and in effect they no doubt will be, in greater or lesser degree, as a result of the San Francisco conference. But these proposals as they now stand represent the measure of agreement which the four great allied powers—the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China—have so far been able to reach between themselves as to the form and substance of the functions of this new international organization.

It is interesting to observe that, generally speaking, the form proposed for this new organization follows rather closely the form of the present League of Nations, though there are some differences in the machinery. The proposals call for a General Assembly, a Security Council, an International Court of Justice, and a Secretariat. The General Assembly corresponds to the present Assembly of the League, the Security Council corresponds roughly to the Council of the League, the International Court of Justice and the Secretariat are more or less substantively similar to existing bodies under the League.

But it is important to note that in these proposals there are two new organizations which have no place in the League of Nations. The first is a Military Staff Committee, which is to be responsible for the use of such forces as the Security Council may find necessary to employ in order to put down aggression in any part of the world; and the second is an Economic and Social Council of eighteen members appointed by the General Assembly, whose function will be to "facilitate solutions of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN.

So it will be observed that under these proposals the old League set-up has been strengthened in two ways: first, with respect to warlike preparations for the enforcement of security, and, secondly, with respect to peaceful progress along economic and social lines.

I want to deal for a few minutes with the composition of the Security Council as suggested here. As honourable members know, the Council is to consist of eleven members. The five big powers—Great Britain, the United States, China, Russia and France—who are to have permanent seats on the Council, will be represented by one member each. The other six members of the Council are to be representatives of countries chosen by the General Assembly. They are to be elected for a period of two years and will not have the privilege of immediate re-election. The function of the Security Council, its primary object, is to guard the peace of the world, whereas under the League of Nations the responsibility for keeping the peace of the world rests equally upon the Assembly and the Council.

There are people who say that these proposals are very heavily weighted in favour of the five great powers who are to be the permanent members of the Security Council, and I suppose there is a good deal to be said for that contention. I should like for a moment to deal with the discussion which arose here yesterday afternoon out of a question asked by the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler), as to whether a permanent member of the Security Council, one of the five great powers, could prevent the Council from dealing with any dispute to which that great power itself was a party. The answer to that, if I may be permitted to give my interpretation of it, is in two parts. If honourable senators will examine the proposals they will see that the Security Council has two different modes of action. The first is dealt with in Chapter 8, section A, under the heading of "Pacific settlement of disputes." It comprises power to investigate disputes that arise, to make recommendations for their pacific settlement, to refer questions to the international court and to make reports. The second list of functions of the Security Council is under section B. This relates to what happens if a peaceful settlement proves abortive and the economic sanctions or, ultimately, military sanctions, have to be enforced against the offending power.

With that division in mind, it is interesting to refer to the provision for voting by the Security Council, in Chapter 6, section C, paragraph 3:

Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters should be made by an affirmative vote

of seven members including the concurring vote of the permanent members;—

If that stood by itself it would mean that all the five great powers would have to agree to everything that the Security Council did, but the paragraph has been modified in this way:

provided that, in decisions under Chapter 8, section A,

and in another matter of minor importance—
—a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.

That means that if one of the Big Five powers is a party to a dispute which comes before the Security Council, that power cannot vote in any proceedings under section A—that is, for the pacific settlement of the dispute. In other words, it cannot prevent the Security Council from attempting to deal with the dispute by investigating it, or making recommendations or referring matters of law to the courts, and so on. But in respect of any action proposed under section B of Chapter 8, that is economic or military sanctions, any one of the Big Five powers can vote and say, "No, I refuse to allow economic or military sanctions to be taken against me."

A good deal has been said, I think with considerable justification, to the effect that this amounts to dictation by the great powers. Perhaps it does. On the other hand, I suppose it can be said with equal truth that it is no more than the recognition of the facts of life, because no matter what international organization you set up you cannot really coerce a great power. If you attempt to do that the ultimate result will be war, and your international organization will fall to the ground. To give a great power the right of veto under these circumstances is merely to recognize the fact that that great power cannot be coerced.

Hon. Mr. KING: May I interrupt for a moment? I am pleased that my honourable friend has taken this opportunity to clarify the matter now under discussion. When my honourable friend from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) raised a question in regard to it yesterday I was not certain as to just what voting rights the five great powers would have, and I intimated to him that I would try to clarify the point. That has now been done by the honourable gentleman from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen).

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: On this question of dictatorship by the great powers there has been a good deal of discussion, and I should like for a few moments to direct the attention of the House to some statements made by various prominent members of the British Government.

This is what the Right Honourable Anthony Eden said on November 16 last:

If the United States, Russia, France and ourselves can work together, understand each other, and resolve our problems, I believe that out of this war a long period of peace may come. There may be some who say that that means a great power dictation. Believe me, it means no such thing. The truth is that unless the great powers can work together the foundations of peace are not there.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: And Sir Alexander Cadogan, Under-Secretary of the British Foreign Office, and one of the British representatives at Dumbarton Oaks, is quoted as follows:

No one wishes to impose some great power dictatorship on the rest of the world; but it is obvious that unless the great powers are united in aim and ready to assume and fulfil loyally their obligations, no machine for maintaining peace, however perfectly constructed, will in practice work.

At this time, honourable senators, I should like to deal with the position of Canada at the San Francisco conference. We have heard a great deal in the last few months about Canada being one of the middle powers of the world. I think that as a result of the war effort that this country has put forth during the last few years, that is perfectly true. Perhaps it is also true that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals do insufficiently recognize the position of the middle powers—

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN:—and that modifications may be advisable in that respect. I cannot help, however, rather deprecating the idea that our delegation to San Francisco should try to push this country into the leadership of the middle powers, and should make claims and advance demands merely to show how important we have become.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: It seems to me, if I may be pardoned for saying so, that throwing one's weight around, merely for the sake of showing that one has the weight to throw around, is a rather adolescent conception. Moreover, I believe such an attitude is totally unnecessary in our own interest.

I should like honourable senators to consider for a few minutes the position which Canada will occupy in this new set-up. It is an exceptionally favourable one. It is far more favourable than the position ever was under the League of Nations, to which the United States was not a party. Consider for a moment the composition of the Security Council. Under these proposals the two

countries with which we always have been and with which we always will be most intimately associated, Great Britain and the United States—countries with which we are united by every tie of blood and friendship and interest and neighbourliness,—are to be permanent members of the Security Council. I might add for good measure that France, a country from which nearly one-third of our people derive their racial origin, is to be a third member of the Security Council. I think we can say with the greatest confidence that Canada will never lack friends on the Security Council. To put it another way, the fact that Canada will not always, or even often, have its own representative on the Security Council will probably be less important to us than to any other country of middle rank in the world.

This war has taught us all many lessons. One of the lessons it has taught is that Canada, geographically speaking, is essential for the defence of not only Great Britain but the United States as well. Take the case of Great Britain. During the course of this war we have proved to be the lifeline from Great Britain to the North American continent and the great resources of this continent. I think it is true to say that if there had been no Canada, if we had disappeared off the face of the map, Great Britain in 1940 would almost inevitably have succumbed to the attacks of the Nazi forces. It is equally true that Canada is essential for the defence of the United States. We protect the United States from sea and air attacks from the east, the north and the west. You can find examples of that all over this country. Take the United States naval base in Newfoundland; go to the West and look at the Alaska Highway or the Canol project. All these show that this country is essential for the defence of the United States as well as of Great Britain in the case of world conflict. If that premise be granted, and I think it is inescapable, then I think we can say that Great Britain and the United States, as permanent members of the Security Council will, for their own sake, have to take the interests of Canada into account. Whether or not Canada from time to time acquires one of the temporary seats on the Council, this country will always have two firm friends on that Council who, for their own protection, must look after our interests as well as their own.

I have put the matter on the ground of self-interest. Perhaps it is the lowest ground of all, but our membership in the British Commonwealth and our long, firm friendship with the United States, I submit, puts our relations with those countries on a higher footing than self-interest alone. All three of us have the

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN.

same fundamental ideas of right and wrong; the same basic concepts of human liberty, of the rights of the individual and of moral responsibility, the origin of which can be traced back to the Christian religion. What is the result of that?

I think we can confidently say that on broad questions of international policy our three countries generally think alike to reach the same conclusion. Let me again put this phase of my remarks in the form of a question. Can anyone imagine a case in which, Great Britain and the United States as permanent members of the Security Council having agreed to take certain international action together, Canada would refuse to go along? If, for instance, the United States and Great Britain agreed to impose sanctions and to apply force somewhere to prevent aggression, does any honourable senator think for a moment that our country would hang back and refuse to do her share? To ask this question is to answer it very emphatically indeed. If I may repeat, in the new world organization Canada will occupy an exceptionally fortunate position, and for that reason I do not think it is necessary or even wise for us to attempt to force our way to the front at San Francisco as the spokesman of the middle nations, or to clamour for a permanent place on the Security Council. From what I have just said I do not wish it to be implied that I have any idea that our country should take a back seat or hide behind the skirts of Great Britain and the United States. I am proud of our country, and I want our country to play its full part in the new international organization; but I suggest, honourable senators, that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals give us much more cause for satisfaction than for dissatisfaction. To use the old adage, it is well not to look a gift horse in the mouth.

Let me again emphasize that our position among the United Nations will be far stronger than it was under the League of Nations. Under the League of Nations, Canada stood out in rather conspicuous isolation on the North American continent.

That brings me to the next point I wish to consider. I believe that under the new set-up Canada can and will go a great deal further in making advance commitments in support of the decisions of the United Nations than she felt able to go in support of the decisions of the League of Nations in the twenty years between the two wars.

I do not like to do so, but I must remind honourable senators of the position which Canada consistently adopted, in the twenty years between the first Great War and the present war, when critical questions came up for decision before the League of Nations. I

think we shall agree among ourselves that it was not—may I say?—a very virile attitude.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I believe it can be said truthfully that in general we tried our best to escape from any obligations under the covenant of the League. Both political parties, alternately in power during that period, were equally responsible. Two examples come to my mind. The first is the attitude of the Bennett Government in 1932, at the time of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, when that Government at least tolerated and certainly did nothing to discourage Japanese aggression. I have under my hand the Parliamentary debates of the other Chamber for the session of 1932-33 containing a report of a speech made on the 16th of May, 1933, by the late Honourable C. H. Cahan, at that time Secretary of State, defending the position he had taken at the conference of the League in Geneva in December, 1932, when Japanese aggression was under consideration. That speech, I must say, contains little else but a long catalogue of excuses for Japan's action, followed by a long set of reasons why Canada should do nothing about it. But of course the Bennett Government was by no means solely responsible for that attitude. Let me remind honourable senators of the attitude, in December, 1935, of the Government of the present day. At that time it publicly disavowed Dr. Riddell, Canadian representative at Geneva, when he proposed oil sanctions against Italy, then engaged in a brutal attack against Abyssinia, a fellow member of the League.

I repeat, honourable senators, our attitude during that period was, to say the least, not very virile—not very inspiring. But it may very well have been necessary for Canada to adopt that attitude at the time because of our isolated position as the sole member of the League of Nations in this part of the world, and because of uncertainty as to the position our great neighbour to the south would have taken if Canada had been dragged into a war in the Atlantic or the Pacific as a result of the imposition of sanctions against Italy or Japan. Moreover, I think it is only fair to say that Canada was by no means alone in the attitude she took during that period.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Was any member-nation in favour of the League taking action against Japan?

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I was just going to remark that the whole trouble lay in the inherent weakness of the organization of the League.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: May I interrupt the honourable gentleman? Did not the United States favour intervention against Japan in regard to the Manchurian incident?

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I rather think the United States did. For several years there has been a continuing dispute between Mr. Stimson and Sir John Simon, the two statesmen representing the United States and Great Britain respectively at that time, as to what actually happened. To my mind, the inherent weakness of the League of Nations was this: every member was bound to resist aggression against its fellow members, but it was left to each member to say what force, if any, it would use should occasion arise. Theoretically, each member was on the same footing; for instance, Canada and Nicaragua, France and Siam. Moreover, there was no provision for an international armed force, nor for consultation between the chiefs of the general staffs of the various member-countries. It was the old story—everybody's business became nobody's business. I think we can at least console ourselves by reflecting that that mistake is being avoided by the present proposals. These provide for a military staff and for the immediate use of armed forces by the Council in case of aggression.

Now, if I am not taking up too much time of the House—

Some Hon. SENATORS: No, no! Go ahead!

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: —I want to amplify this by reading two clauses which seem to me to be of intrinsic importance in dealing with the question of supplying forces to the Security Council for the purpose of restraining aggression. They are clauses 5 and 6 of Section B, chapter VIII. Clause 5 reads:

In order that all members of the Organization should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Such agreement or agreements should govern the number and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The special agreement or agreements should be negotiated as soon as possible and should be in each case subject to approval by the Security Council and to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

Similarly, clause 6 deals with the immediate organization of national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action by the Security Council. It is well to emphasize, honourable members, that the whole object of these proposals is to supply forces

from each of the member-countries after agreement has been reached with the parliaments of each member-country.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: May I interrupt my honourable friend—not to criticize but to ask a question? I listened to the speech of the Prime Minister in another place. I understood from him that after the San Francisco conference is over and the charter is agreed to and signed by the representatives of the various countries in attendance, subject of course to its ratification by their respective parliaments, agreements would be entered into between the Council and each member-country, which agreements also would require parliamentary ratification.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: That is precisely provided for in clause 5 which I have just read.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I wanted to be sure that you and I agree on that.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: Perfectly. The emphasis is on the point that for the purpose of meeting aggression there should be forces immediately available to the Security Council, as a result of what you might call long-term agreements made between the Council and the various countries of the world. By such agreements those countries would, whenever required, make available a certain proportion of their military forces for the use of the Security Council.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question at that point? Suppose, for instance, there is trouble between Turkey and Greece, and the matter comes before the Council. No agreement can be reached and the two countries refuse to refer their dispute to the Court of Justice set up by this proposed organization. Then the Council must take action, prompt action. In that event does the machinery provided compel the Council in any way to consult the governments or the parliaments of the member-countries before they take that action?

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: Perhaps I might answer the honourable gentleman in this way. The Council consults governments, not parliaments. If my honourable friend will look at clause 9, providing for the military staff committee—

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Just read it, please.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: —he will see that after the committee is established there is this provision:

Any member of the organization not permanently represented on the committee should be invited by the committee to be associated

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN.

with it when the efficient discharge of the committee's responsibilities requires that such a state should participate in its work.

Suppose there was trouble between Turkey and Greece, and Turkey the aggressor; I would assume that the agreement which the Security Council had made with the different countries of the world would provide for regional security. It would require that, in the first instance, the armed forces of the countries nearest to the place where the trouble arose should be called upon, and that only after they had proved to be insufficient would countries further away from the scene of trouble have to send their forces. Then as soon as any country was required to send its forces to the support of the Security Council it would automatically become a member of the military staff committee.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I suppose we would have the right to assume as well that in the event of such a squabble, Canada's representative on the Council would throughout the crisis keep in touch with his government. But I am somewhat disturbed by the possibility of it being necessary to refer the matter to Parliament, thus preventing prompt action.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I do not think that is so.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That possibility does not exist?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Can the honourable gentleman suggest any method by which the time for action can be shortened? Supposing that the military staff and the Security Council called upon Canada for the use of our armed forces, the first step would be to have an agreement drawn up. I should like to know how long that would take. Then it would have to come before Parliament.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I do not agree with my honourable friend as to just what the machinery would be.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is what the Prime Minister said yesterday.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN. No, he did not— if my honourable friend will excuse me. First of all, there would be what I have described as a long-term agreement between the Security Council and each member of the organization, under which each individual country would agree to keep available for the Security Council, in case of need, a certain proportion of its military forces. Then, presumably, Parliament having sanctioned that long-term agreement, there would be no question of going back to Parliament when the emergency arose; the agreement would govern.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I read the Prime Minister's speech somewhat cursorily, but I understood him to say that neither he nor the delegation nor the Government of which he is head would enter into any commitments whatsoever. How can the honourable gentleman reconcile that statement with the statement he has just made? Our representative on the Council would not have authority to commit this country to take action against an aggressor nation. The Security Council would say, "Well, Canada, we should like you to contribute so and so." Is it not a fact that an agreement has first to be drawn up?

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I understood the Prime Minister to say that neither he nor the delegation could bind this country in any way; all they could do, as the resolution itself sets out, would be to come back with the agreed proposals and submit them to Parliament for approval.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: When this country becomes a member of the organization and the Security Council is set up, then the Security Council makes an agreement with this country and every other country, providing that in future, if and when the emergency arises, this country and the other countries will make available certain military forces for the use of the Security Council.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not want to interrupt my honourable friend again, but he has gone away beyond the statement made by the Prime Minister yesterday and—

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I, too, am sorry to interrupt my honourable friend. I think in his speech yesterday afternoon in the other Chamber the Prime Minister made it perfectly clear that he was not responsible for these proposals. They are proposals agreed upon between the four great powers, and submitted by them for consultation with the other powers.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: They may be modified.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: They may be modified. He was simply saying that he was not responsible for these proposals or for anything that appears in them at present.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite so.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: If the Canadian delegation to the conference agrees to these proposals, he and other members of the delegation will have to report back to Parliament and seek parliamentary sanction of the organi-

zation as well as of the long-term agreements for the use of military force.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Every country which is represented at the conference will have to ratify any agreements that are made there before they can be binding upon that country.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: Yes.

I strongly hope that the Canadian delegates to the San Francisco conference will express the willingness of this country immediately to enter into this world organization and to make an agreement with the Security Council covering the terms and conditions under which our military forces will be available for the purposes of the Council if and when the necessity should arise. It is perfectly true that once we have signed an agreement of that kind and it is ratified by Parliament we shall have surrendered a part of our national sovereignty. We shall have bound ourselves to obey orders from this international organization—on which Canada may not be directly represented at the time—to put part of our armed forces at its disposal for the maintenance of peace and the repelling of aggression. We have got to face that fact. It is no use hiding our heads in the sand. That may mean that some day our Canadian boys will have to go to a distant part of the world to fight against an aggressor nation. It is a serious obligation to assume, but I venture to urge that we, in common with the other nations which form part of the organization, must assume it if peace is to be maintained. And surely, honourable senators, the very fact of such a pledge by Canada and all the other United Nations will have a profound effect in deterring potential aggressors in the future. It was just the very want of specific provisions of that kind and the employment, instead, of foggy and miasmic expressions of pious aspiration which turned the League of Nations into the laughing-stock which it ultimately became.

People talk of the surrender of part of our sovereignty as if it were a very terrible thing, but I contend that it is necessary for us to surrender part of our sovereignty if we are to ensure peace. In the past there has been too much insistence on the sacred right of every sovereign nation to behave exactly as it wished, regardless of the harm it might cause to others. One lesson we have learned in this war is that no nation can now afford to live by itself alone. In the United States there has been a great deal of debate on this subject of partial surrender of national sovereignty in the interests

of the new international organization. I should like to quote to honourable members two remarks made in that connection by Commander Harold Stassen, the young and brilliant ex-Governor of Minnesota, who has been prominently mentioned as the next Republican candidate for President. For the last three years he has been serving with the United States Navy in the Pacific, and he has been named by President Roosevelt as one of the United States delegates to the San Francisco conference. He said:

That we do not subscribe to the extreme view of nationalistic sovereignty; that we realize that neither this nation nor any other nation can be a law unto itself . . . and that we are willing to delegate a limited portion of our national sovereignty to our united nations organization.

And again:

There may be diplomats who do not know it; there may be many political leaders who are afraid to admit it; there may be many people who do not understand it, but the extreme principle of absolute nationalistic sovereignty is of the middle ages and it is dead. It died with the aeroplane, the radio, the rocket and the robomb.

There has also been considerable discussion by the Senate of the United States on the analogous question of whether Congress should give up part of its right to declare war by conferring upon an international organization the power to order American forces to be sent abroad to repel aggression. I was interested in the report of a speech made in the United States Senate on September 19 last year by Senator Ball, a Republican, from Minnesota. I quote from the report:

The question raised here was whether the United States quota force should be used to stop aggression at the direction of the Security Council, the American representative agreeing, unless Congress had formally declared war. He said: "The world security organization would not be making war, but preserving the peace. Its whole purpose is to eliminate war from the world, not make it . . . The whole house of world security would tumble down if one essential pillar were missing—a strict international law against military aggression and the means to enforce it.

Suppose there was a clear case of aggression in South America, the senator continued, the United States would want it stopped quickly, but if the position taken by some prevailed, Congress would have to declare war on the aggressor nation before United States forces could act. Under the proposed plan, however, the international organization would use an international force to stop the aggression. There would be no declaration of war, but instead joint international action to preserve peace. He asked: "Under which method would the United States be likely to retain the good will of their South American neighbours? Under one plan each individual nation would be forced to declare war in order to preserve peace; under

the other, the world community of nations would do a policing job on international outlaws. Which makes better sense, and which is most likely to preserve peace?"

I am sure all honourable senators followed with a great deal of interest, as I did, the debate on this resolution in another place, and I am equally sure that they were pleased, as I was, with the virtual unanimity of opinion expressed by the vote taken there yesterday afternoon. There are only two elements in our national life, both of very minor importance, who may be said to have opposed this resolution. The first is composed of extreme nationalists, the so-called Independents, from my own province of Quebec. These gentlemen live in a dream world of their own, a world of racial miasmas, inferiority complexes, and Communist bogies. The second element is composed of gentlemen who advocate the doctrines of social credit. Those gentlemen seem to have arrived—by what process of reasoning I am unable to imagine—at the conclusion that all the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were prepared by wicked international financiers. Well, honourable senators, these two elements may well be termed the lumatic fringes of our political life, and I do not think we need pay very much attention to their views on this particular matter.

But there is one trend of thought which is a little critical of Canada's attitude at Dumbarton Oaks. Some people think it will weaken our ties with the rest of the Commonwealth; and now some people are saying that Canada should go to the San Francisco conference purely as a member of the British Empire, and form a united front with the other Commonwealth countries. I do not share those views, in so far as I understand them. In the first place, I find it difficult to think anybody really believes that Canada's participation in the San Francisco conference or in the international organization which will result therefrom could in any way injure our relations with the other members of the Commonwealth family. The ties that bind Canada and the other members of the British Commonwealth are primarily those of sentiment: they are ties of blood and of loyalty on the part of all to our common Sovereigns. The peoples of the Commonwealth hold the same concepts of human government and liberty. Ties of this sort are on a level entirely different from that of the political arrangements which it is proposed should be entered into with fifty or sixty other governments for the purpose of maintaining peace. I would differentiate our relations with the Commonwealth from our relations with the other members of this proposed

international organization by a simple analogy: our relations with the Commonwealth are family relations; with the others, friendly business relations. Canada has been a member of the League of Nations since 1919, but it would be a bold man who would say that her membership in the League during all that time has had any injurious effect upon her relations with the other members of the Commonwealth.

I rather deprecate also the suggestion that has been made in some quarters that Canada should form a united front with the other nations of the Commonwealth at San Francisco. Canada is a nation, and we can stand on our own feet as a nation at San Francisco. I believe that if honourable members will reflect on this point they will realize that each nation of the Commonwealth will carry more weight and will be listened to with greater respect by the other nations if it speaks for itself as representative of its own particular part of the world. I think it might have a very bad effect upon the other nations of the world if they went to the San Francisco conference with the suspicion in their minds that the members of the British Commonwealth had been "ganging up" together beforehand to try to "put something over" on them.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: The whole trend of the debate in the other place, and in this Chamber, has been to emphasize the importance of the Security Council. I am rather inclined to ask myself whether in the long run the Security Council will be the most important instrument provided for in this set-up. I am inclined to think that in the future the real permanent developments of international relations are very likely to come through the Economic and Social Council provided for in Chapter 9, as well as the various organizations that will be tributary to it. At the same time, of course, it is very natural that our thoughts should turn to the Security Council, its future and its functions. We are in the midst of war and for the last five or six years our minds have been filled with war and threats of war and the prevention of war in the future. I suggest to honourable members that they might ask themselves whether an international conflict is likely to take place within the next three or four generations.

I was very much impressed by a remark made by President Roosevelt in the course of his famous "quarantine speech" at Chicago, delivered in 1937, in which he said that ninety per cent of the people of the world desire peace, and only ten per cent want war for the purpose of world domination. He was

obviously pointing the finger at Germany and Japan. What will be the position after this war is over? Germany and Japan will be hopelessly defeated, their territory and their population will be greatly reduced, and they will have been deprived of the means of making war in the foreseeable future. I think that is basic and axiomatic. If we look back on the history of western civilization it is rather interesting to observe that potential world conquerors turn up about once every hundred years. There was Philip of Spain in the seventeenth century; Louis Quatorze of France in the eighteenth century, Napoleon at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and Kaiser Wilhelm and his degenerate successor at the beginning of the twentieth century. I think history will record this war as more or less a continuation of the last Great War, and the two together as the supreme attempt of the German nation to conquer the world. If that historical perspective be true, it may well be that we have seen the end of attempts at world domination for some generations to come. What will the position be? Germany and Japan will be wrecked, ruined and repressed; the victorious Allies will be the dominant political force of the future world; the four great powers, the United States, the British Commonwealth, Russia and China, will have irresistible forces at their command.

Under these circumstances, is a war of worldwide significance likely to take place in the foreseeable future?

With regard to ourselves and the British Commonwealth of Nations there is no question. War is repugnant to us all, it violates our most cherished principles. There is no danger that either the United States or the British Commonwealth would attempt to engage in a world war in the future. I think it is equally true to say that there is no danger to be apprehended from either Russia or China. You can usually judge the future behaviour of a country from its past history. Neither Russia nor China has ever set out to conquer the world, and neither of them has ever given out the idea that they are the "master race" or the "sons of heaven" and that therefor they have an inherent right by their own destiny to conquer the inferior nations of the world for the purpose of ruling them. Both Russia and China are countries of vast extent and great resources which are largely untouched. Neither of them is a "Have-not" nation. Both have sustained enormous material damage in this war. I pause to suggest that for many years to come the energies of both these nations will have to be devoted to the reconstruction and development of their own countries and to the raising of the standard

of living of their own people. It is rather interesting to speculate that during the next century Russia may occupy the position the United States occupied in the nineteenth century—a great country concerned only with its own development, and anxious not to be disturbed by happenings in the outside world. It is even conceivable that our grandsons may have cause to be annoyed at Russian isolationism in the same way that this generation has at times had cause to regret the isolationism of the United States. All of which leads me back to what I said a few minutes ago, that if what I have predicted comes true, it is very probable that the Economic and Social Council and not the Security Council will be the most important of the organizations set up under this plan.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: The Security Council, after all, fulfills a negative function, but the Economic Council performs a positive function in economic progress and human betterment.

Hon. WILLIAM DUFF: Quite right.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: On the other hand it should be borne in mind that within a few years after the last war at least two other wars broke out—wars of conquest—one between Greece and Turkey and the other between Poland and Russia. When you consider the conditions that exist in Europe today and what the possible peace terms so far as boundaries are concerned will be after this war is ended, there is always the possibility of more disturbance in Europe. The existence of the Council at that stage and for the next few years will be very important. I agree that for fifty years there is no possibility of another struggle such as we have just gone through. This Security Council will seek to prevent wars anywhere in the world, big or small, and I think that is very desirable.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I agree with my honourable friend. I was directing my remarks to the possibility of a world war in the immediate future. It seems to me that the Security Council will be sufficiently strong to deal with any regional wars.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: May I ask one further question? Assuming that the Security Council deal with a matter, and the time comes when military force must be applied, is a declaration of war necessary? Will their action start the machinery of war and will the necessary force be applied? I would think so, so far as the matter has been explained up to this point.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I am sure that is a question I would not venture to answer. It is

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN.

a legal question as to whether a state of war has been created or not.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I would think that once the nations agree to establish a Security Council and give it authority to apply force, the Council would have the right to apply that force without a declaration of war because, to that extent, the nations have given up their sovereignty. I would doubt very much if a declaration of war would be necessary.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Might I interject for a moment to say to my honourable friend, who is rather pessimistic, why worry about that now?

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I am not worrying.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Neither am I. I say let these people go to San Francisco and see what is going on and come back and report to us. Why worry about what is going to happen ten or fifteen years from now?

Hon. W. M. ASELTINE: Because we cannot change the report when it comes back; we have to adopt it or we do not become a member of the league.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Very well, we will stay outside and hoe our own row.

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: Why not understand it before our delegates go.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I am glad to have started an intelligent discussion between honourable senators on this most important point.

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE: You are doing all right.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: I was about to remark—and I have not very much more to say—that the Economic and Social Council will be an integral part of the new international machinery; and I think it will probably be far more important for Canada to be a member of the Economic and Social Council than to be a member of the Security Council. I believe that Canada will have a very important part to play in the Economic and Social Council and in the various tributary bodies. It is by this means and through these instruments which are offered to the nations in the proposals to be submitted at the San Francisco conference that our country will be able to assume its full share in the colossal task that faces our generation, the task of rebuilding a shattered humanity.

Honourable senators, I have come almost to the end of my long and, I fear, somewhat discursive remarks. If I were to follow the precedent established over the last twenty-five years in the League of Nations, I should terminate with a peroration on the beauty of

perpetual peace. I propose, however, to resist that temptation. It seems to me that in those days we had too many perorations and too little performance.

Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: To-day the time has come for action. I will conclude by repeating the remarks of the honourable leader on the other side at the termination of his eloquent speech yesterday afternoon, when he referred to the members of the Canadian delegation to the San Francisco conference, and particularly to those who will go from this honourable Chamber. They carry with them not only our best wishes, but our hearts as well. They have a great task and a great opportunity, and, in the words of my honourable friend the leader on the other side (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne), we wish them God speed.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. A. D. McRAE: Honourable senators, I want to congratulate the honourable senator who has just taken his seat (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) on his very able and instructive speech. It has removed certain questions that were in the minds of some of us. Generally, almost entirely, I am in agreement with him. He pretty well expressed my views, except when he forecast the end of all wars. I am not as hopeful as he is. War has not changed humanity very much, and if we may judge from what has happened in the past it has not bettered humanity very much. Nations after all are but collections of individuals, and I fear that following this war, as following the last, our troubles will be many and grievous, and we shall have threats of war and probably war itself unless we have some such organization as is now proposed to maintain international peace and security. I remember that when I came back from the last war we were told there would be peace for ever. At that time I addressed the Canadian Club at Calgary. I said then that war was inevitable because there was no agency to prevent it, and I was criticized severely because, as you know, at that time everyone was optimistic and fully believed there would never be another war. Well, I am just as certain now as I was then that we shall have wars in the future unless we form an organization to stop wars.

To me, the proposals to be considered at the San Francisco conference are very encouraging. I did not anticipate that such progress could be made in the direction of world peace before this war had been brought to a termination. I think the proposed organization is our only chance to avoid future wars. Its effectiveness depends of course on

power; but that is the realistic way of dealing with war. I would be content if the maintenance of peace were left to the three powers, Russia, Great Britain and the United States—

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: —because they have been active participants in this war, they have unrivalled military, naval and economic strength, and if one of them withdraws from the organization our peace effort ends.

It seems to me we are all talking too hopefully about the Chinese situation. China will not become a nation for another century—at least not a democratic nation. The Chinaman has no conception of nationality at all. His life centres first in his family, then in his community; beyond that the average Chinaman has no interest in the so-called National Government of his country. True, certain factions function as government, but anything like a national democratic government in China will be a development of the future, for the Chinese change slowly. However, I am not very much concerned on that account. I fear we shall have trouble with France, if we may judge from the experience of the fifteen or twenty years following the last war. But so long as Great Britain, the United States and Russia stick together they have ample power to ensure the peace of the world.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: I am very hopeful of their ability to prevent aggression. I would say to those who object to one clause or another of these proposals that they have been worked out by men familiar with world conditions and should receive our favourable consideration. Certainly we have to take a chance with them; we have no alternative. Some people would have one subject or another injected into these proposals. I am prepared to take them as they stand. No doubt the conference will make some amendments, but not such as will change materially the broad principles laid down in the charter. I would not have those principles changed, because, as I have said, it is the three great Allied Powers on whom we must rely to maintain the peace of this world.

We wish our delegates God speed. They will carry to the conference the sentiments which have been expressed in this and in the other House. But they will carry more, they will carry with them the hopes not only of the members of the Parliament of Canada but of practically every citizen of this country. I say to the delegates: You have a grave responsibility. No one expects that you will get any particular thing that you may want. You have a give-and-take proposition to

handle, and you must do the best you can. We have got to be, and we shall be, satisfied and happy with what you bring back.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Marcotte, the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Hon. the SPEAKER informed the Senate that he had received a communication from the Assistant Secretary to the Governor General acquainting him that the Honourable Patrick Kerwin, acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, would proceed to the Senate Chamber this day at 6 p.m. for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to a certain Bill.

APPROPRIATION BILL NO. 1

FIRST READING

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill 2, an Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1945.

The Bill was read the first time.

SECOND READING

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable senators, when shall this Bill be read the second time?

Hon. J. H. KING: With leave of the House, I would move second reading now. The Bill covers further supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1945, the total amount required being \$5,654,976.27. The various items are set out within the Bill, and I shall mention only one or two of the larger sums. In the Post Office Department the further supplementary amount required is \$2,246,056. This, I believe, is largely made up of additional expenditures on wartime mail services. There is an item of \$271,160 for operations under the Canada Grain Act; \$267,090 for the Hudson Bay Railway; \$353,273.61 under the Maritime Freight Rates Act, and \$173,000 for the Rehabilitation Branch of the Department of Veterans Affairs. These are the large amounts required to supplement the main estimates of the fiscal year just ending.

I do not believe any further explanation is necessary. As honourable senators know, if supplementary estimates are agreed to it is customary to pass them in this House without discussion.

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the SPEAKER: When shall the Bill be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. KING: With leave, I move the third reading now.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Mr. KING: I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 4, at 8 p.m.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Honourable Patrick Kerwin, acting as Deputy of the Governor General, having come and being seated at the foot of The Throne, and the House of Commons having been summoned, and being come with their Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to give the Royal Assent to the following Bill:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1945.

The House of Commons withdrew.

The Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to retire.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 4, at 8 p.m.

THE SENATE

Wednesday, April 4, 1945.

The Senate met at 8 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

PAYMENTS TO GOVERNMENT BY CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INQUIRY

Hon. Mr. FOSTER inquired of the Government:

What amounts have been paid to the Government each year from January 1, 1940, to December 31, 1944, by the Canadian National Railway System from its surplus earnings?

Hon. Mr. KING: The answer to the honourable gentleman's inquiry is as follows:

Year ending December 31, 1940, Nil. Deficit for the year amounted to \$16,965,044.18.

Year ending December 31, 1941, \$4,016,326.74.
 Year ending December 31, 1942, \$25,063,268.32.
 Year ending December 31, 1943, \$35,639,412.23.
 Year ending December 31, 1944, \$23,026,924.35.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from Thursday, March 29, the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Honourable Mr. Vaillancourt for an Address in reply thereto.

Hon. A. D. McRAE: Honourable senators, in rising to speak I want to express my thanks to the mover and the seconder of the motion for the great pleasure they afforded me by their addresses some days ago. They struck a very high plane, one that gives promise that they will perform very useful service in the Senate of Canada.

The subject to which I wish to direct your attention to-night is post-war employment. I had intended to bring this subject up for a general discussion by way of notice; but as the shortness of the session made that impracticable, I would ask you to bear with me while I review the situation before us as I see it.

There is no question that Germany is approaching the end, and that within three months at most will be completely crushed. Then post-war employment will be the outstanding issue before the country; in fact, it is now on our doorstep; and I would expect that by the time the next Parliament convenes it will be in our midst. Maybe it is regrettable that we have not made further progress. True, both Houses of Parliament have put in a great deal of time considering the question and have given it extensive publicity, but so far as I can see not a great deal of what is contained in their reports has been brought down to the point where action can be taken as soon as the opportunity arises. I am therefore fearful that we shall find these problems before us to be dealt with by the next Parliament.

Now, as to the national responsibilities which post-war employment involves, may I refer to the members of our armed forces many of whom will have to find new occupations when they return to civilian life. We have at the present time a total of roughly 3,000,000 men and women engaged in war services and directly or indirectly, in war production industries. That is about a third of our population. Fortunately all of these persons will not be on our hands at one time. The continuation of the war against Japan and the forces of occupation in Europe will doubtless absorb a considerable number of our army personnel; also some of our war plants

will revert to peacetime production without any serious interruption. But it is not too much for us to expect that within the next year a million of our men and women will have to change their occupations, since naturally once Germany is defeated our production of war materials will be greatly reduced and the major portion of our armed forces will be disbanded.

The committees set up in both Houses to deal with this subject have done a lot of useful work, but I sometimes feel that their approach to it has been too altruistic and not sufficiently realistic. I have reference to the billion dollars which it was estimated would be required to implement certain measures of social security. That expenditure would be based on an eight billion national production, of which one-eighth or twelve and a half per cent would be required for social security.

I shall endeavour to point out just how impracticable this idea is, but for the moment I want to mention another little sum of \$200,000,000 annually that Parliament voted for family allowances. I am opposed to the family allowance as it is set up on several grounds. First, it interferes with the independence of the family. Similar experiments have been tried before, and they have seldom proved successful in individual cases. I think we are assuming quite a responsibility when we try to make partial provision for the raising of families. At any rate, the family allowance interferes with and undermines the ideals of the average man who is proud of his ability to bring up and educate his family on his own initiative. Furthermore, it encourages the idea, already too prevalent among certain people in our country, that they can to a certain extent live off the Government. Too many people in Canada think the Government owes them a living, and this so-called social security goes quite a way towards convincing them that they are right. I believe that the average Canadian wants a good job at pay which will enable him to raise his family to his own liking, and to have the satisfaction of doing it all by himself. He wants to be independent, to be lord and master of his own home. I agree that we should provide employment for every worthy Canadian who wants to work; that is his due; but I oppose the idea of this family subsidy which, should we fail to provide employment, would be nothing more than a dole. I am confident that most honourable senators will agree with me that we do not want doles of any kind.

Our pre-war production was four and a half billions, of which roughly one billion was

exported. The present national production is eight billion dollars, half of which, or four billion dollars, is exported. After the war if we are to maintain a national production of anything like eight billion dollars, even if we allow half a billion dollars for increased consumption by our own people under good working conditions, we shall still have to export four billion dollars, or four times what we exported before the war. I am free to say that I do not see how that can be accomplished. It does seem to me as though the people who are juggling with these tremendous figures must expect national revenue to fall on us like a Christmas snow storm.

It is far beyond my powers to comprehend how, under the trying circumstances in the world to-day, we can expect to maintain anything like our present national production. At present, operating as we do, we have no marketing problems. That four billion dollars represents munitions and supplies, war equipment and, I presume, the money we give away, roughly one billion dollars a year. But we cannot continue that in peace time. Those figures are all right as war appropriations, but we will have a different set of rules to go by once we return to peace. Our endeavours to maintain exports will not be unopposed. It is evident in what we read in the press that the United States and other countries as well are making tremendous efforts to increase their external trade. For a time, while Europe is being supplied with food and other requisites, a certain part of our production will be required, but I do not think that will be for long. We have been warned by Britain that we must not expect her to buy as much from us as she bought in pre-war years, unless we can balance the account. That is rather reasonable.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: And Mr. Churchill has told Britain that to let up on her agricultural production would be a calamity. That of course means that Britain will buy less wheat and other farm products from us. I was somewhat surprised to note in the press a few days ago that a member of the Belgian Government said in Montreal that his country would be back in the British market within a few months. That seems hardly possible. I was also surprised to read official reports showing that the dairy cattle production of France is now seventy-five per cent of what it was at the outbreak of the war.

Europe is not going to require from us anything like as much produce as we thought she would before she becomes re-established. I notice that recently Britain made a treaty

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

with Sweden—I presume a very favourable one, because Sweden has not been in the war and therefore has no war burdens; if anything, she has made money out of the war. That brings to my mind a suggestion that if we are to have an equitable readjustment of things after the war, countries such as Sweden and the Argentine and all others that grew rich on our fight for civilization should be obliged to pay an import tax to United Nations countries as a means of sharing to some degree in the expense incurred to maintain their civilization. As I see it, I am afraid that, notwithstanding all the statements to the contrary, the drift after the war will be towards self-sufficiency on the part of the nations, each endeavouring to live as closely as possible within the limits of its own production so as to reduce its purchases abroad. That situation will of course be due to the scarcity of credit. In that regard there is much promise in the international banking arrangement which has been discussed, and which is the only way by which credit can be safely extended to these various countries with the hope of getting payment for the goods purchased. Much will depend on this international banking arrangement when it is worked out. Now, with regard to employment after the war, the provincial, federal and municipal governments are carrying on a very commendable planned effort to provide employment. To a considerable extent that would be immediate employment. Through that effort we might hope to bridge the gap that will occur between wartime activities and the re-establishment of industry on a peacetime basis. That, honourable senators, I submit is a very temporary effort, and any volume, great as it may be, will represent but a very small part of what the industries of this country can be expected to and should produce. At best it is only a stop-gap.

That leads me to the question of the situation with respect to our present tax system. In this regard I have nothing but commendation for Canada's tax effort during the war. We have accomplished wonders. We have raised half of our total expenditures by taxes, and the other half we have borrowed from our fellow citizens. But, as I have said, that was under war conditions. There was no marketing problem in connection with any of our production, and in war time, on account of the scarcity of manpower, we did not permit expansion of any industry; on the contrary, we tried to keep private business down to the very minimum so that money would be available for war loans and personnel for the war effort. That was correct. We have done well. But, honourable senators, I submit that there is as much difference between war

effort and post-war effort as there is between day and night.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Successful activities in war-time, if continued on into the peace will be our ruination. I am going to refer to some of the taxes as they affect our corporations, and for the record I wish to say that I am neither a director of nor a shareholder in any of our leading industries, and only wish to express my unbiased views to honourable senators for what they are worth. At the present time, as honourable senators well know, the tax on corporations is forty per cent. In addition, there is an Excess Profits Tax which, including the 20 per cent credit, accounts for all the excess profit. Then, when dividends are declared the shareholder pays his income tax, in all as high taxation as any country in the world. I am not looking for much reduction in our income taxes, but I say that it is going to be essential to make reductions if we are going to get business going again. Some companies have been severely handicapped by the present system of taxation as other interests throughout the country have been owing to the war. There are a great many companies, particularly those on standard profits, which have not been in a position to accumulate anything to enable them to make the transition from war to peace. These companies should be given some consideration. The main point, however, is such reduction of the corporation and excess profits taxes as will enable them to produce with some hope of profit. That is particularly true if we are looking for an increase in our industrial efforts. That is what improved national production really means. As I see it, the present tax system is a stone wall in the path of the establishment of new industries and the successful operation of many established industries.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: We won't get started as things are to-day. Something definite has got to be done for our corporations so that they can successfully revert to peace-time production. The Government should give our corporations some definite assurance as to what they will have to meet in taxation in the post-war period so that they can make their arrangements accordingly. As it is, practically all industries are following a policy of wait and see. I think that will be the situation nationally until the Government takes some definite action in the matter, and that of course will be for the new Parliament. I know that the reduction of taxes at this time is a very difficult matter. It is obvious that

we will have to borrow money after the war if we are to take care of our responsibilities and meet the situation. It is difficult to reduce taxes in the face of this; nevertheless we must reduce taxes, even if we borrow more money. And that is the answer. We will have to mortgage the future to an even greater extent than we have already done in order that our industries may get going and furnish the employment we hope for. That is going to require a lot of courage, a definite decision, and some risk; but we are in the position now where we have got to do it. We have got to take our courage in our hands; we have got to consider the situation and do what we think is best. As I have said, that issue is right on our doorstep. It will have to be dealt with when the new Parliament convenes.

There are one or two projects that offer considerable employment, and which also demand our prompt attention. I have in mind our place in the world of air development. There is no doubt that great advances will be made in the next few years, and we are particularly equipped to take a leading position in this air transportation. As a result of the war long distances have been travelled and safety of travel has been improved. This is going to result in great civil air developments in the future. If you have any doubt about that, note the struggle which the American and British companies, and possibly some others, are making for a place in the air. We have as much claim to a premier position in the air service as any other country.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: And we should lose no time in asserting our claim. I trust the Government will give this matter its early consideration, because otherwise I am afraid we shall be overlooked. The development of air transport would give almost immediate employment to probably twenty thousand of our returned airmen, and over a period of time to many more.

The honourable senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) spoke very feelingly on what we were going to do with our airmen who were returning—all young men, on the average about twenty-five years of age or less, who have come out of our universities and know no other occupation than flying an aeroplane. But that occupation they know well. They have been well educated in it. It has cost us probably \$10,000 each to educate these boys. We should not throw that education away. Coupled with the general development of aviation there is also the development in our own country, particularly in our north country

where the bush pilots have in the past blazed the trail. Such a service, if properly developed, will take another ten or twenty thousand of our men. I know the Government has been hesitant about adopting a policy in that regard. I am told that some returned airmen have already devised a plan to operate a company of their own on a more or less mutual basis and pay for the shares with their own money. They want the right to fly in certain districts, and it should be given to them. Some little help should be given them as well.

It is difficult, honourable senators, to overestimate the development that will come about in air transportation. This brings me to a phase of the question on which I am not in sympathy with the Government. I do not believe in government operation of any business, and particularly of world-air business, where complications with different countries might arise, and where a company owned entirely by the Government of Canada would be in a different position from a company owned by the Canadian National Railways or the Canadian Pacific Railway. Furthermore, as we all know, it is virtually impossible to get from any Government institution the initiative and energy, the economy and rapid development which comes about in private enterprise. We have two magnificent transportation companies in the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have both had experience and connections in ocean shipping. The Canadian Pacific was the greatest transportation company in the world until it lost so many of its liners and freighters in the war. I hope it will be able to re-establish and resume its marine service. I feel that our air service should be operated by our railway corporations and should come under the Transport Board, which has not been very busy during the last few years and doubtless could supervise air operations.

As I say, I am not favourable to the Dominion Government entering into the flying business. Nor am I favourable to its confining the business to one railway corporation. There is enough scope in Canada for two air lines across the country, and if they are operated by our railway companies we shall have reasonable competition and a more efficient and more economical service; of that I am sure.

But what is more, this air development should eventually take care of, say, 50,000 members of our returning air force. That means not only pilots but ground crews and every other factor that constitutes an air service. That is not a small item in the em-

ployment of our returning airmen, who, perhaps, have the strongest claim upon us for re-establishment in civil life.

I might mention, not by way of criticism, but in support of my point, that it would have been impossible for me to imagine that any responsible air company or transportation company would have put Lockheed Electras instead of Douglas planes on our air lines. The Lockheed Electra had been discarded on every transcontinental air line but one in the United States when we put them in operation here, and it was discarded on that one a few months later. That was bad business. I do not charge Mr. Howe with responsibility for it, although it was a bad example of government direction of our air services. That would be unthinkable to either one of our railway corporations. At the same time I want to compliment the Air Force on the magnificent service they have provided with those planes; there are no complaints on this score; but it would have been much better if Douglas machines had been purchased. Now both of those types are out of date, and the new planes which will take their place will be infinitely faster and safer, and I predict they will carry an ever increasing percentage of passengers, ninety per cent of our mail, a large percentage of express, and not a little light freight. In these days when our war planes can carry from eighty to one hundred passengers, and a corresponding weight of freight, air lines may even enter the freight service. This only goes to show that inasmuch as we are robbing our railways of all this business, air service should be operated by the railways themselves. I am strongly in favour of leaving our air development to our two transcontinental railways.

We hear to-day a great deal about our natural resources. The most important of these for immediate development is the mineral wealth in our north country. I am talking now of something I know just a little about. In our country, perhaps more so than in any other part of the globe, the pre-Cambrian shield is found close to the surface from the province of Quebec to the Rocky Mountains, and as you get west into the territories there is no cover whatsoever, the glacial period having removed it all. It is said that the pre-Cambrian shield extends into New York state, but the cover there is over 2,000 feet thick, and you cannot look for minerals there. In our north country the cover varies, but it is very light, and that is one reason why we have had this great development in northern Quebec and northern Ontario. But this development is only starting and there is no reason why at any place along that pre-Cambrian shield clear across the continent equally profitable mining development should

not result. This is particularly true when you get out to what is known as the barrens.

In this connection I may say that honourable members will find the maps prepared by our Department of Mines are very interesting. They clearly show the faults, and the quartz outcroppings appear almost as plainly as though you were on the ground itself. The Department of Mines has long been an excellent department, and in this as in other respects it has done an excellent job. Its maps aid greatly in the development which is now about to come through. People in the United States are looking to Canada for investment, largely in our mining developments. Millions of dollars will be invested here if there is good hope of profit. In that regard we had a very good mining law before the war, and it is only necessary now to continue it after the war. That, with the tax readjustment which I have described, would almost spontaneously bring about developments much more rapidly than any we have ever had, because the situation in our north country is becoming much better understood, and mineral discoveries are more general, particularly of the outstanding mineral—gold. Men who ought to know predict that in the Yellow Knife district, which takes in a wide range, the development might even rival the Rand. Certainly gold deposits are found over a far-flung area, and there is every reason to expect that in the next few years new developments will add greatly to the gold production of this country. I look forward to the day, not so very far ahead, when with an aggressive policy we shall be producing \$500,000,000 worth of gold a year. Gold is subject to no market fluctuations. Some of you may have had doubt about its value when the United States had nearly \$30,000,000,000 worth of gold stored in Kentucky. But what has become of that gold? A large quantity of it has gone to or been ear-marked for South America, a billion and a half will go back to France, and so it goes. Reduction of the stored gold has proceeded at such a rate that last month the United States Government did not have enough gold in Kentucky to cover its currency issue at forty per cent, and therefore reduced the coverage to 25 per cent. I think those who were uneasy about the real value of gold can rest easy. It is the only commodity in the settlement of international balances.

Hon. Mr. HOWARD: It may help to pay our family allowances.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: It surely would. In fact, gold is a magic metal, and it is really worth more than its actual value. But for the present let us leave the magic side of it out of consideration and deal with the production itself. Honourable members from

Quebec who have seen the new gold fields developed do not need to be told what these mean to a province. In addition to the miners who are working underground, there are on the surface all the people required to operate the stores, garages, hospitals and all other facilities of a modern settlement. I have not exact figures, but I believe that for every miner who works underground there are two or three persons employed in the community on the surface, people who are not associated with the mine itself. That brings to mind a suggestion. We have been talking about plans for financing our returned boys for a start in the older communities, but it seems to me that many of them would have a much better chance to make good in new districts where they could blaze their own way and get on their feet sooner. Some idea of the tremendous employment that can come from mining is shown by the fact that in 1943 there were 325,000 miners in South Africa; and it is probable that the number of persons who were given indirect employment on the surface would be 600,000 or 700,000. You cannot measure mining employment in terms of the men in the mines; you have to include all the auxiliary services.

I want to say another word about gold, because I like it and I feel I know a little about it. It seems to me the Canadian mind should be disabused of the idea that the price of gold is not controlled. Complaint has been made because of the rise in price from \$22 to \$35; but the fact is that the price to-day is very much controlled. General Smuts is reported as saying he did not care whether Britain took South Africa's gold or not, for he could always sell it. The fact is that about a year ago gold was selling in India for approximately \$70 an ounce, and the price in Egypt was roughly the same. At the last monthly auction sale reported from Chile gold sold for \$59 an ounce in United States funds. If gold is not a controlled commodity, I do not know one that is.

If we produce \$500,000,000 worth of gold a year in this country, at least ninety per cent of it will be paid out for labour, machinery, and supplies, including products of our farms and factories. In other words, that portion of it will be distributed to the producers of Canada. And, as I said earlier, there is no trouble in marketing gold. Our mining law is good, and we do not need to do any more than get things going again and adjust the tax problem. The great need is a revision of taxation to a peace time basis. Wartime taxes are all right in war, but they are insurmountable barriers, to new industries, to mining and other efforts to increase production in peace time.

The Address was adopted.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Thursday, March 29, the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. King:

That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the following resolution:

Whereas the Government of Canada has been invited by the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of 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 in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and

Whereas the invitation suggests that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization which have been made public by the four governments which participated in the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and

Whereas the Government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference,

Therefore be it resolved:

1. That this House endorses the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference;

2. That this House recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. That this House approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization;

4. That this House agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to Parliament for approval.

Hon. ARTHUR MARCOTTE: Honourable senators, about two years ago, while speaking on a resolution by the honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) for the prosecution of war criminals, I expressed the opinion that if there was among the Allies a country which deserved a place at the conference table when the time came to adjudicate on peace terms, it was Canada. It has been stated in every part of the world by the leaders of the allied nations that in its contribution to the war effort Canada was second to none. For the size of our population and

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

the limits of our resources as developed at the present time, we have done marvellously.

Just a few days ago it was stated in No. 43 of "Canada at War", on page 5:

This is the nation which, compelled by no treaty, agreement, commitment or promise, declared war on Germany September 10, 1939, a war to be waged to the end.

Proud words! A splendid record! But if it is true that we were not compelled by treaty, promise or agreement, there is another truth not to be forgotten, and that is that we were urged to join efforts with the Mother Country, with our sister nations of the Commonwealth and with our Allies, to fight to the limit for the salvation of our Christian civilization, our free institutions, our liberty, and for a lasting peace.

This war is not only the war of England, of the United States, of France, of the Soviet Republics, of the other Allies, including Canada; it is the war of every individual to save his liberty, his mode of living, his right to pray to God according to his conscience.

It may be said that the coming meeting at San Francisco is not the peace conference, but I would answer that it is more than that. It is the initial step to ensure that the next peace treaty will last, and that peace-loving nations will enjoy real peace for many years to come. That is why we endorse the determination of Canada to be represented at that meeting and to join in the mutual efforts to save the world from the horrible carnage and destruction which would be the inevitable results of another world war.

Just think for a moment of the progress made by science in the last four years in the ways of killing men and destroying property, and imagine what it would be after twenty or fifty years of further scientific discoveries. Yet you find some people, happily very few, who are opposed to Canada's being represented at the San Francisco conference. This is beyond comprehension.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE: May I cite just a few words written by a former isolationist, Arthur H. Vandenburg, United States Senator from Michigan, in the Saturday Evening Post of March 17, 1945:

I have always believed in American self-sufficiency. I have thought, and I still think, that we are, and can continue to be, as nearly impregnable as a modern power can be. But something desperately important has happened since Pearl Harbor. War has assumed a new and horrible countenance. Science has confronted human flesh and blood with mechanized disaster. This lethal ingenuity leaps from one horror to another. Robots are in their infancy. Our oceans no longer protect our ramparts.

No nation can immunize itself hereafter against these disasters by reliance upon itself alone. The misapplied slogans of yesterday are mere booby traps in the presence of these hard realities. I have no shadow of a doubt that American self-interest requires our co-operation to meet this terror before it flares up again.

I am not suggesting the dissipation of our essential sovereignty in effecting this co-operation. I am not joining in any movement to submerge our independence in a world state. I am talking about co-operation between nations which retain their essential sovereignty. But one of the attributes of sovereignty is to relinquish voluntarily whatever segments can be traded for something more valuable to us. That is all we shall be asked to do if international peace co-operation is launched on the right basis.

I will not dwell any longer on that phase of the discussion. It was very ably covered in the splendid address made a few days ago by the honourable senator from Inkerman.

Will the House allow me a few moments to analyse part of the resolution and the proposals recited in the pamphlet that has been distributed to honourable senators? In the preamble of the motion it is said that Canada is invited to the San Francisco Conference by the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China; and in Chapter II of the proposals, it is provided that:

The organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

This is the culmination of the steps which have led Canada from the state of a vanquished colony to that of a sovereign nation, and is worthy of note by those who claim that we are still colonial puppets at the beck and call of England. It is the finest tribute to the greatness of British institutions. As has been stated elsewhere and here Canada's status as a nation has not weakened the link between this country and the other nations of the Commonwealth and the Mother Country. On the contrary that link has been strengthened because it is forged by a common allegiance to our King, and by common ideals of civilization, of liberty and of democratic institutions.

There is another fact worthy of mention. The Security Council, as stated in Section A of Chapter VI, will be composed of eleven members, five of which, namely, the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China, and in due course, France, shall have permanent seats.

What a difference one year has brought: In Bill 84 of last session, an Act for carrying into effect the agreement for United Nations relief and rehabilitation administration between Canada and certain other nations and authorities, Article III, Section 3, says:

The Central Committee of the Council shall consist of the representatives of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, with the Director General presiding without vote.

There is no mention of France. But to-day we read that in due course France will have a permanent seat on the Security Council. That great country which has known the horrors of moral and physical slavery has recovered her liberty and will take her rightful place among the Great Powers of the world. To me it is a miracle that this recovery, this liberty, has been the result of the perseverance and heroism of France's one-time enemy, England. What a lesson there is in this for us in Canada, who are the descendants of these two great nations.

It has been feared that by agreeing to accept the decisions of the Security Council Canada might sacrifice some of her sovereignty. Even if this were true, why would not Canada accept what forty other nations are willing to accept in a worthy cause? I entertain no fear of the result.

The same principle that governs individuals also governs nations. A man by entering into a partnership agreement with other individuals does not abandon his liberty; he simply makes use of his liberty to co-ordinate certain of his efforts with those of his partners, thereby increasing his capacity for action. The same is true of a nation. Even a great power like the United States of America cannot stand alone to-day. By freely and willingly joining with other powers for a common cause a nation increases its ability to carry undertakings to success, especially if these undertakings are for the purpose of ensuring world peace.

In his address the other day, the honourable senator for Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugesson) clearly demonstrated the reasons for the failure of the League of Nations to justify its existence. Such a body needs not only the authority to judge, but the power to enforce decisions. Experience of the last twenty-five years has shown what was lacking in the League of Nations. We will not fall into the same errors again. There should be no fear on that score.

And now I come to the great controversial issue of commitments. What will be the commitments of Canada? Let us study for a

few moments the different stages of the proceedings leading to commitments. Section 4 of the motion says:

That this House agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

I ask honourable members to note the word "acceptable." It is important, it is essential.

Then Section 5:

That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to Parliament for approval.

This means that the charter will have to be approved by our Parliament.

But there is more. Let us see what are the commitments. In section 2 of chapter II, we find that—

All members of the organization undertake, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership in the organization, to fulfil the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the charter.

We are committed to "fulfil the obligations assumed by them"—the members—"in accordance with the charter." We do not know yet what these obligations will be.

Now, section 5 says:

All members of the organization shall give every assistance to the organization in any action undertaken by it in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

Again, this is vague as to special commitments.

When we come to the Security Council we find that chapters VI and VIII must be read together to get the gist of the powers given to the council. Chapter VI covers the general power given to the Security Council; chapter VIII enumerates the specific powers. What, under chapter VI, are the commitments of any member of the charter? Let me read section B:

In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the organization, members of the organization should by the charter confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and should agree that in carrying out these duties under this responsibility it should act on their behalf.

Then all members agree generally:

Section 1. T. That the Council shall have primary responsibility.

B. Shall act on their behalf.

Section 4. To accept the decisions of the Security Council and to carry them out in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

This so far is very general. Now I come to chapter VIII, section B, article 4:

Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval or

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE.

land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade and other operations by air, sea or land forces of members of the organization.

And article 5:

In order that all members of the organization should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the Security Council on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Such agreement or agreements should govern the number and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided. The special agreement or agreements should be negotiated as soon as possible and should be in each case subject to approval by the Security Council and to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

In section 6 we reach the first real commitment: a "national air force contingent for combined international enforcement action."

But before we are forced to comply with these decisions, three steps have to be taken:

1. Special agreements shall be concluded among the members themselves.
2. These agreements shall be subject to approval by the Security Council.
3. They shall be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

Section 6 says:

In order to enable urgent military measures to be taken by the organization there should be held immediately available by the members of the organization national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action should be determined by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in paragraph 5 above.

All this shows to what extent precautions have been taken to ensure a free acceptance of any commitments by any member of the organization. But once it is accepted a commitment must be kept and fulfilled.

Will Canada refuse such a part in the general undertaking? I do not believe so. Surely our nation, which has increased her debt to over twenty billions of dollars, has given the lives of thousands and thousands of her young men, has made all kinds of sacrifices to secure victory, and to preserve liberty to the world, will not hesitate to make her contribution to insure lasting peace.

Willingly we pay heavy premiums for fire, life and other kinds of insurance. Surely we will gladly pay the premium for peace insurance. Let us remember the old roman precept: "Si vis pacem, para bellum".

I need merely mention in passing, the benefits which will accrue to Canada from the activities of the Social Council, for they are obvious to us all.

Care, however, should be taken that we do not undertake the carrying out of reforms which are not within the jurisdiction of Parliament.

In another place, the Prime Minister made an appeal to some members to make unanimous the decision to send delegates to the San Francisco meeting. I am satisfied that there will be no occasion to make such an appeal to this honourable assembly.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE: But there is an appeal to be made to some of our fellow citizens. We love peace. We have given proof of it by living in harmony with our neighbours for over a century. But unhappily we lack unity in our own country. Differences exist, but really they are only superficial and would disappear in an atmosphere of good will. Let us therefore follow the precepts of the old Chinese philosopher whom I cited some time ago. Let us study and find the causes of our troubles, shed prejudices, remedy injustices—if there be any—and since we are willing to join other nations to promote peace in the world, let us unite with our brother citizens to preserve peace in our Canadian family.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. W. McL. ROBERTSON: I am sure, honourable senators, that to anyone who has been privileged to hear the very excellent addresses which have been made in this Chamber on this resolution—to which those of the honourable senators from Ponteix (Hon. Mr. Marcotte) and from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae) are no exception—it must be a matter for regret that this House does not in the circumstances have the opportunity of exercising a greater influence upon the thought of Canada in particular and of the world at large in general.

No greater opportunity could come to us than to exercise our ability to think clearly and objectively with respect to the problems implicit in this resolution and the other great problems that will face this country in the momentous days that lie ahead. After all, every one of us wants security and prosperity for Canada, and I make no excuse for mentioning both together because I believe they are indivisible and must be given careful thought as far as our future plans are concerned. It is well that we give to our delegates who may go to the conference at San Francisco and to other international conferences the benefit of our ideas.

Some very excellent views have been expressed in the course of this debate. I was particularly impressed by one remark in the very excellent address of the honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen), which we listened to with so much pleasure a few days ago. Referring to the question of Canada's seat, or lack of it, on the Security Council, he said that the Assembly and the committees arising out of it, provided for in these proposals, might well be even more important in future than the Security Council itself. I regard the Security Council as being the policeman of the future as far as world affairs are concerned. It will be the responsibility and duty of those who comprise the Assembly to rebuild this world so that the desire for war will have passed, when the work of the policeman would be of a very limited nature. This being so, I can offer no further suggestions to those already made in regard to the Security Council. I should like however, to suggest to the delegates who will represent us at San Francisco that we in this House should give them the benefit of our views with respect to the questions which may arise in the Assembly or in the committees to be set up by the Assembly. It is quite possible that in the time at their disposal the delegates will only be able to set up the necessary framework to consider these particular matters. The Committee on Economic and Social Affairs is of such vital importance to us that I think our representatives should lose no opportunity of discussing the removal of the barriers to international trade, whether the opportunity arises in the fashioning of the framework for the consideration of that question in the future or in conversation with individual members, because I believe from the bottom of my heart that the future peace and prosperity of the world depends upon such removal and that it would have the most vital effect upon the whole future trend of mankind.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: If that be so, and I think it is generally recognized, it is particularly desirable that our delegates should be dynamic and aggressive and positive in respect to the matter, because, as the honourable senator from Vancouver pointed out, there are very great objections and obstacles in the way.

The question is an important one, honourable senators, because our economy depends to such a large extent on international trade. In the three years before the war less than seven per cent of the production of the United States was exported. Even the United Kingdom, which is looked upon always as one of the greatest trading nations, exported only

about twenty per cent of her production. But in those same years we in Canada exported about thirty-five per cent of our total production. That being the case, one of the absolute necessities for the solution of the problems that will face us in the future, is that conditions in respect to international trade in post-war years should be at least as favourable as they were before the war, because, as was pointed out by the honourable senators from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae), Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) and Thunder Bay (Hon. Mr. Paterson), in the intervening period the productive capacities of this country have increased tremendously.

The increase is staggering. The impact of two great wars seems in each case to have resulted in a tremendous development of our productive capacities—which shows the wealth of our natural resources and the adaptability of our people. In 1939 there were 638,000 people employed in manufacturing. In 1944 the number had risen to more than a million and a quarter—an increase of upwards of 600,000, despite the fact that there were 800,000 men in the armed forces. In the same period the monthly payroll had gone up from \$14,000,000 to \$40,000,000. Gross production had increased from three and a half billion dollars to more than eight billion dollars. Concurrently with that industrial expansion there has been a tremendous increase in agricultural and other primary production.

If therefore we are to prevent a terrific upset in this country, and our economy remains anything like it was in pre-war days, we must have a corresponding increase in our export trade in order to keep gainfully employed those who are now engaged in industry, as well as those in our armed forces when they return to civilian life. I will go further. I suggest to you, honourable members, that the very security of this half of the North American continent which we are privileged to occupy depends on our having a much larger population. We must have a great many more consumers for this tremendously increased productive capacity; a great many more to share the burden of our increased national debt; a great many more to share the overhead of our railroad, hotel, highway, waterway and harbour facilities, which only a few years ago presented a tremendous financial problem. And last but not least, by increasing the number of people within our borders we shall remove the tendency of people in the overcrowded areas of the world to envy the great good fortune that is ours. I have not the figures before me, but I have no doubt that there is no other part of this world in which there is half a continent with such tremendous

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON.

resources—the honourable senator from Vancouver referred to them in one particular—occupied by a trifling eleven and a half million people. Contrast the sparse population spread over this vast area with the terrific congestion in other parts of the world. It is inevitable that, unless there is a very substantial increase in our population, the people in those overcrowded countries will cast envious eyes towards Canada.

Every national interest dictates that arrangements between nations should make possible not only a continuance of but a very great increase in the volume of international trade in the future. In this connection the honourable senator from Kingston (Hon. Mr. Davies) made what I consider a most startling remark. He wondered whether this matter would be discussed at the San Francisco conference, and referred to the fact that in the company of himself and some other twenty responsible persons, two noted Canadian economists had said that Canada would face a very serious situation if Great Britain, as a result of the abnormal conditions that had arisen during the war, should confine her trading to the sterling bloc, meaning that we could not expect her to purchase from us anything like what she had purchased in the past. And they suggested that this might result in a condition in which, as the honourable gentleman said, "The people of Canada would have to become reconciled to continued taxation at the present high rates, because it would be necessary either to subsidize the three Prairie Provinces or to liquidate them and move their people to other parts of the country."

Honourable senators, the fact that since the war our facilities for international trade not only have not been improved but have been very much lessened, is a most important matter, and one with regard to which I think the influence of our delegates should be exercised to the utmost of their ability. In 1937, for instance, Great Britain purchased from us more than \$400,000,000 of goods and we purchased from her about \$147,000,000. If in self-defence or through abnormal circumstances she had to confine her trading activities for a considerable period of time largely to the sterling bloc, that might bring about a very serious condition for Canada.

This would tremendously upset our whole economy, even on a pre-war basis, and honourable senators can imagine what effect it would have under present circumstances.

The London Times of March 9 had a most interesting reference to Great Britain's recent financial agreement with Sweden, which was mentioned by the honourable gentleman from

Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae). Apparently the great difficulties that Britain is facing arise from the huge quantity of sterling that is outstanding and her announced intention and desire to confine her trade in future as far as possible within the sterling bloc. The agreement with Sweden provides that the rate of exchange between sterling and kronor is to be established, and both countries agree to keep any surplus receipts of the other's currency without limit. As the London Times editorial puts it:

The United Kingdom will accept and keep kronor, and Sweden will accept and keep sterling.

The closing paragraph of the editorial says this:

It is hard to say whether the idea of the world trade in terms of universally convertible currencies will become attainable or not, during the early years after the war. But it is almost certain, in view of the disorganization which exists at present, that no universal system can be built at all unless it is first prefabricated in sections.

I take it, honourable senators, that however desirable may be the ideal of a marked lowering of the barriers to the flow of international trade, it is inevitable that in the immediate post-war period there will arise sections—to use the London Times' term—for trading purposes, which sections will be as large as circumstances may make possible, and that the greatest effort will be made to remove obstacles to the flow of international trade within those sections. That is to say, trading between countries within the sections is likely to be on a much more favourable basis than between any of those countries and others outside the section. Therefore I suggest to the delegates who represent us at San Francisco that we want to make sure of getting into a section, and that that section should be the largest one possible.

I want to suggest, moreover, that inasmuch as we cannot contemplate a situation wherein our security will not involve the closest possible co-operation with those countries which, as we have learned from history and the experience of two wars, think as we think and act as we act, the section of international trade of which we become a part should include as a very minimum the United Kingdom and the United States.

Hon. Mr. HOWARD: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: Needless to say, we would hope to have it immediately enlarged by the inclusion of countries that revolve in the orbit of those nations or are most closely associated with them. The important point is that since eighty-five per cent of our external trade in pre-war days

was done with Great Britain and other parts of the Empire and the United States, we should use every possible influence to have Canada become part of a trading section which includes these countries. If that kind of arrangement cannot be made with countries such as Great Britain and the United States, whose living conditions and ideals are so similar to ours, I ask you, honourable senators, with what countries could it be made?

I for one hope that the delegates representing us will use every opportunity that may arise, whether by way of assisting to fashion the branch of the international organization that will deal with world trade, or by way of personal contacts, to associate us in a trading section with Great Britain and the United States. It seems to me that no thinking person can deny the necessity for this, unless we are prepared to adopt a much lower standard of living than we now enjoy in this country and have enjoyed for some years past.

Every part of this country would benefit by our becoming part of such a trading section. Imagine the prosperity that would come to British Columbia, for instance, through our having preferred access to the markets available to us as a member of the section. And it does not require any stretch of the imagination to picture how greatly the three prairie provinces would benefit, for their whole economic future is wrapped up with the question of international trade. The tremendous potentialities of these provinces are perhaps among the outstanding opportunities for development in the world to-day. Then the central provinces of Quebec and Ontario, with their great manufacturing structure, which would suffer so seriously from any reduction in trade, would on the other hand certainly stand to gain enormously from increased exports to markets within the section. And I want to say to my honourable friends from the Maritimes that New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island also would have everything to gain from our inclusion in a large trading section. In those provinces we have had many painful experiences of what it means to be on the circumference of a self-contained Canada. We are on the fringe now; but if we were part of a trading section which comprised Great Britain, the United States and other countries, our position would be moved to the centre. If present predictions are right, no one from the Maritime provinces will be a delegate to the San Francisco conference, but I do not hesitate to suggest that the delegates from Canada should point out to the United Kingdom representatives that the location of the Maritime provinces on this

continent bears a striking similarity to the location of the British Isles with respect to the continent of Europe, and express the hope that in its rebuilding plan Great Britain, which is traditionally far-sighted, consider moving some of its industries to our Maritime provinces just in case there should be further trouble in Europe—for no one knows what the future holds.

I submit to honourable senators that the happiness, the security and the prosperity of Canada make it imperative that we should work for the closest possible economic arrangements between us and those people with whom we have most in common; and to this end we should become part of a trade section which includes the United Kingdom and the United States, and afterwards help to extend it as far and as rapidly as circumstances permit. I believe this is a matter of tremendous importance, and if any suggestions that I have made with respect to our delegates should prove of value, I shall be happy indeed.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gouin, the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.

THE SENATE

THURSDAY, April 5, 1945.

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. King:

That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the following resolution:

Whereas the Government of Canada has been invited by the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of 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 in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and

Whereas the invitation suggests that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization which have been made public by the four governments which participated in the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and

Whereas the Government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference,

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON.

Therefore be it resolved:

1. That this House endorses the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference;

2. That this House recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. That this House approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization;

4. That this House agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to Parliament for approval.

Hon. L. M. GOUIN: Honourable senators, I am absolutely convinced that it is my duty as a Canadian as well as a Christian to support the resolution concerning the San Francisco Conference. Everyone of us has already taken communication of the proposals which are to be considered by the delegates and which were, for the greater part, adopted at Dumbarton Oaks, and made public on October 9, 1944. The first paragraph of those proposals states that there should be established an international organization under the title of "The United Nations."

Paragraph 1 of Chapter III declares:

Membership of the organization should be open to all peace-loving states.

In other words, it is assumed, first, that "the states of the world form a community," and secondly, that "the protection and advancement of the common interests of their peoples require the effective organization of such a community of states." These words, which are taken as self-explanatory, are borrowed from the first postulate of a statement prepared by a group of North American jurists, to which I belong, and which met under the chairmanship of Judge Manley Hudson. That statement, by the way, if I remember correctly, was published in the Canadian Bar Review of April, 1944.

Chapter II is entitled "Principles," and Paragraph 1 reads:

The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states.

Does it follow from this, honourable senators, that each state is to have only one vote? I say no, and in support of my stand I would refer honourable senators to section A of

Chapter V, which deals with the General Assembly. It reads as follows:

Composition: All members of the Organization should be members of the General Assembly and should have a number of representatives to be specified in the Charter.

As honourable members will have noticed, over the week-end the newspapers published statements, whether well-founded or not, to the effect that the principle of "one state, one vote" would not be adhered to, but that instead Great Britain, the United States and Soviet Russia might each be given several votes. Later it was declared, authoritatively or otherwise, that the United States would not take the initiative in asking for more than one vote. Whatever may be the practical issues on that question, I intend to discuss the principles which are involved and which will remain true, independently of any policy that may be adopted. I have just mentioned the first principle of the proposals, namely, the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and I wish to remark at once that too broad an interpretation should not be given to that principle or doctrine. We all realize perfectly well, I think, that in fact all states are not equal to one another. This truth becomes absolutely obvious if we look, for instance, at the map of our western hemisphere. The democracies of the new world are unequal by whatever test we assess and measure them: they differ completely in natural resources, size, population, industrial and agricultural production, commercial and financial power, military strength, standards of living and of civilization, and so on. If the contemplated international organization persisted in treating all states as being perfectly equal, that rule would, I submit, be as unjust as a rule which would give equal voting power to every shareholder in a company, irrespective of the number of his shares. That analogy is cited from a work entitled "The League of Nations," second edition, page 61, by the well-known author Pollock. Another authority, Brierly, referring to the doctrine of equality, states in "The Law of Nations," second edition, pages 91 and 92, that

is a true theory only if it means that the rights of one state, whatever they may be, are as much entitled to the protection of law as the rights of any other, that is to say, if it merely denies that the weakness of a state is any excuse in law for disregarding its legal rights. This is the only sense in which any system of law can be said to recognize legal equality; all Englishmen are equally entitled to have their rights upheld by the law, but they do not have equal rights.

A few lines further on Brierly adds that by giving too wide an interpretation to the theory of equality the smaller states have proffered:

—unreasonable claims which have seriously hampered the improvement of international organization. One such incident occurred at the Hague Conference in 1907, when the scheme for an international court of justice, upon which agreement had been almost reached, was wrecked by the refusal of some of the smaller powers to agree to anything less than equal representation of every state upon the court. The doctrine was innocuous so long as there existed practically no co-operative management of affairs of general international interest; if it is to be used to justify a claim by every state to an equal voice in the further organization of international society, it will be not only indefensible and unjust in principle, but obstructive of progress.

In other words, on the basis of the doctrine that all men in the so-called "state of nature" are equal to one another—a proposition entirely untrue, according to Brierly, page 90—jurists of the so-called "naturalist school" of international law, such as Pufendorf, Vattel and others, have professed the theory of equality of states.

But let us remark here that this false equalitarian doctrine has never in fact afforded any real protection to a weak state; it has never prevented effectively any act of aggression. Therefore, while I claim that the rights of the weakest of all the states of the earth are entitled to the full protection of international law, with all the sanctions provided by the new charter, on the other hand, I am a firm believer in the doctrine which is sometimes described as the "functional theory"—the theory of representation upon a functional basis. This means that duties always correspond to rights; that the assumption of heavier responsibilities in any particular field of action entitles a given state to a greater voice in the deliberations of the international community. In other words it does not seem fair that all members of the international community should have equal voting power irrespective of their contributions to the maintenance of justice and order in the world.

I would refer to the contributions of nations in the past and to the part those nations will probably play in world affairs as the guardians of peace. In view of their past contributions, it seems quite logical to grant more than one vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations to first-class powers, such as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Even a secondary or middle power like Canada, as honourable members know has made much greater sacrifices and put forth a much greater war effort than the majority of the other minor powers, and in fairness to the Canadian people such a fact should in some way be recognized.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: In the days to come our great Commonwealth and the United States of America probably will have to bear again the bulk of the burden in order to maintain international peace. We should have no illusions about that. Such onerous duties should be accompanied by a greater influence in the councils of the United Nations. Our great and glorious country, Canada, is now of full age, enjoying the plenitude of her rights as a free, independent and sovereign state; and as such, the "Land of the Maple Leaf" undoubtedly is entitled to speak and to vote in her own name at the San Francisco conference or any other future international assembly.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: I concede to no other power, no matter how friendly, the prerogative of speaking on our behalf, unless, of course, on some special occasion we have agreed to make its representative our own official agent and mouthpiece. I admire the heroic people of Great Britain. I lived with them in the dark days of November and December, 1944. I shared their sufferings and their meagre rations, and with them I underwent the daily attacks of the V-1's and V-2's and I have the deepest personal admiration for the greatest statesman of the present world war, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: Again and again I have paid my compliments to the indomitable courage of the valiant population of the British Isles. I wish to assure my friends over there that my compliments were perfectly sincere, and to state emphatically that the enemies of Great Britain are my enemies. But I am a Canadian citizen, and as such I want the representatives of Canada at the San Francisco conference to speak as Canadians; to stand, of course, at the side of the British delegation as members of the same family, but to bring their own individual contribution to the debates as the special envoys of Canada.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: We now come to the most-discussed provision of all in the proposals, the notorious veto clause. As honourable senators are aware, as a result of a further agreement between the United Kingdom, the United States, Soviet Russia and China, an amendment was added under Section C of Chapter VI, which, to be quite frank, gives the power of absolute veto to any of the four Great Powers already mentioned, and also "in due course"—whatever may be the exact meaning of those words—to my own beloved

Hon. Mr. GOUIN.

France. Through the power of the veto thus conferred upon them those five permanent members of the Security Council would really be above the law. Personally, I wish to register my formal protest against the injustice which would result from the adoption of such a system. It would, in my opinion, establish a flagrant discrimination in favour of the "Big Five", for undoubtedly not one of the five permanent members of the Security Council would vote for action against itself should it ever be guilty of an act of aggression against another state. Generally speaking, the international organization which is contemplated meets with my hearty approval, but unless the veto clause is modified, its innate defect will, I fear, be an ominous threat to the future peace of the world.

I admit at once that the solution of the problem is not to be found in a too broad interpretation of the doctrine of the sovereign equality of states, which I have just discussed and to some extent have discarded. I realize fully the difficulty of the situation, but I sincerely hope that our delegates will do their utmost to find an appropriate remedy for the anomaly which I have just criticized.

I wish also with all my heart that Poland were to be duly represented at the San Francisco Conference. Surely the admirable heroism, the terrible sufferings, of that glorious and tragic country entitle her to a seat among the United Nations!

I trust that when our Canadian representatives enter the conference hall at San Francisco their presence will be most cordially and enthusiastically welcomed. To-day no country enjoys a greater moral prestige than Canada. All the peoples of the world know the courage and the valour of our armed forces on the fighting front, and are familiar with the colossal, even miraculous, war effort which has been made by Canadian men and women on the industrial and agricultural fronts. Our contribution far exceeds anything which could normally be expected from a country of only eleven and a half million inhabitants. Canada has every right to be proud of the splendid record of her soldiers, her airmen and her sailors, her farmers and her workmen.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: During my recent mission overseas in connection with the educational services for our armed forces, everywhere in Europe it was my privilege to realize that in the esteem of the good people over there Canada has risen to the rank of a great international power. May I add that my work—under the direction of our devoted and competent education officers—has been the most interesting experience of my whole life. I have

put all my heart into the faithful execution of my assignments in Great Britain, Northern Ireland, France, Belgium and Holland, and I have always been welcomed by our boys. They are indeed the greatest and finest lot of lads to be found anywhere on earth.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: I may say that it is not without anxiety that our Canadian personnel overseas look to their future after the war. In the various camps, bases, and hospitals in Europe which I visited, and in the various messes where I took my meals, again and again I was asked the question: "Now, or soon after the cessation of hostilities, what can we do? What subjects can we study in order to earn a decent living? To the sacred cause of the education of our soldiers, airmen, and sailors, I have already devoted a few months of my life. With them and for them I faced many dangers, I lived in huts and buildings without heat in the coldest time of winter; but despite these dangers and discomforts I have only one desire—to go back once more to my dear young comrades, and, if possible, to follow them on their victorious and glorious march to Berlin.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. GOUIN: I want with all my heart and soul to do everything within my power to make sure that the veterans of World War No. 2 will be more fairly treated than were those of the first World War. Never forget, honourable senators, that our boys are real heroes and are entitled to every educational facility which will help towards their successful re-establishment in civilian life. I have already done something for them. I intend to continue to do my wee bit and to carry on my educational job. In fact, the greatest opportunity for us, the education officers—our own D-Day—will come soon after the order "Cease Fire!" has been given following the occupation by our troops of Germany—then the land of total defeat.

Some unavoidable delays have prevented me from returning overseas as soon as I had intended. My transfer from the R.C.A.F. to the Canadian Army is only now being completed. I do not expect to sit here again until the last of our Canadian soldiers, whether he be English-speaking or French-speaking, shall have returned from Europe. This shall be my contribution to our national unity! I offer my life and my work for my country and my compatriots, to bring about a better understanding among all of us.

As my final words I would quote the well known sentence of Honoré Mercier: "Let us cease our fratricidal strifes! Let us unite!"

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. NORMAN P. LAMBERT: Honourable senators, my first words must express my pleasure and congratulation upon the character of the debate on this subject as it has been conducted in both Houses of Parliament. Without exception the contributions from all quarters have been worth while; but I think they have been made with a greater measure of objectivity in this Chamber than in the other. It is most gratifying to observe the widespread interest of the members of both Houses in this vital subject of international peace and security.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: I should like particularly to express my admiration for the very lucid and comprehensive exposition of the different clauses of the charter which the honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) presented to us last week. I must also express my deep appreciation of the inspiring report which the honourable senator who has just taken his seat (Hon. Mr. Gouin) has placed before us in connection with his recent mission to our forces overseas. I am sure honourable members will join me in wishing him God-speed on his return, knowing full well that he will acquit himself with the ability and whole-hearted devotion to duty which has characterized his services in this Chamber.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: No subject could be more appropriate for consideration by the Senate than the resolution before us to-day, and I trust that this debate is just the beginning of many discussions here on the important question of international affairs. I should like to suggest now that through our Standing Committee on External Relations, which will be meeting again before long, and through further discussions in this Chamber, honourable senators should assume some increased measure of responsibility for spreading enlightenment on this question amongst the people of our country.

I wish to emphasize much that the honourable senator who has just sat down said about the basis of this country's representation at San Francisco, and to support his general attitude with respect to the growing sense of Canadian nationality in this Dominion.

In view of uncertainties which have developed and been reported in the Press during the past few days, the subject of the San Francisco conference becomes even more hypothetical as a basis for discussion than it was last week. We have no alternative, however, but to proceed with the discussion. In

any case, the proposals which are supposed to be considered at San Francisco, known as the Dumbarton Oaks plan, represent merely a draft constitution of an international post-war organization for the preservation of the world's peace. The beginning of these proposals, it is worth remembering, came in October, 1943, at the Moscow Conference, when the representative heads of four great allied powers declared:

The necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

I think these words, "based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small," should be definitely underlined for our attention.

When considering the proposed powers of the principal members of the Security Council, it would be well for us to ponder over the possible reasons for such a declaration being made at Moscow in 1943. In my opinion it was made as an expression of war aims, and as a steadying influence for all democratic countries. Honourable members will recall that prior to 1943 a considerable body of opinion was being created in both Great Britain and the United States in support of the thought that the interests at stake in this war could not be successfully prosecuted without a statement of war aims. I believe that when the heads of the four Great Powers met at Moscow in 1943 they decided that because a great many countries would inevitably be devastated and the whole world would suffer from economic and financial disruption, the time had come when it was necessary to make a concession to the rising tide of opinion to which I have referred. That declaration was made the subject of study by the representatives of the four Great Powers at Dumbarton Oaks in the United States last summer, and from that conference emanated all the proposals that we now have before us, except section C in Chapter VI, which deals with voting privileges in the Security Council and was formulated more recently at Yalta. In any event the proposals represent for us now only the views of the Great Powers on the kind of organization required to maintain future peace.

At San Francisco these proposals will go before the larger body of some forty-four nations, including the Great Powers, for consideration and debate. Much criticism of the details of the Dumbarton Oaks constitution has already arisen in different parts of the world, and amendments and adjustments in

its provisions will undoubtedly be made before the constitution finally takes its form and is referred to us again for ratification. In the meantime our function here is to analyse the text before us and make whatever suggestions we deem advisable for the guidance of our delegates, whether they may wish to adopt them or not.

It seems to me, however, that the important point to stress now is that the Parliament of Canada, as well as the legislative bodies of all countries sending delegates to California, should reflect a willingness and determination to assume obligations and commitments for the maintenance of peace. I agree with those who urge that there should be no evasion of our responsibility in this connection. Both Houses of Parliament are making it clear to the Canadian delegation that this country desires to become a member of the new world organization and proposes to accept whatever obligations finally emerge from the deliberations at San Francisco. The important clauses of the constitution relating to voting powers and sanctions will be thoroughly debated and decided upon, and the final draft will be submitted to us for ratification. It should be clearly understood now that that ratification must be final and without reservation; and it will be the duty of our delegates to make clear the basis on which the charter will be acceptable to Canada.

This naturally leads to the question of Canada's status internationally. If Canada is to make commitments such as suggested in regard to the enforcement of sanctions in Chapter 8, the only sound and practical way in which she can make them is as a national entity, completely responsible for all the implications of such a position. Certainly we could not entertain the thought of Great Britain, or any one Empire voice, committing this country to the enforcement of sanctions. It seems to me that on this point Canada inevitably must be prepared in future to accept full responsibility for the character of her own external and foreign relations.

This thought brings me to the very important matter of representation for this country and other countries participating in the new world organization. I do not think enough attention has been paid to this aspect of the subject during the course of the debate in this Chamber—or in the debate in the other House, for that matter. To my mind, the success or failure of the conference at San Francisco in reaching a desirable objective, will be commensurate with its ability to found the new association of United Nations on an equitable and democratic basis. Representation in this world organization must be based

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT.

as completely as possible upon, for one thing, the principle of "no taxation without an adequate voice" in the decisions to be made. Otherwise, I cannot see Canada, or any other nation, assuming obligations for any kind of sanctions.

My friend, the honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) the other day dealt with the significance of the veto power given to any one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, which, as the charter now stands, is the predominant factor in controlling the entire world organization. He thought that under such a provision Canada would be in a favourable position because of her friendly relationship with the United States on the one hand and Great Britain on the other. But I am of the opinion, and I feel very strongly on the matter, that our position should be made clearer than that. I agree with the honourable senator that Canada should not try to throw her weight around; and I think I can assure him and other honourable members here that there is not much chance of that happening under the leadership of the present Prime Minister of this country. I do believe, however, that Canada's influence should be exerted, and should be felt, because we have something definite to contribute, something which is now being recognized outside of our own boundaries. If we are to be subject to commitments in future, and that is implied in our approach to the whole question, we must have adequate representation in the deliberations and decisions of any organization of the United Nations. At present, under the provisions of the charter, the supporting members are divided into two classes: the five Great Powers—and others. Amongst the five so-called Great Powers there are two doubtful quantities—at least for the present purposes of the organization—namely, China and France. It may be said truthfully that insofar as the San Francisco conference is concerned, it will be the Great Powers—the United States, Russia and the United Kingdom—who, under the powers assigned to the Security Council, together with their voting privileges, will have the burden of maintaining the peace of the world. The remaining forty-one or forty-two countries represented at San Francisco, who will largely compose the membership of the General Assembly, will consider themselves obligated to accept the decisions of the Security Council and to carry them out in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. As these proposals now stand, therefore, Canada has no more assurance of having a vote on the Council than some state that has little or no contribution to make.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: But more chance of being elected.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: More chance of being elected, but less of having something to say.

This failure on the part of the charter in its draft form to distinguish between states which have something to offer to the world's security and those which have very little, strikes directly at Canada's position. This fact has been noted and commented upon outside of this country as well as within, and has raised the suggestion of the classification of so-called "middle powers." After all, there is no country which would be more likely to be involved in another world war than Canada. One of the clear results of the present conflict has been to make of Canada a buffer state between two very great powers—as definitely a buffer area as ever Belgium was between France and Germany. In this connection I should like to quote the London Economist:

If Canada is prevented by the smallness of her population from taking rank with the great powers, she has . . . made a place for herself in a category all her own. . . . In absolute terms, the distance that separates Canada from the Great Powers is less than that between her own achievements and that of any other of the smaller United Nations.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Then, the London Times says:

Once recognition of the special position of the Great Powers is translated into constitutional terms, formidable new difficulties arise; for if it removes the absurdity of treating Albania as an equal partner with the United States, Britain or Russia, it leaves open the absurdity equally patent and (once differentiation has been admitted) far more invidious of placing Albania on the same footing with Canada or Brazil.

The last quotation which I shall make in this connection is from the London Spectator, which says:

There is no recognized criterion for the assessment of the magnitude of states, but certainly a mere arbitrary division into great and small will not stand. Despite her limited population Canada has exerted during the war a military and industrial effort which puts her little, if at all, below the pre-war France as a world power by any method of estimation. The Spectator has repeatedly made the point that this problem of power would have to be solved by a more realistic division than is set down in the charter. It cannot be a case of "Great Powers" and the rest, for the rest consists not merely of Liberias and Costa Ricas, but equally of Canadas and Brazils.

In order to meet and overcome this weakness in the draft charter, Canada, through her Prime Minister, has already presented her theory of functional representation as

exemplified by the setting up of such international organizations as UNRRA; the International Civil Aviation Organization, with headquarters in Montreal; the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as well as the International Labour Organization and the Universal Postal Union, which have been in existence for many years.

In July, 1943, the Prime Minister said that representation on international bodies;

—should be determined on a functional basis which will admit to full membership those countries, large or small, which have the greatest contribution to make to the particular object in question.

Again on August 4 last when referring specially to a proposed security plan, the Prime Minister said:

The Great Powers are called by that name simply because they possess great power. The other states of the world possess power—and, therefore, the capacity to use it for the maintenance of peace—in varying degrees ranging from almost zero in the case of the smallest and weakest states, up to a military potential not very far behind that of the Great Powers.

In determining what states should be represented on the Council with the Great Powers, it is, I believe, necessary to apply the functional idea. Those countries which have most to contribute to the maintenance of the peace of the world should be most frequently selected. The military contribution actually made during this war by the members of the United Nations provides one good working basis for a selective principle of choice.

The functional theory of representation, as set forth by the Prime Minister, is a sound challenge to the theory of the "sovereign equality of all nations," which is the formula used in the declaration from Moscow, and the basis of the present charter. In practice, states do not exert equal influence either in peace or in war. That is why the Great Powers have always been able to dominate the world. The danger is that a few of these great powers will emerge from the present world situation as an international dictatorship. As long as "sovereign equality" is the dominating slogan of a world conference the real power will be shared only within a small group of states.

When referring to the functional theory of representation, it should be noted that it is more than a theory so far as Canada is concerned. Our part in the setting up of the organization called UNRRA, and our representation on it now, form a practical example not only of a sound and equitable basis of international co-operation, but of the real influence exerted by Canada in an important world cause. It is worth mentioning here that membership in UNRRA is based upon one per cent of the national income of the par-

ticipating nations. We have already voted \$10,000,000 on that account.

In the discussions which took place at Bretton Woods on financial and monetary matters, it is no secret that Canada's representatives had a great deal to do with the shaping of the final report which came from that conference. And likewise at Chicago it was definitely the influence of the Canadian delegation which saved for the world some prospect of establishing an international association in civil aviation.

These illustrations surely go to prove that definite functions to be performed in serving a world need are a sound basis of representation in any world set-up. As a matter of fact it has been well said recently by a competent observer that the future success of the United Nations will be assured when and if the Economic and Financial Council provided for under the charter has been able, through this functional service, to take the place of the Security Council itself.

The most fundamental question that can be discussed at San Francisco also, I repeat, a standard for equitable representation in a world organization. It should be pursued until the right formula is devised and accepted.

A number of different ideas for the permanent establishment of a representative system of world security have been submitted from many quarters. In an informative and interesting article published a couple of weeks ago in the New York Times the idea of a "weighted" or balanced representation for an international conference was advanced. Six different plans were suggested. I shall not attempt to outline them all. They vary from suggestions of representation on the bases of land area, population and commerce to the length of national frontiers, literacy, migration, means of communication, and numbers of international treaties which a country may have entered into. Commander Stassen, while Governor of Minnesota, insisted that a good formula could be found to include several factors. He mentioned literacy, the contribution of each nation to expenses of joint government, and the natural resources of each nation. Others have suggested plans of proportional representation, based on arbitrary calculation of the size of a properly constituted world assembly.

These six plans simply illustrate the work of some thoughtful people upon this question. The important point is that they all recognize that nations are not equal, and that the fairest and most acceptable basis for voting power is that which emphasizes the human achievements, as well as population, of the different nations.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT.

Now, in view of the uncertainties which have arisen during the past week in connection with the San Francisco conference, it is possible that all that may come out of it just now will be a continuation of the present grand alliance of United Nations for the purpose of ending this war and creating some kind of world order, out of which later a permanent system of peace might develop. That seems to have been the prevailing idea at the recent conference of South American and North American representatives held in Mexico City. The Act of Chapultepec which issued from that conference provided for a provisional interim security system, effective immediately, whose chief responsibility will be to draft a permanent treaty embodying certain principles to be decided upon at a later date. Incidentally, Canada has been invited to join with these South American nations and with the United States in this Pan-American arrangement for the future. At any rate, it is to be hoped, as suggested by Mr. Walter Lippmann the other day, that before April 25 the principal powers, through diplomacy, may be sufficiently in agreement to avoid any public disturbances or ruptures in present Allied international relations. If such agreement cannot be reached in the preliminary conversations of the "Big Three" which are supposed to be held in Washington before April 25, then the San Francisco conference might be postponed until it had a better chance of succeeding; or it could go ahead on the basis of an entirely different objective from that contained in the present charter. It must be admitted that at this date even these modifications in the publicized plans for the San Francisco conference would be most unfortunate.

Reference to the results of the present conference in Mexico City serves to emphasize the use of regional arrangements and agencies as part of the machinery for maintaining world peace. The present charter contemplates such a possibility, and membership in the new world organization may involve the necessity of membership in an appropriate regional group. This war has made it quite evident that for economic and strategic purposes regional commitments for Allied defence and offence have been regarded as essential to the joint cause. Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States have all signed mutual defence agreements, which are distinctly regional in their application. Great Britain herself attempted in 1940 to form a federal union with France, and now for economic and financial reasons, her advisers are recommending the establishment of a regional bloc based upon the pound sterling. Mr. Churchill a couple of years ago suggested that the most practical method of reorganizing world relations

after the war might be to establish three great regions or zones of control, described roughly as the Asiatic, the European and the Pan-American areas. It is clear that regional interests would to a certain extent overlap in such an arrangement. For example, all the Great Powers have considerable interests and responsibilities in the Pacific. But an effective measure of co-operation for world peace might be easier to realize through three representative regional organizations than through one world agency directed by a council of three or four Great Powers.

After considering the new world charter from these several angles, we are finally confronted with the realistic question: What is the alternative to it all? The failure of the United Nations at San Francisco to give some hope of world stabilization would do much to intensify a condition of chaos and demoralization from which no nation would escape. The very existence of civilization itself would seem to be at stake, and I believe that Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin have thought of this danger from the first of their conferences. That is possibly the best reason why the California conference must succeed.

Over the long term of years ahead the development and strengthening of an international institution which shall protect the peace of the world will depend upon the development of a different sort of world psychology from that which has controlled peoples of past generations. It is, I think, becoming increasingly evident that the self-centred thing called "national sovereignty" must be enveloped in a broader consideration of human democracy. The word democracy itself needs re-shaping in the minds of us all. It is not enough to equate democracy with our acknowledged system of parliamentary or responsible government, or with our so-called systems of capitalism and individual enterprise. These are only the forms of certain aspects of democracy. The great message which the United Nations must ultimately convey to the world as the result of their war against totalitarianism and dictatorship is that democracy is a dynamic system, devoted to securing the largest possible measure of freedom and welfare and development for the maximum number of individual human beings throughout the world, regardless of national boundaries. To begin to realize even a small measure of such an objective will require a far-reaching and fundamental change in the political thinking of democratic peoples everywhere. A brilliant American woman, Susanne Langer, summed it all up the other day when she said:

What we need, and what the leaders of our age should aim at and foster, is (1) trans-

national thinking; (2) international planning, and (3) super-national administration and law. How far it will be possible to achieve even the beginning of this new outlook for mankind upon a world that has been devastated by war, the coming conference in California will answer, at least in part. To provide that answer will not be a simple task. Canada's part in it may seem unpromising and unimportant, but this country has a peculiar and really worth-while contribution to make at this time. It is a two-fold contribution. Canada seeks no territorial gain; she has no desire for world power. She occupies an important strategical area of the world's contracting surface. By a fine example of international co-operation in this war she has contributed largely to its success, and is in a position to give further of her wealth and resources to help re-establish the world on a civilized basis. Further, by taking her due place internationally, she contributes to the upbuilding of her own character and individuality.

The problem of welding forty nations into an international organization for peace is not unlike the welding of nine provinces into a dominion. If it is difficult for nine provinces, strung across half a continent, to recognize the need for unity of purpose and action internally as a nation, how much more difficult will it be for forty different nations, distributed all round the globe, of different race, language and economic interest, to reach the necessary measure of agreement to bring about the peace of the world? And yet the very act of approaching this great task, with full appreciation of the obstacles to be overcome, may well have the effect of helping Canada to overcome her own internal weaknesses. By the very process of contact with other peoples in international conference we may, in perspective, very well see ourselves as others see us. Our young men and women abroad to-day fighting for their country have that perspective; they know what it is to be Canadians. California may well become the mirror in which this country for the first time may see herself in true proportion.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Without that vision we cannot expect to do much for ourselves or the world at large. The responsibility for measuring up to the standard expected of us in our demands for increased national and international status is right here, in these Chambers of Parliament, in the kind of thinking and leadership which we give to this idea.

Before taking my seat, I should like to say a word about the political situation in Canada, as suggested by the subject now before us. And here, may I say, I have no

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT.

desire to introduce any controversial or partisan note. Last November, when the amendment to Bill 80 was before the Senate, I ventured to predict that this Parliament was more likely to be prolonged than to be dissolved in the near future. My thought was based upon the immediate prospect of the most serious battles of the war on the Western Front, and the impossibility of any Government, sensitive and responsive to the state of public opinion, attempting to disturb or disrupt conditions at home while we were going through that ordeal. This prediction of mine provoked considerable dissent from some of my friends opposite, who, it seemed to me, were rather putting themselves in the position of thinking more about defeating Mackenzie King than anything else. Now we are beginning to see the end of the war in Europe, and our minds are turning to the affairs of peace. We are also within twelve days of the expiration of the life of this Parliament. By virtually a unanimous vote, the Government is being authorized by Parliament to send a non-partisan delegation to the conference at San Francisco. Whereas it was impossible to get unanimity for war six months ago, it seems possible to get a fair degree of unanimity for peace now. Let me ask, honourable senators, where and to whom will the Canadian mission to California report when it comes home? If present indications materialize, there will be no Parliament to report to at that time. Will the results of the conference, so far as Canada is concerned, be thrown into the controversial arena of a general election campaign, or will the friends of my honourable friends opposite be prepared to follow through with the same whole-hearted and non-partisan support which has characterized their position during this debate in both Houses?

Suppose for a moment that the present Government met defeat in a general election, and that the leader and possibly all the members of the delegation from the other House were unable to appear in the next Parliament. Would the continuity of Canada's interests in the cause of peace be then well served? This, I maintain, is a very proper question to be raised in the Senate, which is enabled by the Constitution to safeguard the continuity of such a vital national interest. Because this is so, it seems to me that the delegates who go from the Senate to San Francisco will have an added responsibility thrown upon them. I might almost argue that a much larger delegation from the Senate than has been forecast should go to the conference, in order that the country may be assured that its representatives will have a

place in which to make a report when they come back from their work. I mention all this because I believe there is still some ground for thinking that the life of this Parliament should be extended instead of being dissolved.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: The delegation to San Francisco would then submit its report and recommendations to the bodies that authorized it to go there, and thereby the Canadian electorate would receive much needed enlightenment and leadership on the subject before being asked to go to the polls to elect a new Parliament and a new Government. What is of greater importance still, in my opinion, is that the hundreds of thousands of young men and women who are actively engaged in serving this country's war needs abroad would be given more time to bring to bear the full impact of their thought and influence upon the great question dealt with at the conference. Certainly they have a larger stake in the future than most of us have, and just as certainly they have earned the right to exercise an active hand in remoulding that future.

I submit, honourable senators, that in the disposal of this matter lies the answer to the question as to whether or not we really believe that the issue of the world's peace represents the most important subject ever to come before a Canadian Parliament.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Sinclair, the debate was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Mr. KING: Honourable senators, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 10, at 8 o'clock in the evening.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 10, at 8 p.m.

THE SENATE

Tuesday, April 10, 1945.

The Senate met at 8 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

PRINCE ALBERT NATIONAL PARK—
COMMERCIAL FISHING

INQUIRY

Hon. Mr. ASELTINE inquired of the Government:

1. Is commercial fishing permitted in the lakes in Prince Albert National Park in Saskatchewan, and if so,—

- (a) In what lakes?
 - (b) To whom was the contract or permit let?
 - (c) Was it let by tender, and if so, where and when were tenders advertised?
 - (d) What was the consideration?
 - (e) What quantities of the different kinds of fish were netted in each of the years 1943, 1944 and 1945 in Kingsmere and Crean lakes.
 - (f) What was the limit authorized by the contract or permit?
 - (g) Was the limit reached in any of said years?
 - (h) Are any restrictions imposed on the sale of the fish so taken?
 - (i) Why is commercial fishing permitted?
 - (j) On whose recommendation was commercial fishing authorized?
 - (k) Who is responsible for the policy of conservation in this national park?
2. Is commercial fishing permitted in any of the other Canadian national parks, and if so, in what parks?

Hon. Mr. KING: These are the answers to the honourable gentleman's questions:

1. Commercial fishing has been allowed from time to time in various lakes in Prince Albert National Park depending on local conditions and the advisability of netting the non-game species. The following answers apply to fishing in the fiscal year 1944-45, with the exception of question (e):

- (a) Kingsmere, Crean and Waskesiu Lakes.
- (b) Mr. Axel Olson, Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, had a permit to net white fish in Crean and Kingsmere Lakes. Mr. Alex M. Pease, Waskesiu Lake, had a permit to net whitefish in Waskesiu Lake.
- (c) Yes. Not advertised in press. A copy of the call for tenders was sent to all known interested persons and posted locally.
- (d) In Crean and Kingsmere Lakes:
Whitefish— $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ per pound.
Other fish accidentally netted as follows—
Pike— $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ per pound.
Pickerel— $\frac{1}{2}$ ¢ per cent.
Lake Trout—8¢ per pound.
In Waskesiu Lake, \$140.00.

(e) Fiscal year 1943-44:	Pounds
Kingsmere Lake—	
All species	84,839
Crean Lake—	
Whitefish	63,845
Yellows	27,641
Jacks	10,846
Mullets	2,512
Lake Trout	11,119

- Fiscal year 1944-45:
Complete returns not available.
- (f) Crean Lake—150,000 pounds.
Kingsmere —100,000 pounds.
Waskesiu — 20,000 pounds.
- (g) No.
- (h) Not on fish taken from Crean and Kingsmere Lakes. Fish netted in Waskesiu Lake must be sold in the Park.

- (i) To reduce the number of whitefish in the lakes and to augment the food supply by replacing meat shortage caused by rationing.
- (j) On the recommendation of (1) Dr. D. S. Rawson, Professor of Biology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, who has been engaged by the Department for a number of seasons to make fish cultural examination of park waters and advise the Department on fish management in the national parks. (2) Department of Fisheries. (3) Officials of the National Parks Bureau.
- (k) The policy of conservation in the national parks is laid down in the National Parks Act, which is administered under the direction of the Minister of Mines and Resources who is advised on matters of policy by officers of the Lands, Parks and Forests Branch.

2. Not in the fiscal year 1944-45. Commercial fishing has been permitted in other national parks at various times when such action was considered advisable. The netting of fish (non-game species) has been allowed in Riding Mountain Park and Waterton Lakes Park.

DELEGATES TO SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

SENATE REPRESENTATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. H. KING: Honourable senators, I should like to refer briefly to the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons on Friday last regarding the delegation which is to accompany him to the World Security Conference to be held at San Francisco, beginning on April 25.

The Prime Minister has expressed the desirability of having the delegates represent as wide a field of political thought in Canada as possible. With this in view, from the parties opposing the Government in the House of Commons, he has invited to accompany him Mr. Gordon Graydon, House leader of the Progressive Conservative party and Mr. J. M. Coldwell, leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The Government side of the House will be represented by the Prime Minister, the Honourable Mr. Louis S. St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, and Mrs. Cora Casselman, the lady member from the constituency of Edmonton.

I am sure it will be gratifying to honourable senators to know that this Chamber will have two of its members on that delegation.

In the matter of representation, I think we have been generously treated. As Govern-

Hon. Mr. KING.

ment leader in the Senate, I have been asked to attend this conference. I wish to say that I feel greatly honoured, not only because I have been chosen a member of the delegation, but also at being one of the two selected for the signal honour of representing the Senate of Canada.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. KING: I am very appreciative of the distinction which has been conferred upon me, and also of the great responsibilities and obligations thereby entailed. I can only say that I will give my best judgment and ability to the matters that will come to us for consideration.

At this point I should like to thank honourable senators who, after much thought and great care, have delivered such excellent speeches in this Chamber on the subject of the San Francisco conference. I assure them that their addresses will receive most careful study.

I know we all regret that my honourable friend the leader opposite (Hon. C. C. Ballantyne) has not found it possible to accept the invitation extended to him by the Prime Minister to be one of the representatives of this Chamber at the conference. In a letter to the Prime Minister, the honourable gentleman has indicated that he will be unable to accept this responsibility, and so that our record may be complete I should like to read this letter. It is as follows:

The Senate
Canada

April 5, 1945.

My dear Prime Minister:

Referring to the two personal interviews which you graciously gave me last week in Ottawa when you invited me to be one of the Canadian delegation that will be attending the United Nations San Francisco conference to be held on April 25.

Please be assured that I deeply appreciate the high honour of being invited by you to form part of this delegation. Frankly, I can say that I would like very much to have accepted your invitation but owing to so many personal difficulties in the way which I explained to you at our interviews, I regret that it is not possible.

May I be permitted to wish you and your delegation a pleasant and safe trip and every success under your distinguished leadership.

Kindest regards,

Yours sincerely,

C. C. Ballantyne.

Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
P.C., C.M.G.,
Ottawa.

I should like to associate myself with the Prime Minister in expressing disappointment that my honourable friend will not be attending the conference. He would be a very valuable member of the delegation because of

the knowledge and experience he gained in his association with Sir Robert Borden when conferences on peace and security were held after the last war. As is well known, my honourable friend has had a long career in Parliament—in the House of Commons and in the Senate—and his acceptance of the invitation to go to San Francisco would have been most gratifying, I am sure, not only to the Prime Minister but to the other delegates who will accompany him.

The honourable gentleman's inability to accept has necessitated the selection of another senator from the party opposite, and I know that all members of this Chamber are pleased that the honourable senator from La Salle (Hon. Mr. Moraud) has been chosen.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. KING: In him I shall have a distinguished and able colleague who will share with me the honour and responsibility of representing the Senate of Canada at this important and historical conference. I believe we all feel that although the individuals composing the delegation may vary in their political views with regard to affairs in Canada, the delegation as a whole will go to the conference united in its endeavours to realize the hope that is in the mind of the Canadian people, namely, that out of this international organization will come better conditions, world security, and the avoidance of warfare.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE: Honourable senators, I am rather overwhelmed by the kind references to which the honourable leader has just given expression, and I want him to know that I sincerely appreciate what he has said about me. As my letter to the Prime Minister stated, nothing would have given me greater pleasure than to be a member of the delegation to the San Francisco conference. But insurmountable difficulties that I do not need to go into here made this impossible. I take pleasure in informing you, honourable senators, that I was received in a most gracious, friendly and courteous way on two occasions by the Prime Minister, who certainly did his best to prevail upon me to attend the conference; but, as I have already said, it was impossible for me to accept.

I know I speak for all other honourable members of this House as well as for myself when I say that the Prime Minister is fortunate indeed in having the honourable leader of the Government in this House (Hon. Mr. King) as a member of the delegation. It was right and proper that he should have been selected, not only because of the position he

holds in this Chamber, but because of the fact that he has had a long and distinguished career in public service, first as a member of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, and since as a member of Parliament and as a Minister of the Crown. The knowledge that he has accumulated and the ability that he has developed during his long years of service eminently fit him to go to the conference as the senior delegate from this Chamber.

May I be permitted also to extend my congratulations to my honourable friend from La Salle (Hon. Mr. Moraud), who has been selected as the second delegate from the Senate. The Prime Minister was good enough to call me at Montreal by telephone and say that he was desirous that the delegation from Canada should not exceed seven members, and inasmuch as a French-speaking member of the other House was a delegate, in the person of the Minister of Justice, it was thought only right and proper that a French-speaking member of the Senate, and especially such a distinguished one as my honourable friend from La Salle, should be chosen from our side of this Chamber. I speak, Senator Moraud, not only for myself, but for every honourable senator on this side of the House in wishing you a safe and pleasant journey and a successful mission.

Before I sit down may I join with the honourable leader opposite (Mr. King) in again expressing the hope so often expressed in this Chamber during the debate that the San Francisco Conference will result in the laying of a sure and lasting foundation for world peace and security.

Hon. LUCIEN MORAUD: Honourable senators, I wish to thank the honourable leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. King) and my own leader (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) for the kind words they have just spoken about me. I must say that when we adjourned last week I had not expected that this honour would fall upon me. I was only advised of it on Sunday last.

I am very sorry that the honourable leader on our side, who is so well qualified to be a delegate to the conference, could not accept the Prime Minister's invitation—and, without false modesty, I should like to add that many of my colleagues are better qualified than I am to be included among those who are to go to San Francisco. However, I understood that whatever might be my deficiencies it was my duty to serve, and I feel greatly honoured. I can assure honourable members that I am fully aware of the obligations which I have undertaken, and of the consequences which

we all hope will flow from this conference. You may be certain that I will do my best to prove worthy of the confidence which has been placed in me.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Thursday, April 5, the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. King:

That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the following resolution:

Whereas the Government of Canada has been invited by the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of 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 in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and

Whereas the invitation suggests that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization which have been made public by the four governments which participated in the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and

Whereas the Government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference,

Therefore be it resolved:

1. That this House endorses the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference;

2. That this House recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of mankind; and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. That this House approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization.

4. That this House agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to Parliament for approval.

Hon. ELIE BEAUREGARD: Honourable senators, the motion before us calls for the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the invitation from the Government of the United States to send representatives to the San Francisco conference, which is planned

Hon. Mr. MORAUD.

as a general assembly of peace-loving nations to draft a world charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

So far I have heard of no good reason why Canada should refuse the invitation. Canada has invested heavily in world peace. With a population of a little more than eleven million, she has invested in world peace nearly one million men and some twenty billion dollars.

Let us not expect too much of the San Francisco conference. Let us be satisfied that a great deal will have been accomplished if forty odd nations get together and agree to agree on ways and means to prevent future aggression and another world war. The Dumbarton Oaks conference outlined the establishment of four bodies as well as a code of international procedure. The San Francisco conference is expected to accept as a basis for an international organization the principle of four bodies—that is, a General Assembly, a Security Council, an Economic and Social Council, and an International Court of Justice—and is to draft rules of practice and a code of international procedure applicable to such bodies. The preliminary proposals, as set out in this pamphlet, have been studied and explained at length in both Houses of Parliament, so that honourable members are thoroughly conversant with them; but it is probable that they will be amended and revised ad infinitum by the conference.

Our attention has more than once been called to the suggestion that permanent members of the organization are not to be subjected to force by the Security Council. Much may be said for and against Chapter VI, section C, paragraph 3. It boils down to this, that for the time being the "Big Three" will be the pillars of the world peace structure. If any of them are removed the whole structure must collapse. War against any one of the "Big Three" cannot be restricted to any given area; it means world war again.

Much concern has been aroused by the news release that Russia would have two voices in the General Assembly. It has been intimated that this might induce nations in the Russian sphere of influence to come into the Soviet fold without losing too much of their sovereignty. This may be entirely without foundation. But does it really matter? A big power like Russia can speak loud enough with one voice. It is not the number of voices, but the power behind them that counts. If the voice of Canada is not to be lost in the grand chorus, let us not try to assume a role out of proportion to our importance. We may achieve more if we do not attempt the impossible.

It has been reiterated time and again that the conference does not purport to be a peace conference. The delegates will not have to re-shape the map of Europe, decide as to the punishment of war criminals, or provide for modes of control and indemnities. The conference is limited to the drafting of laws, by-laws and measures designed to promote peace and prevent aggression.

The laws are to be formulated before the map of Europe and the Far East is re-shaped. As a rule, laws are made for men, not men for laws. That is to say, if national boundary lines, war penalties and war indemnities are not discussed at the conference, they will be the main topics of discussion in lobbies and caucuses.

With this in view, I should like to add a few words about a matter purposely omitted from the agenda—I refer to the future of Poland. The ghost of Poland will be hanging over the heads of the delegates. Poland is one of our Allies. Canada declared war as soon as Poland was invaded. Poland's sons have waged war shoulder to shoulder with our sons. Poland once saved civilization. Poland is a Christian country of some thirty-five million people. We are proud that Canada is more than ninety per cent a Christian country. During this war Poland has suffered more than any other nation. Yet, notwithstanding all that, Poland has done and suffered in defence of civilization and liberty, she is apparently to be singled out as the one Allied country which may lose the war whatever may be the magnitude of the victory of the Allied Nations.

I am aware that a friend of Poland who spoke in another place was criticized by a local paper for injecting disruptive propaganda into Canadian politics. I am also aware that a member of the Government has tried to justify the so-called Curzon line. We are now concerned with foreign politics, and our delegates will not be in a position to fulfil their mission of peace and security unless they go a little deeper into modern history. In connection with the Curzon line I should like to quote the words of a man who in 1939 was instrumental in settling the eastern border of Poland. I refer to Mr. Oscar Halecki, Director of the Poland Institute of Arts and Sciences in America. Mr. Halecki is an historian of international reputation, and the former head of Warsaw University. Speaking in reference to the Curzon line before the Council of Foreign Relations in Chicago, Mr. Halecki said in part:

How did this line originate? When we were at the peace conference, we did hope that all the frontiers of Poland would be fixed at Versailles, in the East as well as in the West.

To-day many people believe that such an eastern frontier really had been fixed at the conference and that it was the Curzon line. That is entirely untrue. I remember the night, from March 2 to March 3, when all the experts of the Polish Delegation received a telephone call and were told that a memorandum on Poland's eastern frontier was badly needed in order to be submitted to the Big Four. We worked the whole night through and drafted a line more or less in agreement with the line later adopted in the Riga Treaty. I have to confess that we went a little farther by including some districts which were left to Soviet Russia in that treaty, because we knew, for instance, that, in the Ploskirow region in Podoliov there was an enormous Polish peasant population.

At the same time, however, a group of Russian exiles—Russia was not completely silenced at the Paris peace conference—submitted another memorandum suggesting a line which, of course, was not then called the Curzon line, and as a matter of fact was the line of Empress Catherine the Second. In saying that, I am simply repeating what has been stressed in a very interesting article in a Russian newspaper here in this country a few weeks ago. The article said the Curzon line has little to do with the British Foreign Secretary. It is a line drafted by Empress Catherine the Second, a line which in 1795, after the third and total partition of Poland, was supposed to be not an eastern frontier of Poland, but a frontier between Prussia and Austria on the one side, and Russia on the other. Going back to that line at the peace conference of 1919, the Russians made it quite clear that they wanted to keep all of what Russia had annexed in the three partitions of Poland.

Therefore, to say that we had an obligation to consider that line as a definite eastern boundary of Poland is simply misrepresenting history. And considering the problem from a legal point of view, it must be recalled that the decision announced in Article 87 of the Versailles Treaty was carried out in the spring of 1923, when all the great powers, including the United States, definitely recognized the eastern boundaries of Poland as fixed in the Riga Treaty, the boundaries which existed without any controversy until September, 1939, and which not only the Polish government but the Polish people are claiming now.

I am loath, in speaking of Poland, to pronounce her eulogy as if she had passed away. I cannot believe that the Allied nations will quietly proceed to iron out their differences without giving further help to this maimed soldier of liberty and civilization. As regards Poland, the conscience of the world is not at peace; the British conscience is not at peace. For confirmation of this one has only to read the Congressional Record of the United States, and the reports of the House of Commons in Great Britain as they are found in the London Times file in our library.

The Northwest Review of Winnipeg of March 8, 1945, resoundingly echoes the British conscience. I refer to a letter of the Catholic

Bishops of Scotland to the British House of Commons. It is strongly worded. I shall quote only the final appeal.

We earnestly call upon each member of the House of Commons to show in no uncertain way that our honour and our Christian ideals are not to be bartered and sold for undisclosed gains at the price of the faithful ally Poland, condemned to chains and slavery. May the Almighty and Everlasting God in His infinite mercy forbid that this blot on civilization—this outrage on humanity—be perpetuated in the name of the British people.

I would also refer to the April 1945 edition of the well-known Review of World Affairs, published under the chairmanship of Lord Phillimore. It says, in part:

Mr. Eden promised a worried House of Commons that Britain would not recognize the Lublin Committee as it stands, and would not withdraw recognition from the legal Polish Government in London until a new one had been found in strict conformity with the Yalta pledges. This has led to the impasse over the San Francisco conference. That Poland, the causal ally of the war, should not be represented is incredible. It has caused the severest shock throughout Europe. It may do incalculable harm.

I do not forget that Canada is not responsible for the sad fate of Poland; but according to the law of every country there is such a thing as the accomplice after the fact. Under present circumstances, either through silence or formal approval, Canada may become an accomplice after the fact.

Nations, as such, have duties and responsibilities. Canada is engaged in the war, and she will participate in this conference in order to fulfil what the majority of the people consider to be her duty and her responsibility. We may accept the "fait accompli" and dismiss our responsibility as to guilt. That is what a famous Roman procurator did many years ago when he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying: "I am innocent of the blood of this just person, see ye to it." I still hope that Canada, for one, will not abandon Poland without giving her an opportunity to make her plea before the World Security Conference.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BEAUREGARD: While, as a matter of courtesy, our Government was kept posted as to what was going on, Canada was not invited to the Mexico Economic Conference. She was not invited because she was not considered to be an American country. The centre of the world seems to be moving from Europe towards America, and it is possible that before long it will be situated in the

Hon. Mr. BEAUREGARD.

western part of this continent. To what continent do we belong? We will have to make up our minds about that.

The San Francisco Conference is not to be a peace conference; it is to be a conference of peace loving nations. But nations are peace loving only as long as they enjoy a reasonable measure of economic security. That is why the aims of this conference should be inspired by the Atlantic Charter, which all agree should be used as a guide. It will be the duty of our delegates to be governed by the principle of the Atlantic Charter, particularly paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5, to which the Dumbarton Oaks conference intended to give effect by means of an Economic and Social Council dealing with humanitarian aspects of international relations.

Let us repeat these principles of the Atlantic Charter, which every delegate should know by heart:

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Fourth, they will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labour standards, economic adjustment and social security;

Canada will be represented at the conference by a strong delegation. That is well, for delegates of experience and influence are needed. The conference should foster world trade as a means of world security. We shall deal with devastated countries. We shall trade with the American continent. We shall barter with the less solvent countries and sell to and import from the solvent countries. For a secondary power that may prove to be the practical course of action towards peace and security.

Hon. CAIRINE R. WILSON: Honourable senators, the addresses to which we have listened during the past two weeks on the subject of the San Francisco conference have been so excellent that I regret the public has not had a greater opportunity to read the texts. May I extend congratulations to my honourable leader (Hon. Mr. King) and the honourable gentleman from La Salle (Hon. Mr. Moraud), who have been selected to represent us at the conference. I should like

them to know that we fully endorse clause 4 of the resolution now before us, which reads:

That this House agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Also, I should like them to feel that we are prepared to support any measure which will lead to the formation of such an international organization for the guarantee of future peace.

With the honourable senator from Rougemont (Hon. Mr. Beaugard), who has just spoken, I deplore the fact that Poland will not be represented at this conference. I have been an active member of the Canadian Friends of Poland, an organization with which I have done quite a little work.

When speaking on the motion for an Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the honourable senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) made a statement to which I had expected there would be some reference in subsequent speeches. He said:

With all respect and humility I say that the late President of that country made a great mistake, and because he did not carry his own people with him, he probably is as largely responsible as any other man in the world for the terrible conflict in which we are now engaged.

As a former President of the League of Nations Society in Canada, I should like to comment upon that statement. From pronouncements of leaders of opinion in the United States and from views expressed by people with whom I have talked, I have come to the conclusion that the ideals of President Wilson exercised a sound influence upon the thought of the American people and were largely responsible for the swing from the former United States policy of isolation. I heard only yesterday that a Gallup poll showed eighty-two per cent of the people of the United States as favouring participation by their country in such an organization as the League. Two or three years ago the former home of President Wilson was dedicated as a national shrine, and on that occasion his great work was heartily endorsed in a speech by President Roosevelt. Only last week the New York Times quoted Senator Connally, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, as having said at a mass meeting of the League of Women Voters in New York city:

It is sometimes said that the League of Nations was a failure. That is an unjust charge. It may be admitted that it was not a complete success. It did, however, serve a useful purpose.

It was an experiment in a virgin field. It could not be expected to attain perfection. It supplied the foundation, however, for further and more complete exertions for the future. The history of the League will light the pathway along which nations will travel in the years to come.

I may now say that it may form the basis and the concept around which the instrumentality which we seek to establish may be constructed.

The honourable senator from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert), who was present with Sir Robert Borden and Mr. John W. Daffoe at the Peace Conference in Paris, has spoken of the universal acclaim with which President Wilson was received when he presented his much cherished Covenant in the Clock Room of the Foreign Office at the Quai d'Orsay. Great hopes for the future were entertained then, and no person who witnessed the spontaneous enthusiasm with which Wilson was greeted in the streets of London, Paris and Rome could doubt the sincerity of the aspirations for peace which were expressed at the end of the last war.

To those who have followed the sad story of the defeat in the United States Senate of the motion to enter the League of Nations, it is clearly evident that Wilson's political opponents, led by Senators Lodge and Borah, resorted to subterfuge. This is freely admitted by Senator Lodge's chief lieutenant, Senator James Watson of Indiana, in his book "As I Knew Them." It says.

"Eighty per cent of the people are for it. Fully that percentage of the preachers are right now behind it . . . all the people who have been burdened and oppressed by this awful tragedy of war . . . are for it . . . I don't see how it is possible to defeat it. . . ." He turned to me and said, "Ah, my dear James, I do not propose to try to beat it by direct frontal attack but by the indirect method of reservations."

We realize to our sorrow to-day that unfortunately this policy was only too successful.

The first President of the League of Nations Society in Canada was Sir Robert Borden, and to the last he maintained his interest in the Society's work. I am very proud to have been associated with that great man, J. W. Daffoe. I think it is generally conceded that he did more than any of his contemporaries to influence the Canadian public to think internationally.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: It is unfortunate that his powerful personality is absent to-day, for he never failed to keep before us the high ideals upon which the League of Nations was founded. Only this winter, in company with others, I attended a meeting of the executive of the League of Nations Society. We chanced to speak to an officer belonging to an air

crew of the R.C.A.F. We told him of our purpose and said that of course we were accused of being idealists. He replied; "The realists have made a sad mess of things; perhaps it would be better to let the idealists take over". I trust two words may be expunged from the vocabulary of the future: appeasement and realist.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Only last week I received a letter from my son in which he stated:

I am really hoping that this will be the last war, after having seen the thousands of graves of this war and the last. Surely we can get along without it in the future.

The Citizen of April 9 contained an article from the London Observer entitled "Realism". I find it rather disturbing. According to the writer the essential feature of the Dumbarton Oaks plan is:

—a refusal openly and in advance to provide security against the only cases of aggression which are ever likely to trouble seriously the peace of the world: aggression by a great power, or aggression by a smaller one which can count on a great power's support. In both cases the offending great power has, according to the project, the lawful right to veto any action by the Security Council. If the new dispensation had been valid in 1935, Italy, if she were then listed as a great power, would have had the right simply to veto sanctions against her aggression on Abyssinia.

The League of Nations is said to have failed. During a period of twenty-two years it settled thirty-six political disputes, and only appeared to fail conspicuously in the major crises, notably those relating to Manchuria and Ethiopia. The great powers failed to use the League machinery, or used it only partly and half-heartedly.

In his well-reasoned address the honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) said that, whereas to-day the Security Council appeared of supreme importance, in the years to come the social and economic sections of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would become increasingly so, and upon these sections rested the hope for the future peace of the world. I may say that only as recently as last September Winston Churchill stated that there would have been no occasion for the present war if the nations enrolled in the League had fulfilled faithfully the pledges they had given.

To-day one finds it difficult to believe it is less than a hundred and twenty years since policemen first appeared on the streets of London. The lack of protection for citizens was so serious that Sir Robert Peel finally decided that something must be done, and, despite strong opposition in both Houses of Parlia-

Hon. Mrs. WILSON.

ment, he succeeded in securing the passage of a bill for the creation of a police force. At the outset the members of this force were the object of opprobrium and ridicule, but their success in preserving law and order was soon appreciated and the "bobby" became an institution. We know to-day that in Great Britain an unarmed policeman exercises more authority than the armed policeman or gendarme of other countries.

During the years since the last great war, through the international organizations set up after the Paris conference, the Governments of various countries, as well as individuals of many nationalities and races, have learned to work together for the good of all, and have established a basis for further co-operation. In the International Labour Organization we have perhaps the most perfect example of this, for here representatives of governments, of employers and employees meet to discuss and, in many cases, solve their problems. The I.L.O., established under article 23 of the League Covenant, has put through sixty-seven international agreements which provide better working conditions for people all over the world.

The accomplishments of the health section have been remarkable, but I shall only refer to them very briefly. The constantly increasing use of sera in the treatment of many forms of illness rendered some type of international yardstick a necessity. Through the Standards Commission at Geneva an international unit was established, so that a unit of insulin, for example, was the same in any country of Europe as in the United States or Canada. In May, 1944, Dr. Frank G. Boudreau, the former president of the League of Nations Association in the United States said:

When the Health Organization's Service of Epidemiological Intelligence was at its height—around 1937—it received from the countries representing more than 90 per cent of the world's population regular reports on the prevalence and movement of epidemic diseases. When the war is over this system—and indeed every other activity of the League's Health Organization—must be extended and perfected, so that the recent rapid increases in medical science may be put to use by the family of nations to free mankind at long last from the plagues which have beset his path for centuries.

To-day we are confronted with the overwhelming problem of millions of displaced persons, and if these unfortunates are not returned to their own homes, or other homes found for them, they will remain a source of friction between nations for years to come. The League's reconstruction work after world war I was remarkable; for not only were half a million prisoners of war repatriated, but

under the great Dr. Fridtjof Nansen the resettlement of several million refugees was arranged, with passport certificates, legal status, transportation, as well as financial help for the destitute.

Honourable members are familiar with the great progress made by the League in limiting the manufacture and sale of narcotics, in checking the traffic in women and children, and its achievements in the economic field.

One overwhelming problem before us to-day is the re-education of the world, and particularly the youth who have been inoculated with Nazi and Fascist doctrines. We have in addition the children who have grown up in the occupied countries warped in mind and body. Many have played an important part in resistance movements and have been taught to lie, to deceive, to steal and to assist the underground in any way possible. I was pleased to learn within the last few days that the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation was about to be re-established, with headquarters in Paris. The Institute accomplished valuable work, but did not achieve its real purpose for, in accordance with the aristocratic organization of education in European and Latin-American countries, practically all representatives came from university circles. Each country wished for purposes of prestige to be represented by its greatest scholars; thus Einstein represented Germany; Madame Curie, Poland, and so on. With a rude shock, the democracies awakened to the fact that the totalitarian states were devoting their attention to elementary education which was pure propaganda for the purpose of realizing objectives put forward by the dictators. A new generation arose with fantastic ideas concerning race, the over-all place of the state in life, and the complete subordination of the individual.

In 1936 Dr. W. E. Dodd, then United States Ambassador to Germany, stated:

There is not a country in Europe where it would be possible to start a war if the people had been taught history accurately for a generation.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mrs. WILSON: Education has received no specific recognition in the scheme drawn up at Dumbarton Oaks, but it is expected that it will be provided for in the Economic and Social Council. Every nation has a culture which is the result of hundreds of years of experience, and to which it is devoted. We have been struck by the failure of the Nazis everywhere to force their view of life upon the defeated peoples. Any scheme for international education must be voluntarily adopted. I heard on Saturday that the con-

ference at San Francisco will be attended by a large body of educationists from the United States, who will be prepared to let people in all parts of their country know of decisions taken, and thus have an informed public opinion prepared to support their policies. We have not been advised of such a plan for Canada, but it is important that Canadians also should understand the provisions adopted at San Francisco, which may mean so much to them and to their children.

Recently I read a statement by Air Marshal Bishop in reply to a query as to what form of memorials we should raise to our heroes of the present war. He said:

If we are to build monuments in memory of our own dead in World War No. II, let us make them realistic; let us form foundations to teach the youth of Canada that war is a grim business, not a thing of glory. Let us teach them that what is needed in the world of to-morrow is not people to die for their country, but people to live for their country. Monuments in stone are inanimate objects, but living memorials should be built to teach the youth of the nation not only national but world-wide ideals for the good of mankind. If there were any way of asking a man who has died for his country whether he wants a monument of rock raised to the memory of the thing for which he died, I doubt if there is much question as to what his answer would be.

Hon. G. P. CAMPBELL: Honourable senators, there is little I can add to what has already been said in support of this motion. I congratulate the honourable senators who have already taken part in the debate. They have, I believe, expressed the sentiments of our people with respect to the great task that lies before the San Francisco conference.

I think we all realize more than ever before that Canada is a self-governing nation. We have reached a period in our national life that we can very well be proud of. The position Canada occupies in the world to-day has been gained by the blood of our soldiers who in two great wars have given their lives in the cause of liberty as we enjoy it on this continent and throughout the British Empire. We should never lose sight of the fact that we are British and that we live under the British flag and enjoy self-government based on the parliamentary system of Great Britain. We are a democracy, and democracy is the one thing which we must have in mind in approaching the great problems to be brought before this conference.

In Canada we have great wealth, we have something to offer to the other countries of the world; we have the opportunity of offering a better life to many people in the other countries of the world. We must at all times assume our responsibilities in trying to carry out the new order which we hope will be

put into effect successfully by the international organization which is about to be set up in San Francisco.

It may not be possible in the discussion of this organization to contribute as much as we would like; the form has been pretty well set; but I do not think we should be discouraged about the number of votes that any of the greater powers will have or the form the organization will take. We should look more to the future and to the establishment of good will between the forty-two nations that will be represented at San Francisco. We are known throughout the world as a peace-loving country. I am sure that people all over the world are astounded at the way in which we in this country and our neighbours to the south have been able to live in peace and harmony for the many years we have enjoyed life on this continent together. To-day we must assume our place as a part of the peace-loving people of this continent, and realize that in the future we must think as North Americans. We must not be at all disturbed by arguments which may arise from time to time as to whether or not we are getting farther away from the Mother Country. I do not think we are. I think that our understanding with the people of the United Kingdom to-day is better than it has ever been before. Improved methods of transportation and the relationship that has existed between us during the last few years has brought us closer together. We are all peace-loving people; we believe in democracy. I am sure that the people of Great Britain and those of the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand are now closer together than ever before. We must do everything possible to promote good-will and understanding between these nations.

I think that we in Canada are in a position to contribute much to the development of good-will and understanding between the people of the United Kingdom and the people of the United States. We understand them, and I think they understand us. The delegates from this country who attend the conference at San Francisco will have a great part to play in helping to bring about understanding between the great peace-loving peoples of the democracies of the world.

I should like to draw attention to one phase of the proposals for the establishment of the general international organization. The honourable senator from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) referred to a different method of determining the representation on the Security Council.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL.

Functional representation based on the part that any member shall take in the organization, and the responsibility of each in maintaining peace is very important.

We in Canada to-day regard ourselves as a secondary power. The great powers are great by reason of their population, or by reason of their armed forces, their wealth or their accomplishments in world affairs. Canada has become the fourth power in the war, and has overtaken and passed many of the other nations so far as production is concerned. Who can say what our position will be in ten, fifteen or twenty years' time, assuming that our population increases, as I venture to suggest it will. Who can say what we would have been able to accomplish to-day or what position we would occupy among the world powers if we had had a population of twenty-five million in this country? We have unlimited natural resources; we have a spirit equal to that of any other people. The accomplishments of the eleven and a half million people of this country have astounded the rest of the world. I venture to say that if there shall be time to consider and discuss the basis of functional representation this country will be in a position to demand representation on that basis on the Security Council.

I suggest that it is important that this country should have representation on the Security Council. To-day the Security Council is probably not the most important part of this organization, but it is nevertheless an extremely important branch. If we were elected a member of the Security Council, not having a permanent seat, we would serve for a short period of time and then would not be eligible for re-election. It may well be argued, I suppose, that only the greater powers should at all times have representation on the Security Council. But I suggest that we must not lose sight of the fact that we are a growing country, and that we have assumed our position in the last two great wars along with the great powers. In this war particularly we have given of our wealth, our natural resources and our manpower to such an extent that we are far ahead of other nations which will be represented, and I suggest that we can present a case of functional representation which should give us a rating very close to that of the permanent members.

There will be eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council. There is no certainty that Canada will be a member of that Council. We realize that it would not be possible to have all the members of the General Assembly on each of the councils, but

I venture to say that we in Canada have something to offer to the rest of the peoples of the world.

As has been suggested by honourable members, the Economic and Social Council may very well be the important factor in this whole organization; in the next number of years we will have to help feed the people of Europe. I suggest that we must not lose sight of the fact that during war nations are drawn together to fight an enemy. In this war people of different political philosophies have joined together to fight Germany. When the war is ended we will have destroyed the enemy that has brought us together. Then, I suggest, we must look for another enemy—an enemy that will threaten the peace and civilization in this world unless it is destroyed. That enemy is poverty, which exists in many countries throughout the world, and I suggest that through the medium of the Social and Economic Council the nations can join together and fight that enemy. In that respect Canada is in a position to play a more important part than many of the other countries. We in Canada believe that poverty must be destroyed. It makes not a particle of difference whether the poverty exists in a section of this country or in some section of Europe; as long as it exists there will be people who will take advantage of it, and there will be unrest and political upheaval which will again destroy the peace of this world.

In approaching this question we are always conscious of the fact that one nation, no matter how strong it may be, can only share with others in trying to bring peace to the world. I am not pessimistic about the outlook before us. We realize—as has been said in this Chamber and in other places—that for hundreds of years attempts have been made to form peace organizations. We have read about them. But I think there is a difference to-day. It is that during this war the leaders of various countries have met together in conference while the conflict was going on in an effort to reach a better understanding. These conferences have been held between the leaders of countries having different political philosophies; nevertheless they have been able to formulate proposals which are of a most constructive character. In considering the world conference about to be held, I suggest we must approach the solution of the problems of the future in a different way than we have in the past. We must resolve that we will work together in peace as we have in war; we must be prepared to give and to take, to share our wealth, and we must find ways to distribute the world's goods. Once we have

done that we shall have taken a long step towards peace throughout the world.

I join with others who have expressed confidence in the delegation that will go forward from this country to San Francisco. I think we are fortunate in having at the head of that delegation a Prime Minister who has had long experience, and is recognized as a peace-loving statesman who has spent his life attempting to solve the problems of the common man. I am sure the delegates from this country will realize the great responsibility devolving upon them.

I agree with the statement made by a number of honourable senators that this House can make an important contribution to the development of better international understanding and relationships. When our representatives come back from San Francisco their report will form a basis for a further discussion and consideration of international affairs. The Senate is well qualified to study this subject, and other subjects of a non-political character which affect the people of the country as a whole.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the country which caused the present war and the preceding one is Germany. I venture to say that there is no member of this Chamber or of the other House, indeed no person in Canada, who does not at heart fear the possibility of future upheavals in Europe at the hands of the Nazis. It seems to me that one of the great problems for the Peace Conference will be how the German people can be dealt with in order to make sure that never again will they be instrumental in disturbing the peace and involving the whole world in another terrible conflict.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Farris, the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.

THE SENATE

Wednesday, April 11, 1945.

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

MOTION

Hon. Mr. KING moved:

That for the balance of the present Session Rules 23, 24 and 63 be suspended in so far as they relate to public bills.

The motion was agreed to.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE
DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. King:

That it is expedient that the Houses of Parliament do approve the following resolution:

Whereas the Government of Canada has been invited by the Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the governments of 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 in the United States of America to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, and

Whereas the invitation suggests that the conference consider as affording a basis for such a charter the proposals for the establishment of a general international organization which have been made public by the four governments which participated in the discussions at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and

Whereas the Government of Canada has accepted the invitation to send representatives to this conference,

Therefore be it resolved:

1. That this House endorses the acceptance by the Government of Canada of the invitation to send representatives to the conference;

2. That this House recognizes that the establishment of an effective international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security is of vital importance to Canada, and, indeed, to the future well-being of man-kind; and that it is in the interests of Canada that Canada should become a member of such an organization;

3. That this House approves the purposes and principles set forth in the proposals of the four governments, and considers that these proposals constitute a satisfactory general basis for a discussion of the charter of the proposed international organization;

4. That this House agrees that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the preparation of an acceptable charter for an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security;

5. That the charter establishing the international organization should, before ratification, be submitted to Parliament for approval.

Hon. J. W. de B. FARRIS: Honourable senators, if the only thing to be considered in this debate were the passing of the resolution, any further remarks would be out of place, because undoubtedly there is complete unanimity in the Senate with respect to the resolution, which simply records approval of the Government's acceptance of the invitation to attend the San Francisco conference, expresses our confidence in the delegation, and indicates that we are in favour of the proposed international organization. It is difficult to understand the mental processes of any peace-loving Canadian who opposes this resolution, and there is certainly not such a one

Hon. Mr. KING.

in this Chamber. But while the resolution may not justify further discussion, the occasion requires the fullest consideration, and I think this responsibility falls particularly on the Senate. As a group of men of experience, and I hope of some wisdom, it is fitting and necessary that our views and conclusions should be made available, by way of discussion here, to those who will go as delegates to the conference.

There is perhaps an even more important reason why we here should discuss the proposed international organization. In a democracy public opinion is always the power behind those who act for the democracy.

Hon. Mr. HOWARD: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Therefore it is essential that we discuss the subject to give a lead to all the citizens of Canada. In the circumstances it is not sufficient that we give mere lip service to the proposal before us by voting for the resolution.

For these reasons, honourable senators, although a good many speeches have already been made in this debate—speeches which I think you will agree are a credit to the Senate and to Canada—I make no apology for continuing the debate.

The proposal is that once again the world join in an effort to achieve enduring peace. That, honourable senators, is a very ambitious proposal. It is one that in all the history of the world has never yet succeeded. Looking over the prospects, I think there is really only one encouraging reason why it may succeed at this time. I cannot bring myself to believe that it will succeed because we are going to have a better world than before. It is not my belief that human nature can possibly be improved by continued and awful brutality—and that is what we have experienced and have had to take part in for now nearly six years. If there is a real chance of this scheme succeeding at this time, when it never did before, it will be primarily for the reason that mankind now appreciates the consequences of another war as perhaps never before. From the experiences we have had twice in our own time we cannot help realizing that science, in what it has achieved and is likely to achieve in the immediate future, is so mastering the mechanics of annihilation that if there is another war civilization will be capable of complete self-destruction.

In sending our delegates to San Francisco we are seeking to evolve a plan for peace to become effective after the war is over. But first it is essential that there shall be victory—and with the greatest satisfaction we are conscious of how much better the prospects for that victory look to-day than ever before.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: But following that victory and anterior to the operation of this scheme there has to be a treaty of victory—I put it that way rather than as a treaty of peace. The plan to be worked out from the agreement reached at Dumbarton Oaks is in its essence a treaty of peace. What will happen after this war is over is, first, a treaty of victory. The success of the proposals we are considering will depend largely on the intelligence with which that treaty of victory is made effective.

Now, honourable senators, let us keep it clearly in mind that the essence of this mission to San Francisco is peace. That should be written in every man's mind in large letters. This is not a proposed world organization for the sake of that organization; it is not a plan to make representation for the sake of representation or to determine which nation shall have the most important representation—

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS:—it is not to make commitments or refuse to make them for the sake of those commitments or for the purpose of avoiding them; it is not to consider trade that we are going down there; it is not even freedom or democracy for the sake of democracy that we are concerned with at this time. I am not belittling any of these things, or their importance in themselves but I want to have our thinking straight, because it is in that way that progress is best made. The issue which will be discussed and passed upon at San Francisco, and I hope acted upon, is peace for the sake of peace—peace permanent and enduring.

Now, I propose to discuss this question at some length because I consider that time spent in intelligent consideration is worthwhile. I have given some time to preparation and I hope, honourable senators, that what I say may be of some use and may make some contribution to our thinking about these proposals. I would ask you to consider this question under three heads: first, the attitude or frame of mind with which we should approach it; second, its direct relation to the proposals at Dumbarton Oaks; and third, some of the definite and sensible things which we as practical people can do to give effect to these proposals when they are formulated.

First, the approach to this question. I think, honourable senators, it is a primary essential that every person should realize that, standing alone, eloquent speeches about higher ideals and what ought to be done will never save us from the aggressor in the future any more than they have in the past.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: And so I would approach the question with the thought in mind—not that we should now attempt to reform the world, or that out of that reformation might come peace; but rather that out of peace may come the foundation on which reforms may grow and develop, and our idealism have full scope in future. If I am correct in this, there are two things we ought to keep in mind, one being a realistic understanding of human nature and the other of world conditions. The honourable senator from Rockcliffe (Hon. Mrs. Wilson) said last night that there were two words she would like to drop out of the language, one was “appeasement” and the other was “realism”. I think that probably the only difference between the honourable senator's views and my own is one of definition. As to appeasement, yes; I hope we shall never experience that mental attitude again.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: As to realism, I have this to say—I wrote it down last night when the honourable senator was speaking: A realist is one who believes in a practical policy which will make idealism possible.

Our plans at San Francisco must be made practical enough to work; they must be realistic enough to meet the situation in a world where I think human nature has been worsened by what has happened. Our plans must be sensible enough to endure—to endure after our enthusiasm has cooled off. Let everyone keep in mind—and I hope our delegates will keep it in mind—how quickly our enthusiasms subside and how short are people's memories; and that one after another there are new generations coming on which have not gone through our experiences. I make my suggestions to you based on the knowledge that water will never rise higher than its source, and based on the belief that our plans will endure only if they are practical enough to meet realities as they exist. It is not the New Year's resolutions which count—we have all made those—but the resolutions which endure past Easter, and during the heat of summer, and when the cold of winter has come again. It is my belief, honourable senators, that permanent peace will be established only if the peace-loving nations of the world are strong enough and determined enough to prevent war. The facts which I now state are to me self-evident: it was organized force which started the present war; it was organized force which finally overtook the start that the enemy had and is now resulting in victory; and it will only be organized force, properly directed, which can prevent another war.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Let us look at our own experience as a nation, or at that of any other civilized nation that we know. How do we maintain—to use the words of our own constitution—"peace, order and good government" in this country? Well, honourable senators, we maintain it by an organized society in which there are a Criminal Code, criminal courts and police forces. If there should ever come a time in our history when we decided that psychology was better than the Criminal Code and that psychiatrists and various other officials should supplant police officers, we know what would happen to organized society. Even though only a very small minority in the community are criminally minded, I believe that these requirements, which we have proved to be necessary among individuals, are equally necessary in international relations.

I have referred to the peace-loving powers. There are three great world-powers to-day. There are other great powers, but the United States of America, Russia and the British Commonwealth of Nations are the great world-powers to-day. China is a power but she is not a world-power. France, which has been a great power, and will be again, is struggling at the moment to recover from her prostration. When we come to deal with the Dumbarton Oaks scheme, I think it is a fine thing that France is one of the permanent members—not for what she is to-day, but for what she has been and what she will be.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: But speaking for the moment of what I consider to be the basic idea, the foundation, I should like to see an agreement between the three great nations.

Anthony Eden said this last May:

The responsibility for any future world organization for peace should be constructed on and around—

I emphasize these words as being in accordance with my ideas.

—on and around the four great powers,—

He included China.

—and all other peace-loving states should come in and play their part in the structure.

Now, honourable senators, I do not want to be accused of defeating the very thing I am advocating—the practical—but I would like to see, as the basis of all that is to follow, a simple agreement such as this:

The United States of America.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The British Commonwealth of Nations.

Recognizing that enduring peace is necessary for world welfare and the maintenance and growth of civilization,

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

And believing that this pledge is an essential prerequisite on which to found an association of free nations and build a successful world administration based on justice and equality before the law,

We do solemnly pledge one to another, and to all other nations of the world as follows:

(1) That we ourselves will keep the peace;
 (2) That we will individually, collectively and in co-operation with other like-minded nations take adequate measures—

(a) to control and restrain any aggressor nation from preparing for war;

(b) to prevent any nation from beginning a war; and

(c) to stop any aggressor nation from waging a war so begun.

And to these ends we will provide and use as may be required all our available power and forces.

I would have that treaty signed by the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Hon. Mr. LEGER: May I ask, is that a quotation?

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: It is a quotation from what I wrote. This is a treaty that I am merely suggesting as indicative of the line of thought that I am offering to the Senate.

Hon. Mr. LEGER: It is very good.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: If I could convert this theoretical proposition into a reality I would have it signed by every member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. With respect to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals other considerations apply, but there would be no more complications in the way of having this treaty signed as I have suggested than there was in having the Treaty of Versailles signed in the way that was insisted upon by Sir Robert Borden.

There is, of course, no such treaty as I have suggested, but I have a feeling that there is the next best thing, namely, an understanding between those three great powers. Whether you have a treaty or an understanding, you must have a foundation before you can have a superstructure. In the proposal we are now considering there is a foundation and there is a plan. Let us look at that plan just as if we had heard nothing at all about Dumbarton Oaks. After all, this is a peace plan that we are considering. Well, what is peace? It is freedom from war. A straight line is defined as being the shortest distance between two points, and the shortest way to peace is to stop war. I should therefore hope to see three things incorporated in this plan with a view to giving effect to the basic idea: an organization

to prevent the acquiring of armaments by aggressors, an organization to prevent and stop war, and a world court of international justice:

An organization to prevent the acquiring of armaments, and an organization to prevent war! It seems so simple, honourable senators; and it is logical. We have been brought up on the doctrine that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. As I have already said, our experience within our own nation demonstrates the value of prevention. In the Criminal Code of Canada we have laws not only against acts of violence and disturbances of the peace, but very drastic laws against the carrying of certain kinds of weapons. Why? Not because we are an unlawful community, but because in Canada, as in every other lawful community, there are certain people who, unless kept within check, will commit deprecations. The same thing is true of nations. In this debate an honourable member quoted President Roosevelt or Prime Minister Churchill—I have forgotten which—as having said that not ten per cent of the people of the world wanted war. The simple, the logical and the practical thing to do is to take care of the unruly and the unlawful in world relations as we do in our domestic relations.

Let us look at our problem from the point of view of experience. History is a great guide. Without elaborating upon them, I will mention a few dates and incidents, just as a reminder of what happened in the recent past because of the failure of peace-loving nations to take appropriate action against aggressors. In 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria. China, a member of the League of Nations, appealed to that body, which appointed a committee of experts. It was, I think, two years before the committee brought in its report, which gave Japan a slap on the wrist, whereupon Japan retired from the League. In 1935 Abyssinia was invaded, and sanctions were applied against Italy. These things are coming home to us. If I had my way I should take that word "sanctions" out of the new arrangement, for in my opinion sanctions are only a source of aggravation and irritation. In international relations you either mean business or you do not. If you apply sanctions with respect to cloth and odds and ends, but not with respect to the oil which enables the aggressor to wage war, you simply create a source of irritation to the aggressor and of aggravation to yourself.

There was a man standing on the sidelines in 1935, watching to see what the peace-loving world would do to check Italy. What happened in 1936? That man, the greatest enemy of humanity who has ever lived, invaded and occupied the Rhineland. In

July of the same year the Spanish civil war broke out. I read the other day that Captain Liddell Hart said that the second Great War began in July, 1936. In 1937 the war between Japan and China started. What do we remember about that war? Well, we did not object to the shipment to Japan of scrap iron and other goods useful in the waging of war. We also remember that later on the Burma road was closed. In 1938 came Germany's annexation of Austria. Things began to move faster then. In that same year there occurred the partition of Czechoslovakia, and next year, 1939, the second World War began.

It would be unfair and idle to indulge in recriminations about these things, but there is every reason why each of us should look into his own heart and say: "Just what was my attitude at that time? To what degree did I, by voice or influence or in any other way, endeavour to contribute to a different situation?" They who can give favourable answers to these questions are very rare. Those who attempted anything are mighty few. Two men did. Anthony Eden resigned from the British Government. Churchill during the years from 1932 to 1938 made many speeches warning his country and the world of Germany's re-arming, and the imminence of war. His son assembled and published those speeches under the title of *Arms and the Covenant*. I have the book before me, and I recommend it to every senator, and also to the members of our delegation. If time was not going so fast I should like to read a page or two from this book; I will not do so. Churchill gave ample warning of the threat of war, but his warning was not heeded.

An Hon. SENATOR: That is right.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: To-day, with a conviction born of reality, we know that over those years the world, including Canada, was the victim of a state of pacifism, which is an illogical desire for peace that blinds man to realities and makes him believe that what he does not see will not hurt him. This is a characteristic which the pacifist holds in common with the ostrich. When trouble comes the ostrich sticks his head in the sand; the pacifist hides his head under the blankets. All that we have gone through from the time of the last war up to 1939 has brought home to us some wholesome truths that we should do well to remember, whether we can make our children remember them or not. It is a fact that too great a desire for peace defeats its own end. Peace at any price means no peace at all. Looking back, we can see clearly that we

failed to win the peace because the people wanted peace so badly that they were not willing to risk peace for its own achievement. The desire of the moment for peace was so great that we refused to face the dangers confronting us or to see the growing menace of our enemies arming and rising up around us. I say—and I believe it is a necessary contribution to our thinking in approaching this question—we ought to realize that the same reactions may follow at the end of this war; that there may again be a desire for peace so strong as to defeat its accomplishment. If we have peace it will not be because we are gentle and forgiving and meek, but because these peace-loving nations, of which we are one, are practical and realistic and strong. I have high authority for what I am saying: "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."

In this plan which we are to set up on the foundation and background of an understanding between the great nations there are some things which should not be included. It is all right to have them collateral to the plan, it is essential that they should be looked forward to as an outcome of peace; but some of them certainly should not be tied in as part of the essential plan for peace.

One person will say to you, "Why, the thing is simple! Let us ascertain the basic cause of war and root it out." Well, what is the basic cause of war? It is the "cussedness" of human nature. I do not believe we should attempt the high ideal that peace must wait on the regeneration of man, but rather hope that regeneration may some day follow peace.

Another subject which should not be a part of our peace plans is that of international boundaries in Europe. This question will be dealt with primarily in the Treaty of Victory rather than at the San Francisco conference. For the sake of peace, I sincerely hope the problem of these boundaries is not interwoven with the essentials of the arrangement for peace. Honourable members who read any of the authoritative books on the complications of boundary lines and the difficulties that arise from racial and religious differences and national hatreds will appreciate what may happen to our proposals if these collateral issues are tied in as part of the peace plan.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: That was the trouble with the League of Nations.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Then there is the question of freedom of trade. The honourable senator from Shelburne (Hon. Mr. Robertson)

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

made a most interesting speech on that subject. I was brought up in the belief of freer trade, and I still hold it as an ideal; but you and I, practical men of experience, know that nothing involves more of human selfishness than protection and free trade. Every change in the tariff which helps one man may adversely affect the business of another. Then there is trouble. So it is between nations. Tariff reform should be kept in its right place and right sequence. If we ever get this world welded together on a peace basis, we may then try to help the "have-not" nations, we may even try to help ourselves by more freedom in trade, but in the name of peace, the thing we now seek, let us divorce these proposals from immediate association with our plans for peace. We talk about the "four freedoms". There are other freedoms than those contained in the Atlantic Charter. We all have faith that over the years progress will be made by the peoples of the world. I for one believe that if we are not any better in our hearts, we are at least more intelligent, and with intelligence will come achievement.

But all these things, a better world, more equitable boundaries between nations, freedom of trade, the four freedoms, and many other reforms will come not as the basis of peace but as the result of a peace permanent and enduring.

Then there is the question of democracy as a basis of world peace. An editorial in the Ottawa Journal of April 3, discussing this subject, said:

Many do not like, and understandably, the idea of a great power overlordship; nor much relish the idea of membership in an organization which in one of its chief characteristics seems to violate the fundamental democratic principle of taxation without representation.

The editorial proceeds:

In some future, distant or near, the dominance of the great powers may be reduced, but to attempt that now, to argue that some small, weak country must have as much influence in a world security organization as Russia, the United States or Britain, is to argue nonsense. It is a condition the world faces, not a theory.

I want to say a word or two about democracy. In the first place, let us keep this in mind: The issue now is not democracy; it is peace. If honourable members will stop to think they will agree with me that democracy is the most highly specialized form of government the world has ever known.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: The achievement of successful democracy requires not merely an educated ruler, but also a highly developed and educated nation.

Some Hon. SENATORS: That is right.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: It took Great Britain a long time to achieve democracy. Most countries in the world to-day are not capable of or competent to have democracy. If it comes to a country too soon, it fails. We saw that in Italy, and there are other countries one could name. Russia is not a democracy. I am making no attack on Russia. I bear testimony to her wonderful achievement in the social and economic field and in this great war, but I should think that Stalin would be insulted if anybody said that Russia was a democracy as we understand it. Take any nation—take a nation that emerges from savagery. It does not first achieve democracy. The first sign of organization is the big chief with the big stick. Self-government only comes slowly, and down the ages. We have had the Magna Carta in Britain for seven hundred years. When King John was forced to sign the Magna Carta there was no democracy in Britain as we understand it. It was the nobles who wrested power from the king, and it was for themselves and their class that Magna Carta was secured. The great masses of people in England had never heard of the idea of democracy at that time, and if it had been given to them they would not have known how to make it work. It has taken England a thousand years to achieve an effective democracy. This idea that you can take a conglomeration of nations in all stages of social and economic development with many of them having no conception of democracy, and expect to form them into a democratic union, is to ignore realities and hope for the impossible. But I have no doubt that some day out of this organization, if we can hold it together, a democracy of nations may be accomplished. As I said before, it is something to look for and work for, and not to jump at too soon.

Now, honourable senators, these are my suggestions as to how to approach this question—I am afraid I have taken too long in doing so.

Some Hon. SENATORS: No, no.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: As I said before I consider it of the greatest importance.

Now, "in the second place"—let us consider the Dumbarton Oaks proposals that will be submitted to the delegates at the conference as a basis for discussion. You will notice, honourable senators, that the Canadian letter of acceptance was a very guarded one. The invitation suggested that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals would be the basis for the scheme, but the acceptance by the Prime Minister stipulated that they would be a basis for discussion of the scheme, which I think is the proper ground upon which it should be put.

No nation which goes to San Francisco should be tied to the consideration of these proposals further than to say that they are valuable as a basis for discussion.

The recital to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals says that the organization is based on the principle of the "sovereign equality of all peace-loving states." My honourable friend from De Salaberry (Hon. Mr. Gouin) who spoke the other night in one of the most interesting and best speeches I have heard in the Senate—I did not hear my honourable friend from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugesson)—expressed a little concern over the meaning of these words. If they mean what he suggested they might mean, I could understand his concern. To me they sound a good deal like the recital in another famous document—that "all men are born free and equal." That depends entirely on how you interpret them. I do not think the recital in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals means that all sovereign nations are equal. If this were the meaning I would challenge the statement. I would feel more like the Irishman who said he believed that one man was as good as another—and sometimes a little better. The recital means to me that each nation is the equal of the other in its rights to be a sovereign nation. That is all I think it means. It is all it could mean, and make any sense. Every nation is entitled to be a free nation; every nation is entitled to be a sovereign nation and to have the form of government which the people of that nation wish to have. In that sense all nations should stand on an equality. But when we consider equality from the standpoint of intelligence, or education, or wealth, or power, or force as a means of waging war and the maintaining of peace, it would be utter nonsense to suggest that all nations are of equal sovereignty, because in that sense they are not.

In approaching the question that I have in mind, one of the first things to consider is the essential differences between the League of Nations covenant and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. These have been canvassed so often in this House and elsewhere that it is not necessary for me to mention them further than to have them before us sufficiently for our discussion. The important difference in on this question of peace and war. The essential power of the League of Nations was, under Article XI of the Covenant, vested in the League itself. Perhaps it would be worth while recalling to honourable senators' memory what it says.

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League

shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise, the Secretary-General shall, on the request of any member of the League, forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

When we come to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals on the other hand, honourable senators, the powers of the Assembly, which embraces all the nations which will come in, are very definitely in contrast with the Security Council. I ask you to consider that, because to my mind it is of importance. Chapter V, Section B-1 states:

The General Assembly should have the right to consider—

That is a well chosen word.

—the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; to discuss—

Another very carefully chosen word!

—any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace.

and so on. And here is what the General Assembly under the new scheme shall not do. It shall not,

—on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which is being dealt with by the Security Council.

In my opinion that is a very radical departure from what was contained in the old League covenant, and in my view the new scheme is a much better one. These powers are vested in the Council, as you will find in Article VIII, Section B, sub-sections 2, 3, 4 and 5. Let me read from Section 4 what the Security Council may do:

Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade and other operations by air, sea or land forces of members of the Organization.

Drastic power is vested in the Security Council of eleven members, five permanent members of which include what I have termed the "three great-powers" and China and France; and six other nations elected for two-year terms, and not entitled to immediate re-election.

Hon. Mr. CADLER: May I ask a question there? You have been speaking about two councils; one the Council of the League of Nations and the other the proposed Council. How was the Council of the League of Nations constituted?

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: It was not dissimilar to the present Council in its set-up. A little later

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

I will clear that up completely, if the honourable senator will permit me. The make-up is not dissimilar. I think that is sufficient for the moment. But the powers of the new Council compared to those of the General Assembly are far greater under the new scheme than they were under the old one. Further than that—and this to my mind is of great importance—the powers of the Security Council are confined to peace matters. I will mention some of the other committees later. The Security Council is a council for peace and is not mixed up with anything else. That is why I like it. Matters that tie in with our committees, other schemes, should be developed collaterally or in sequence after peace has been achieved. The Social and Economic Council is an entirely different committee. Some honourable senators have said that the Social and Economic Council may prove to be of the most importance. I hope this will turn out to be correct. The important consideration for the moment is that they operate separately.

There are two things which should be considered. In the Assembly itself each nation has one vote. I do not know what is going to happen at San Francisco. I think we are all somewhat perplexed. I saw in the papers that Russia was asking for three votes, and that the United States did too, but later abandoned its request.

What should our position be? In the League of Nations Assembly each nation had one vote. This gave 6 votes to the British Empire. The same provision is contained in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Russia is now claiming three votes on the ground that she is made up of separate and independent republics. I am not now advocating any particular plan; I am simply pointing out some of the problems which will have to be faced. The same question came up in the United States Senate when the Treaty of Versailles was before that body for ratification. I quote from Duncan Hall's book "The British Commonwealth of Nations", page 346, which records the reservation passed in its final form by the United States Senate in March of 1920. It reads as follows:

Until Part I, being the Covenant of the League of Nations, shall be so amended as to provide that the United States shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to that which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of Empire in the aggregate shall be entitled to cast, the United States assumes no obligation to be bound, except in cases where Congress has previously given its consent, by any election, decision, report, or finding of the Council or Assembly in which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of Empire in the aggregate have cast more than one vote.

I do not for one moment suggest that that was the real reason why the United States did not enter the League; but, make no mistake about it, that reason existed, and it is a thing that must be kept in mind when we are again dealing with this question. One of the best sources of information about what happened at Versailles is Sir Robert Borden's Memoirs, to which I shall give some references before I am through. As Canadians we have to consider our external relations from the point of view of our position, on the one hand, as a member of the British Commonwealth, and, on the other hand, as one of the United Nations. There can be no departure from the principle which was fought out under the leadership of Borden and Smuts, and definitely established, that every member of the British Commonwealth is a sovereign nation in its own right. There is no camouflage in that. I do not know enough about the constitution of Russia and its component parts to discuss it intelligently, but some of the delegates will be well informed on this subject. It may be that the various Russian states have independent national status, so as to entitle each to a separate vote in the international organization.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: That condition might be created.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: In law we have the term "colourable transaction". Perhaps I should not have even suggested the idea, for I do not know what the facts are, but a mere colourable set-up by Russia or any other country would not be fair and would not be conducive to the smooth working of the new international relationships that we hope will be established at San Francisco. This matter will have to be considered carefully by Russia and all the other countries involved, and for the outcome we shall have to rely upon their good sense and honest endeavours. But, I repeat, one thing cannot be questioned: while the members of the British Commonwealth are tied together as a family of nations as closely as ever, indeed perhaps more closely than ever before, each has international recognition as a completely sovereign nation.

Next I want to deal with some of the problems concerning the Security Council. I am sorry to be taking so long, but if honourable senators think my remarks are worth listening to I will go on.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Yes, go on.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: There has been considerable discussion as to the right of the five permanent members of the Security Council, who are great powers, to prevent the making of a decision by the Council against

themselves. The proposal is that this right of veto would not become effective until after the preliminary steps had been taken. That is to say, if the Council had before it for consideration a dispute involving one of the permanent members, that permanent member would abstain from voting on the question whether the dispute should be investigated and a finding of facts made. But although the Council has the right to investigate the actions of any nation, it has not the power to call on the members of the Assembly to take action against any one of the permanent members without that member's consent. Theoretically, this is wrong, but practically it is not wrong at all, for what good would it do to confer upon the Council the right to make a decision against one of the great powers? Any nation that will risk breaking its solemn pledge to the international organization will consider itself powerful enough to succeed in a defiance of the organization, and if a nation takes that stand there will be war. In such circumstances no attempt to settle the dispute by pacific means will be successful. That is why I think my hypothetical treaty would be an effective one if it were converted into a reality. It seems to me that an agreement between the three great powers must be the very basis of the hopes of peace-loving humanity at this time.

I read somewhere that United States Senator Vandenberg would go to the conference with the suggestion that more of the small nations should be eligible for seats on the Council. I hope that suggestion is not followed. It strikes me that the simplicity of the Council's structure as at present proposed, and the power behind it, are what will make it work. The greater the number of nations on the Council, the greater will be the likelihood of squabbling. Did you ever see a big dog start a fight? It is nearly always the little scrappy dog that starts making trouble, and then the big fellow has to step in and finish it.

Let us now consider more directly some of Canada's problems in relation to Dumbarton Oaks. Under the present plan Canada is not one of the permanent members of the Security Council or part of one of them, for it is the United Kingdom, not the British Empire, that is to be a permanent member. So if Canada has a seat on the Council it will be as an elected member. I should expect that in the ordinary course of events she is likely to be one of the first elected members; and after filling out the term of two years she would perhaps be succeeded by Australia.

I suppose there is no one among us who, upon reading the proposed composition of the Security Council, did not ask himself: "Why should not one of the permanent seats be reserved for the British Commonwealth of Nations rather than for the United Kingdom?" This thing has to be faced squarely. On the Security Council there is to be only one permanent member for the British people, and that must be either the United Kingdom or the Commonwealth. I noticed in the Montreal Gazette a statement which seemed to indicate that that paper was in favour of having the Commonwealth as a permanent member of the Council, with one vote. This would mean that every time a question had to be voted upon in the Council all the nations of the Commonwealth would have to get together and by a majority decision, or in some other way that does not occur to me, direct how the vote for the whole Commonwealth should be cast.

I have looked at the reports of the debate in another place to see if that idea was advanced there, and I find that it was, by one honourable member. I do not want to offer any criticism here of what was said in another place, but I think it would be within my rights to discuss the principle involved in the honourable member's suggestion. The fact that he happens to represent the constituency in which I expect soon to be casting a vote for or against him, perhaps gives me a little more freedom to quote his words. This is what he said, as reported on page 119 of the House of Commons Hansard:

The Prime Minister now bewails our position, yet it is a direct result of the policies of his Government. Had the Canadian Government so willed, the great world power at Dumbarton Oaks could have been the British Commonwealth of Nations rather than the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The British Commonwealth of Nations could have been the power named in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as the power to hold a permanent seat on the Security Council.

Whether that last sentence is correct or not, I am not aware. It may be. I have not heard the honourable leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) indicate that his view is the same as that of the honourable member I have quoted, but I doubt very much that it is.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: No, I should not think it was. But it is a view that is expressed by intelligent people and by some newspapers, and for that reason I think it should be considered. I say that view is an express repudiation of everything that Sir Robert Borden achieved after the last war.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Sir Robert Borden was confronted with the very problem that confronts us. Of course, the British Commonwealth of Nations as we now understand it had not completely materialized in 1920. The Balfour resolutions were agreed to in 1926, and the Statute of Westminster, which gave statutory effect to them, was passed in 1931. But Sir Robert Borden had the vision almost as it afterwards was incorporated in the Balfour resolutions. Paragraph 4 of article 4 of the treaty provided:

The Council shall consist of the representatives of the principal Allied and Associated powers.

These were the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan. So the British Empire was included as one of the members of the Council. Not only in section 4 did the British Empire appear as a member, but also in the Annex the representatives of Great Britain signed not only for Great Britain but ambiguously, as if for the whole Empire, including Canada and the other self-governing Dominions. Then followed the signatures of the representatives for the Dominion of Canada and for the sister Dominions. Sir Robert was confronted with this position: If you put a strict interpretation on that ambiguous form of signature, and Canada is included as part of the British Empire, then she cannot become an elected member. He said "I won't stand for that," and he gives a very interesting discussion of this point on pages 950 to 953 of the second volume of his memoirs. He took the question up with Lloyd George and sent him this memorandum on May 6, 1919:

In order to set all doubt at rest it is necessary to amend Article IV:

(a) by striking out the words "British Empire" in the second line thereof and by substituting therefor the words, "The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland";

(b) by inserting the words "The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland" immediately after the words "The British Empire" in the annex to the covenant.

Turn to the Annex to the Covenant and you find "British Empire." Then follow "Canada" and the other Dominions. Sir Robert was saying: "Before Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand and India, you must insert the United Kingdom, to show that when Great Britain signs she is signing not for Canada, but only for the United Kingdom." So insistent was Sir Robert that he sent that memorandum to Lloyd George and said, "I want it done that way in order that there shall be no misunderstanding about Canada's right to be recognized internationally as an independent nation and so that she will not be deprived of the right to be elected a

member of the Council because she appears as part of the British Empire." He tells us in his book that he only withdrew from that position when he got Clemenceau, Wilson and Lloyd George to sign an undertaking as to what they understood to be the true construction of Article IV. It will be found at page 961 of Sir Robert's Memoirs. They said in effect: "We think the meaning of this document is clear,—notwithstanding that Canada appears as a part of the British Empire, she has the right to be elected a member of the Council," which is another way of saying that Great Britain was signing for the United Kingdom only; therefore Canada, Australia and the other Dominions signed as independent nations and as such were entitled to be elected to the Council. Honourable members, if I had time I would quote what Sir Robert said in his speech in the other House on the motion to ratify the treaty. In September, 1919, Mr. Fielding had suggested that Great Britain could sign the treaty and bind Canada, whether Canada consented or not. Sir Robert replied: "If that is your interpretation, you are just a hundred years out of date." Since that time another twenty-five or twenty-six years have gone by, and the interpretation is even that much more out of date.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: All members of this assembly who cherish the British Empire, who have its ideals at heart, and who want to do everything to perpetuate this great family of nations, should be a unit in their desire and insistence that there be no complicated clause in respect to this Council which will require Great Britain each time she casts a vote to seek the advice of every part of the Empire.

If she could not get accord on that basis, then I do not know what the solution would be. I have never yet heard anybody who objects to the proposal I have given as an alternative who has any intelligent solution of the question.

Now, honourable senators, in this connection how essential it is that this greatest League of Nations which has ever existed, the British Commonwealth of Nations, be not tangled up with agreements that can breed discord, dissension and misunderstanding. General Smuts, when addressing a conference of the Empire nations in May, 1917, said:

Talk about a League of Nations, you are the only League of Nations that has ever existed!

How can we as Canadians in the British Commonwealth of Nations—for we can speak as a family voice, if not as a political voice—

how can we best serve this great ideal effort for peace? There are dangers, honourable senators, in the suggestions I have made that some of the big powers might not live up to the solemn obligations they are now undertaking; the United States might become isolationist—certainly there is no indication of it now, but it might happen; Great Britain might get the germ of pacifism again—even we in Canada might get it; Russia might decide that her destiny lay in world supremacy rather than in co-operation with the other free nations. If any of these things happen I see no solution which will bring about a permanent peace. But there is every indication that these things will not happen and this time our constructive efforts for peace may succeed. What can we do to help? I think the first essential is a better and more continuous and clearer understanding of each other as between the United States of America and the British Commonwealth of Nations. I do not mean—to use an expression I have heard in this debate—that we should "gang up" on Russia. Far from it. But I believe the closer the English-speaking peoples are together, the more we understand each other, the more all these false issues are wiped out, the more unwarranted statements are explained away, the easier it will be to come to a real nation-like man-to-man understanding with Russia.

And when, honourable members, we stop to think of it, there never was anything in the history of the world that ought to be easier of achievement than a close association between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: We speak the same language; to a large extent we have come from the same stock; we have the same traditions of government; we both believe ourselves to be leaders in democracy and the application of the principles of democratic government; and, what to my mind is even more important, we both have the same principles of justice; our literature, our religion—everything that ought to be the basis of real co-operation between one nation and another—are common to the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Let me say this, honourable senators. In this debate I have been surprised that my colleagues in the legal profession have not said more about the International Court of Justice. As you know, war has always been the court of last resort in international disputes. If you are to take away

that final court of decision, something must take its place, and the only logical substitute is an international court of justice. I can sound a note of optimism in that connection. We have had an international court of justice since 1920. There is a member on that court from the United States, although the United States itself never became a member of the League. Professor Manley Hudson of Harvard University is a member of the court and he has published at least two books giving much information on the development of that court and what it has accomplished. But its accomplishments just touch the fringe of what can and ought to be achieved.

I sometimes think, honourable senators, that in these days of grim realities there is a danger that we in this country may lose sight of what the justice of our courts means to our people in their relations one to another. Nothing rankles like a sense of injustice. Nothing creates discord and hatred quicker than a sense of injustice. My friend is getting three pieces of butter, and I am getting only one: the resultant sense of unfairness will cause more trouble than some really serious matter. And so it is that in this country, in the development of our democracy which we boast of, the courts and the whole organization of British justice as we understand it may well be regarded as the bulwark of freedom. I say that with the greatest deference to my friends who live under the civil law, for after all that is the same justice with modifications. I believe that out of the jurisprudence of these two systems, working side by side, we shall develop a greater and a higher conception of justice than perhaps was ever known before.

What has happened in connection with our courts at home should offer great possibilities for the future in international relationships. There is this to be said. The lawyers of Canada and the lawyers of the United States under their respective organizations, the Canadian Bar Association and the American Bar Association, have in every city in Canada and the United States a highly developed group of special committees intensively working on this question, and the studies these lawyers are making are being gradually co-ordinated and will be available to the conference at San Francisco. I regard as of the highest importance the new interest that the legal profession in Canada and the United States is taking in this question of a world court of justice. For the first time in our lives we as lawyers are becoming conscious of international justice. The problems are many and intricate. I will merely mention a few, but

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

I shall not discuss them. Undoubtedly we have a good precedent in the way the present court has been selected.

The great essential is that these men who are selected shall not be representatives of any particular nation or interest. As lawyers we know and many laymen know too, that the great curse of arbitration is that each side appoints an arbitrator, and both together select an umpire. The net result is that there is only one arbitrator, the other two appointees being advocates behind the scenes. I do not want to see that system followed in our world court. Professor Manley Hudson is a member of the present court of international justice. He is an American; his country is not even a member of the League. He represents no country but a world court of international justice. There is much work to be done, not idealistic work but practical world politics aimed at idealism, in order to develop this court and give it greater powers. But care must be taken at all times not to force its development, for if you go faster than world opinion is ready to follow, you only defeat the purpose of the court.

Honourable senators, there is something further that I want to say about Canada's part and then I will conclude. It is this; that in the relationship between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the great country to the south, Canada has a special part to play. We understand the British people better than the Americans do, and we understand the American people better than the Englishman understands them.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: And we have the cordial good will of both; we are the link between the two. Our part is a great one.

One of the things that ought to be taught to public men of the United States—and I think it is our duty to be missionaries but to be diplomatic about it—is that her new responsibilities as a world power will be made much easier if there is a British Commonwealth of Nations to work with her.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: There is nothing that the United States of America should face with greater apprehension than the downfall of the British Empire.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Quite right.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: And not only is this so, but if these two nations are to work together for peace and for the good of humanity, the British Empire must continue to be strong and powerful in order to do its share in the future as it has borne the burden in the days gone by.

Honourable Senators, I have given emphasis in my remarks to the need for a practical and realistic plan for peace. In taking this stand I would not wish to be thought lacking in ideals. I have faith to believe that out of the realities of a peace permanent and enduring may come a realization of our ideals, so that some day our dreams will come true.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.

THE SENATE

Thursday, April 12, 1945.

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

GOVERNMENT WHITE PAPER

Before the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. KING: Honourable senators, I beg to table a Government White Paper on employment and income with special reference to the initial period of reconstruction (English and French versions). I believe that copies of this rather important document are being distributed to the post office boxes of honourable members, or will be available on request at the Printing Bureau.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE PROPOSED REPRINT OF DEBATE IN SENATE

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. A. D. McRAE: Honourable senators, I wish to make a suggestion to the honourable the leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. King) and to honourable members in general. Yesterday we had the privilege—the pleasure, I would say—of listening to a magnificent speech by our colleague from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris).

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: The views he then expressed are such as I am sure the Senate can concur in unanimously.

It seems to me that the question which he dealt with so effectively, so clearly, so logically, and which he so well supported with facts, will confront our delegates at the San Francisco conference. Few people understand our autonomous position as a member of the British

Commonwealth of Nations, and whether the British Empire should have one or more votes in the proposed international peace organization is a somewhat controversial topic. Having that in mind, I would suggest to the honourable leader of the House (Hon. Mr. King) that an ample supply of the honourable senator's speech be printed in both languages, for distribution at the conference. I quite appreciate that any member of our delegation could in a general way answer the question I have mentioned, but the detailed information and logic contained in the honourable senator's address are such as to convince any inquirer, not predisposed towards us, of Canada's actual position within the British Empire.

I would suggest that the speech be edited with a view to deleting certain paragraphs so that it would be a concise presentation of the facts, and that it be published in pamphlet form under the heading "Canada's Position Within The British Empire" or whatever title may be considered most appropriate. Probably the author himself would undertake to deal with his speech along the lines I have indicated.

This address is by far the ablest presentation of the facts in regard to Canada's status as a self-governing Dominion that I have yet listened to. It would be most helpful to our delegates at the San Francisco conference to be able to present a copy of it to any person who might raise the question of Canada's position within the Empire, so that he might see for himself what we claim it to be. The authority of the pamphlet would be further strengthened if issued under the imprimatur of the Senate.

Hon. Mr. KING: I heartily concur in what my honourable friend has said, and will confer with the officers of the Senate with regard to his proposal. I will also bring it to the attention of the Government.

We are all highly appreciative of the splendid address delivered yesterday by the honourable senator from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris). It is an important document, and should be very helpful in making clear Canada's position within the Empire. It also should be of assistance to the delegates who attend the conference.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Anticipating the desire of honourable senators, I have already ordered the printing of five hundred extra copies of yesterday's Senate Debates. These are now in the Clerk's office and are available to honourable senators. I have also given instructions that this issue of the Debates be translated into French without delay.

At this time I might suggest to honourable senators the expediency of publishing a pamphlet containing all the speeches which have been made in this Chamber on the subject of the San Francisco conference. Such a publication, I am sure, would be of interest to all attending the conference, and would constitute a valuable reference book.

Hon. Mr. MACLENNAN: I should like to make what I think is a better suggestion—that we conscript the honourable senator (Hon. Mr. Farris) and send him to San Francisco in an advisory capacity.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 4 p.m.

THE SENATE

FRIDAY, April 13, 1945.

The senate met at 4 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TRIBUTES TO HIS MEMORY

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. H. KING: Honourable senators, I think it fitting that at this time we should for a few moments turn our thoughts to the passing of the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The news of his death cast a gloom over the whole world and affected men and women in every station of life, from those of high estate to those in humble circumstances.

President Roosevelt gave of his best to his country and to the world. At the time of his election to the presidency in 1932 the world was passing through a depression of unprecedented severity. We know how fearlessly he tackled the grave financial, economic and social problems which then confronted the United States. Some of the proposals which he put forward aroused a sharp division of opinion among his countrymen, but they were designed to ease the burden of those who depended on wages for their daily bread. At his re-election in 1936 the international picture had changed for the better, and his domestic policies had also brought about improved conditions.

I believe it is generally conceded that he foresaw more clearly than most statesmen the catastrophe impending in 1939. This was evident in his public addresses throughout 1937 and 1938, particularly his famous Chicago

The Hon. the SPEAKER.

speech in which he strongly criticized the war-like policy of certain nations and suggested that those nations be quarantined. But he was too far in advance of public opinion in his own country, and did not receive the support which the international situation warranted. The American people, lacking his foresight, failed to realize that we were on the threshold of great and tragic events.

Honourable members will recall that during that period he pledged his country to come to the support of Canada in the event of invasion by a foreign power. Throughout those years he urged and encouraged the building up of the military, naval and air forces of the United States, so that they would be in a position to exert their full strength in the event of the country being forced into war. We know how greatly he facilitated the war effort of not only Canada but all the United Nations during the present struggle. It seems strange that one who did so much to consolidate what we now know as the peace-loving nations should pass from the scene at this time, when assured victory is within sight.

If I may, I should like to express to the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, and to the American people, our hope that the present harmonious relations between us, which we believe are of advantage to both countries, will continue. To Mrs. Roosevelt and members of the family I wish to convey deepest sympathy in their loss, by death, of this noble man.

In the other House last evening the Prime Minister, as leader of the Government, spoke on behalf of Parliament and the nation as a whole. He was followed by the leader of the official Opposition and the leaders of other groups in that House. I feel that the speeches of the Prime Minister and of the leader of the official Opposition are of such a character and are so well expressed that it would be fitting to have them reproduced in our own records. If I had the talent of an elocutionist I would read both speeches to the Senate, but knowing my deficiency as a reader I will simply ask that they be placed upon our Hansard.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable senators, when word came to us yesterday that the President of the United States had passed on, we all were affected as if we had lost a personal friend. I believe that throughout the world there are more people mourning for Franklin Delano Roosevelt than ever mourned for any other man in history. That, no doubt, is partly due to modern methods of communication, but it is also partly due to the fact that in our heart of hearts we all believe in humanity, and that in his actions President

Roosevelt epitomized the ideal of what a man in high place should try to do for his fellow men.

Words fail me to express my thoughts. Many people have perhaps wondered what it would be like to live in a period when a great man was on the stage of life. Those who read everything they can find about Lincoln, as almost everybody does, must often try to imagine what the ordinary man and woman of his day thought about him. It has been said that when he was living people did not regard him very highly, that it was only afterwards that his greatness was revealed. I have never been sure about that. It seems to me that human beings can recognize true greatness at the time of its existence. I do not think that anyone who has lived during the past twelve years could have failed to realize that President Roosevelt would go down in history as a great man. It has been a wonderful thing to see this man, with all his physical infirmities, so outstand the rest of the world that for generations to come his name will be a shining light on the pages of history. Yesterday President Roosevelt was a citizen of the United States; to-day he is a citizen of the whole world. That is not a new sentiment: it was said of Lincoln, but I think it can be said with equal truth of Roosevelt.

We in Canada do not always love the President of the United States; but all of us, from the highest to the most humble, loved President Roosevelt. Despite Hitler and Mussolini and Togo, he seemed to say to us: There is still hope for the world!

Mrs. Roosevelt is a great woman. No wife could give greater support and encouragement to her husband than Mrs. Roosevelt gave to the President, and we sympathize with her and her family in their grievous loss.

I join with the honourable leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. King) in wishing the new President every success in carrying out the policies of his distinguished predecessor. We share the sorrow of the people of the United States. We Canadians are a peace-and-freedom-loving people, and we knew that in the late President we had a powerful friend. He will be numbered among the great statesmen of the world.

I fully agree with the proposal of the honourable leader opposite to incorporate in the proceedings of the Senate the speeches which the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition delivered in the other House expressing Canada's appreciation of the late President, and her sympathy with the people of the United States in their loss—a loss not merely national but international.

May I say to the people of the United States: We in Canada, as well as the rest of the world, are under an eternal obligation to your country for having produced such a great man as Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

(The speeches of the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition are as follows):

Rt. Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Honourable members have learned of the death at Warm Springs, Georgia, this afternoon, of the President of the United States. Franklin D. Roosevelt was so close and good a neighbour, so great and true a friend of the Canadian people, that the word when received was as if one of our very own had passed away.

I hasten to express on behalf of the Government, the members of both Houses of Parliament now in session, and on behalf of all the people of Canada, our deepest sympathy with the Government and people of the United States. I wish at the same time to express our deepest sympathy for Mrs. Roosevelt and all the members of the family in their bereavement. Their sorrow and the sorrow of the American Nation will be shared by the peoples of the United Nations and by those who cherish freedom in all parts of the world.

The death of President Roosevelt is in truth a loss to the whole of mankind. Few lives have been more closely identified with humanity in its needs, its struggles and its aspirations. His services to the cause of freedom went far beyond limits of race and bounds of nationality. He was an undaunted champion of the rights of free men, and a mighty leader of the forces of freedom in a world at war. He has left to the world an enduring heritage by what his life, his faith and his courage have contributed to the well-being of his fellow-men. It is a comforting thought at this time to know that before the close of his great career he had already helped to fashion the design of a world organization for the maintenance of peace and security. His rest at Warm Springs was in preparation for the journey to San Francisco to open the Conference of the United Nations. In this conference he envisaged the culmination of his life's great aim—an enduring peace among the nations of the world.

It was my great privilege to have been a lifelong friend of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I knew him very well. Of that friendship I shall hope to speak at another time. My feelings at this moment are perhaps best expressed in lines of Matthew Arnold, which perhaps I may be permitted to quote. May I voice what at this hour lies deepest in the hearts of all:

O strong soul, by what shore
 Tarriest thou now? For that force,
 Surely, has not been left vain!
 Somewhere, surely, afar,
 In the sounding labour-house vast
 Of being, is practised that strength,
 Zealous, beneficent, firm!

I believe it is.

Mr. Speaker, as a mark of respect of our country for the memory of the President, the flag will fly at half-mast from the Peace Tower of our Parliament Buildings. As a further mark of respect I know that all honourable members would wish to have this House adjourn without continuing its proceedings to-day, and I move accordingly.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, to the suggestion with respect to adjournment I believe the Prime Minister will have the unanimous consent of this House. May I be permitted to associate His Majesty's Loyal Opposition with the tribute paid by the Prime Minister, and to say that the news of the great President's tragic passing has left the members of this House filled with dismay and weak with sorrow. The real significance of his death at one of the world's most critical hours must be left in some degree for future times to assess. Measured by every yardstick President Roosevelt's name will echo and re-echo down through the world's hallways of fame as one of the most dynamic, powerful and successful leaders that democracy has ever given to the service of humanity.

He was enshrined in the hearts of every freedom-loving man and woman the world over. Millions of families to-night will feel the same bitter twinge of sorrow they would feel at the passing of one in their own family. President Roosevelt was a fearless, courageous and happy warrior. Whether he was battling against the dread ravages of his paralyzing affliction or fighting the good fight against political, economic and social wrongs, he never flinched, he never faltered, he never wavered.

When it became his task to throw his nation's weight against the temporarily victorious aggressor nations in this global conflict, he threw into that struggle every ounce of energy, effort and determination he possessed. Likewise in preparation for the equally compelling objective of preserving and maintaining permanent peace and security in the world, the late President was at the time of his death engaged in the same vigorous and resolute march to victory which had characterized his course of action through these many years.

I witnessed the inaugural ceremonies three months ago at the White House when Mr. Roosevelt was sworn in for his fourth term of office as President of that great republic. Seldom in my lifetime have I seen such genuine demonstrations and such touching scenes as when I looked over those many thousands who had gathered to do homage to their wartime President. One could feel that that great mass of humanity was leaning heavily upon their fellow citizen and President, with the profoundest conviction and confidence that the immediate future of their nation was in the best hands they knew.

This world can ill afford to lose President Roosevelt as it emerges from this armed holocaust and enters the threshold of one of its most critical periods. As he throws the torch to other hands, let us pray that the relentless pursuit of lasting peace shall be undertaken with the same grim resolution and fortitude which characterized every move he made.

Canada mourns to-night the loss of a great friend and a good neighbour. Seldom has a president of our neighbouring republic to the south been so close to the people of this nation. Nowhere in the world will the sense of personal loss be felt in a deeper way than in the homes of the people of this Dominion. We are thinking of Mrs. Roosevelt and the family as they walk to-night through the valley of the shadow of death. Canada desires to share their grief.

Language seems so weak and inadequate to reveal one's feelings at a time like this I summon to my help those immortal words:

Lives of great man all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints in the sands of time.

Those footprints will never be erased so long as humanity reveres brave men who, in peace and in war, are prepared to die that others may live.

BUSINESS OF PARLIAMENT

STATEMENT OF THE PRIME MINISTER

Hon. Mr. KING: Honourable senators, I have been handed a statement which only a few moments ago the Prime Minister made in the other Chamber, and as it affects Parliament as a whole, I think it well to read it to you. It is in these words:

This week, on Wednesday (April 11), I reminded the House that if the business of Parliament were not concluded before midnight on Monday of next week, this Parliament would be automatically dissolved. I stated that at no time had I any thought or intention of recommending dissolution with a view to shutting off discussion in the House. I added that, as honourable members well knew, the sole reason the Government had waited up to the last or almost the last day of the term of Parliament before going to the people had been our desire to avoid a general election while the war in Europe was still in progress. I have stated, over and over again, that the intention of the Government was not to dissolve Parliament if that could be avoided before the decisive battles were fought in Europe. That position was subject only to the limitation that the people should not be denied the right guaranteed to them by the Constitution of electing a new Parliament at least every five years.

In a nation-wide broadcast on March 2, I said: "Once the war in Europe is over, we feel there should be a general election as soon as possible."

On Monday (April 9) I gave to the House an outline of the minimum time which would be required for a general election, and placed on Hansard an official memorandum on that subject which had been given me by the Chief Electoral Officer. That statement made it apparent that the earliest date at which a general election could be held, following upon the expiration of the parliamentary term, would be June 11.

It rests with honourable members on the Opposition benches, and here I am not referring to any particular party or group but to all honourable members opposed to the Government, whether the war appropriations and supply bills will be ready for Royal Assent on Monday next.

My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has said that so far as members of the Progressive-Conservative party are concerned, they are prepared to conclude the debates in this Chamber at 6 o'clock this afternoon. Intimations have also been given by the leaders of the C.C.F. and of the Social Credit groups that they and their followers are prepared to assist the Government in speedily completing the business for which this session has been specially called.

Were it possible to have the bills reach the other House this evening, that would permit of

prorogation being arranged for Monday afternoon (April 16) at 3 o'clock. If that cannot be carried out, then the House will of course resume its sitting at 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon, to be continued, if need be, until 11 o'clock at night. Were this to happen, without the business being concluded and Royal Assent given to the bills before midnight, the Government would be obliged to resort to Governor General's warrants to meet expenditures both for the conduct of the war and for civil government over the period of the general election and the opening of the new Parliament.

Now as to the completion of the business of the present special session, as honourable members are aware, I stated some time ago that a general election would be called before April 17.

It may assist honourable members in deciding upon the course it is advisable in the public interest for them to pursue if I inform the House at once, on my responsibility as Prime Minister, that His Excellency the Governor General has authorized me to say that he is willing to approve a recommendation to have Parliament dissolved just as soon after the conclusion of its business as may be possible. His Excellency has also authorized me to say that he is willing, at the same time, to approve the immediate issue of a Proclamation for the holding of a general election on June 11.

I am in doubt as to just what our procedure for the rest of the day should be, and therefore will move that the Senate adjourn during pleasure, to resume at the call of the bell, probably at six o'clock. By that time His Honour the Speaker may have information from Government House as to whether the Royal Assent will be given this evening.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

The sitting was resumed.

Hon. Mr. KING: Honourable senators, I am advised that there is still some prospect of certain bills coming to us from the other House, and would suggest that we again adjourn during pleasure.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

Hon. Mr. KING: Honourable senators, I have to report merely that it is the hope of the Government that the two Bills now under consideration in the other Chamber will be completed and sent to us before 11 o'clock. That would give us an opportunity to deal with them this evening, and then I would move that the Senate adjourn until Monday at 2.45, so that at 3 o'clock we might have Royal Assent and the Prorogation of Parliament.

I now move that the Senate adjourn during pleasure, to resume at the call of the bell.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

FIRST READING

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill 3, an Act for granting to His Majesty aid for national defence and security.

The Bill was read the first time.

SECOND READING

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable senators, when shall this Bill be read the second time?

Hon. J. H. KING: I would move second reading now. Briefly, the Bill provides that out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund there may be paid and applied, beyond the ordinary grants of Parliament, a sum not exceeding two billion dollars, subject to allotment by the Treasury Board, towards defraying any expenses or making any advances or loans that may be incurred or granted by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending March 31, 1946.

As is well understood, it is proposed to grant only five-twelfths of the war appropriation. The estimates are based on those of the preceding year, and the items are virtually the same.

I would suggest that the explanatory notes which accompany the Bill should be placed on Hansard.

(The explanatory notes follow.)

Apart from the necessary changes to make this Bill accord with the changes in the amount of the appropriation requested, and the changes in dates, this Bill is in the same form as that of previous War Appropriation Bills, with the two following exceptions:

(1) The preamble draws attention to the fact that the term of the present Parliament will have ended on April 17 next, and that consequently an interim appropriation is necessary to provide funds for the continuing prosecution of the war until the next Parliament assembles; and

(2) There has been added a new paragraph (d) in section two of the Bill.

It is intended that the funds to be provided under the Bill will be used for the purposes set out in the War Appropriation Acts passed last year, and in the War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act 1943 as amended by the War Appropriation (United Nations Mutual Aid) Act 1944.

The amount of the appropriation requested is based on the assumption that expenditures for war and Mutual Aid will continue during the next five months at approximately the same rate as during the last five or six months.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable senators, I do not intend to oppose the passage of

this Bill, but I do want to protest against the summoning of Parliament to meet at such a late date. For the purpose of having a full discussion of war expenditures we should have been in session certainly not later than the 1st of February. I recognize that although the Senate may reject, it has no power to amend, a money bill. A few years ago the honourable leader opposite (Hon. Mr. King) adopted the excellent practice of having resolutions relating to war and other financial measures considered by our Standing Committee on Finance before the bills themselves reach this Chamber. That practice, which was not followed in the present instance, enables us to question the Ministers and Deputy Ministers of the departments concerned and get full information on the proposed expenditures. I appreciate that this Bill covers only interim supply for a period of about five months, and that further supply will be dealt with by a new Parliament, but frankly I do not like to see money bills rushed through. I repeat, I am not objecting to the Bill at all, but I believe it was a mistake to delay the assembling of Parliament until there was not time enough left for a thorough investigation of these expenditures.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the SPEAKER: When shall this Bill be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. KING: I move that third reading be given now.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 2

FIRST READING

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill 4, an Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1946.

The Bill was read the first time.

SECOND READING

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable senators, when shall this Bill be read the second time?

Hon. Mr. KING: With leave, I would move second reading now.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I presume this is a vote of five-twelfths of the total civil estimates.

Hon. Mr. HAIG.

Hon. Mr. KING: It is for a period of five months, yes.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I thought that was so, but I do not see it stated in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. COPP: The amount mentioned in section 2 is said to be five-twelfths of the main estimates.

Hon. Mr. KING: This Bill is for an appropriation of \$148,845,000.59, being five-twelfths of the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1946. In addition it votes the sum of \$437,749.83, one-twelfth of the amount of each of the items in schedule A, and \$862,958.33, one-sixth of the amount of the items in schedule B.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Yes, I understand that.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. KING moved the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

The Hon. the SPEAKER informed the Senate that he had received a communication from the Assistant Secretary to the Governor General, acquainting him that the Honourable Thibaudeau Rinfret, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, would proceed to the Senate Chamber on Monday, April 16, at 3 p.m. for the purpose of proroguing the present session of Parliament.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Mr. KING: Honourable senators, I move that when the senate adjourns to-day it do stand adjourned until Monday, April 16, at 2.45 p.m.

The motion was agreed to:

The Senate adjourned until Monday, April 16, at 2.45 p.m.

THE SENATE

Monday, April 16, 1945.

The Senate met at 2.45 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

ROYAL ASSENT—SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

The Honourable Thibaudeau Rinfret, the Deputy of the Governor General, having come and being seated at the foot of the Throne, and the House of Commons having been summoned, and being come with their Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to give the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act for granting to His Majesty aid for national defence and security.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1946.

After which the Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to close the Sixth Session of the Nineteenth Parliament of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

You will be deeply gratified that the close of the last session of this war Parliament comes at a time when decisive battles against Germany have been fought and won, at sea, in the air, and on land; and when spectacular Allied successes against Japan presage the defeat of our enemies in Asia, as well as in Europe.

All Canada has watched with ever increasing pride the contribution Canadian forces have made toward ultimate victory.

I am particularly pleased that my leave-taking of honourable members of the present Parliament comes at a moment when both Houses have endorsed the acceptance by the Government of the invitation to Canada to send representatives to the United Nations conference at San Francisco which opens on the 25th of this month.

It is indeed gratifying that the Canadian delegation has been assured of the strong support of both Houses of Parliament in a determined effort to further the creation of an international organization to maintain peace and security in the post-war world. Next to the winning of the war, the winning of the peace is the supreme end to be achieved.

As the promise of peace dawns, a shadow has been cast athwart the threshold of the San Francisco conference by the passing of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In the general acceptance of a charter for an international security organization the late President foresaw the realization

of a great hope: an enduring peace through co-operative action on the part of all nations. His life and work helped to impart that vision to others. The deliberations of the conference will now be inspired by his indomitable spirit.

In the death of Franklin Roosevelt, Canada mourns the loss of a true friend and a good neighbour; the oppressed peoples of the earth, a valiant champion; and mankind, a mighty leader of the forces of freedom.

Members of the House of Commons:

My Ministers have consistently taken the position that the people should be secured in their rights under the Constitution to elect representatives to the House of Commons at least every five years, and that, subject to this limitation, any question as to the time of a general election should be viewed in the light of what Canada owes to her fighting men. My Ministers have also felt that, once decisive battles had been fought, a general election should be held as soon as possible. They are deeply gratified that it is now possible to hold a general election at a time more favourable than any hitherto, to a careful consideration by members of the armed forces, as well as by citizens generally, of the problems which relate to Canada's future. The most ample provision has been made for the exercise of the franchise by members of the armed forces in all parts of the world.

The term of the present Parliament will expire at midnight to-night. On the advice of the Prime Minister, I shall approve a recommendation to have Parliament dissolved at the conclusion of this afternoon's proceedings. I shall also approve the issue, immediately thereafter, of a Proclamation for the holding of a general election on June 11.

I thank you for having made the necessary financial provision for the effective conduct of the war, and for meeting the ordinary expenses of government required to bridge over the period between the beginning of the present fiscal year and the opening of a new Parliament following the general election.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The people of Canada as a nation welcome to-day the opportunity to express profound gratitude to Almighty God for the deliverance from evil forces which in His Providence we now see is being vouchsafed to peoples of our own and other countries which our enemies have sought to conquer and enslave. As this Parliament ends, we join in humble and reverent thanksgiving to God for His Mercy thus revealed to our own and other freedom-loving lands.

INDEX TO DEBATES OF THE SENATE

SIXTH SESSION, NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1945

Abbreviations:—1r, 2r, 3r=first, second or third reading. Com=Committee. Div=Division.
M=Motion. Ref=Referred. Rep=Report.

Appropriation Bills. See Bills (Public)

Aseltine, Hon. W. M.

Fishing, commercial in Prince Albert National Park, inquiry, 71

Ballantyne, Hon. Charles C., P.C. (Leader of the Opposition)

San Francisco Conference

Delegates to, 25

Security Council, 24

Senate representation, 73

Senate

Business and adjournments, 5, 36

Senators, deceased, 2

Beauregard, Hon. Elie

San Francisco Conference

Atlantic Charter, 76

Canada's position, 74

The Polish problem, 75, 76

Bench, Hon. J. J.

Address by, in Hamilton—"The Senate of Canada, its Purpose and Function", 30-36

Bills (Public)

Appropriation

No. 1. 1-2-3r, 50

No. 2. 1-2-3r, 98

War (No. 1). 1-2-3r, 97-98

Railway Bill (pro forma). 1r, 1

Black, Hon. Frank B., the late, 2

Campbell, Hon. G. P.

San Francisco Conference

Canada's position, 79-81

Functional representation, 80

Canadian National Railways

Payments to Government, inquiry, 50

Cantley, Hon. Thomas, the late, 2

Copp, Hon. Arthur B., P.C.

Senators, deceased, 3

Davies, Hon. W. Rupert

San Francisco Conference

Britain's home front, a tribute, 29

Canada's representatives, 28

Security Council, 28, 29

Sterling bloc, 29

Donnelly, Hon. J. J.

"The Senate of Canada, its Purpose and Function", Address by Hon. Mr. Bench in Hamilton, 29

Duff, Hon. William

San Francisco Conference

Canada's position, 25

Senators, deceased, 4

Education, 79

Employment and Income

Government White Paper tabled, 93

Fallis, Hon. Iva C.

San Francisco Conference

Canada's position, 26, 27

Food for liberated peoples of Europe, 26

Women's viewpoint, 26

Farris, Hon. J. W. deB.

San Francisco Conference

Boundary problems, 86

British Commonwealth nations, status of, 89-91

Relations with United States, 91-92

Canada's status, 90, 91, 92

Democracy, requirements of, 86

Dumbarton Oaks proposals and League of Nations covenant, 87

Freedom of trade, 86

International Court of Justice, 91

Pacifism, 85

Peace plan, essentials of, 84, 85

Security Council, 89

Sovereign equality of states, 87

Suggested treaty, 84

Voting power, 89

Fishing

Commercial, in Prince Albert National Park, inquiry, 71

Foster, Hon. W. E., P.C.

Payments to Government by Canadian National Railways, inquiry, 50

Germany

Capitulation of, Press report, question of privilege, 36

Gouin, Hon. L. M.

San Francisco Conference
 Canada's position, 64, 65
 Functional representation, 63
 Power of veto, 64
 Sovereign equality of nations, 62

Haig, Hon. John T.

Address in reply to Speech from the Throne
 Agricultural markets, 13
 Parliament, life of, 12
 Re-establishment of veterans, 12
 San Francisco Conference, 14
 Socialism, 14
 Taxation, 13
 President Roosevelt, the late, 94
 War Appropriation Bill No. 1, 97

Horner, Hon. R. B.

Horses in transit, alleged mutilation, 6

Horses in transit, alleged mutilation, 6**Hugessen, Hon. Adrian K.**

San Francisco Conference
 British Commonwealth, 46
 Canada's position, 41, 42, 45, 46
 Dumbarton Oaks proposals, 39, 40
 Economic and Social Council, 47, 48
 Great Powers, the, 40, 41
 Security Council, composition and powers, 40, 41, 43
 World wars, future, 47

Jones, Hon. George B.

Senators, deceased, 3

King, Hon. J. H., P.C. (Leader of the Government)

Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne
 San Francisco Conference, 16
 Socialism, 16
 Taxation, 17
 Trade, 17
 War in Europe, the, 16
 Appropriation Bills
 No. 1, 50
 No. 2, 98
 War (No. 1), 97
 Employment and Income, Government White Paper, 93
 German Capitulation, press report, question of privilege, 36
 Parliament
 Business of, statement of Prime Minister as to date of General Election, 96, 97
 Life of, 16
 President Roosevelt, the late, 94
 Prince Albert National Park, commercial fishing in, 71
 Railway Bill (pro forma), 1r, 1

King, Hon. J. H., P.C.—Con.

San Francisco Conference
 British Commonwealth nations, status, 19
 Correspondence relating to, 18
 Delegates, 23, 72
 Dumbarton Oaks proposals, 20
 Proposal to reprint report of debate in Senate, 93
 Senate
 Business and adjournments, 5, 36
 Committee on Orders and Privileges, M, 1
 "Purpose and Function of", address by Hon. Mr. Bench in Hamilton, 30-36
 Representation at San Francisco Conference, 72
 Sittings, emergency, 6
 Senators, deceased, 2
 Speech from the Throne, M for consideration of, 1

Lambert, Hon. Norman P.

San Francisco Conference
 Canada's responsibility, 66, 70
 Canada's representation, 67
 Canada's status, 66
 Extension of life of Parliament, 70, 71
 Functional representation, 68
 Regional groups, 69
 Sovereign equality of nations, 68

League of Nations, 77-79**Marcotte, Hon. Arthur**

San Francisco Conference
 Canada's position, 56-59

Morand, Hon. Lucien

San Francisco Conference, delegates to, 73
 "The Senate of Canada, its Purpose and Function", address by Hon. Mr. Bench in Hamilton, 30

McRae, Hon. A. D.

Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne
 Air transport, 53, 54
 Export trade, 52
 Family Allowances, 51
 Mining development and gold production, 54, 55
 National production, 51, 52
 Post-war employment, 51
 Taxation, 52
 San Francisco Conference
 Senate debate on, proposal to reprint, 93
 World wars, future, 49

Parliament

General Election, statement as to date of, 96
 Life of, 12, 16, 70, 71
 Opening, 1
 Prorogation, 98, 99

Paterson, Hon. Norman McL.

- Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne
- The economic situation in Canada, 38
- In Europe, 37

Prince Albert National Park

- Commercial Fishing, inquiry, 71

Quinn, Hon. Felix P.

- Senators, deceased, 5

Railways

- An Act relating to (Bill pro forma), 1r, 1
- Payments to Government by Canadian National, inquiry, 50

Robertson, Hon. W. McL.

- Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne
- Canada's war record, 9
- San Francisco Conference, 10
- San Francisco Conference
- Canada's productive capacity, 60
- International trade, 60-62
- Trading sections, 61, 62

Roosevelt, The late President

- Tributes to his memory, 94

Royal Assent, 50, 99**San Francisco Conference, 18-29, 39-50, 56-62, 62-71, 74-81, 82-93**

- Atlantic Charter, 76
- Canada's position, 41, 42, 45, 46, 56-59, 64, 74, 79, 90, 91, 92
- Canada's responsibility, 66, 70
- Canada's representation, 66
- Delegates, 72
- Economic and Social Council, 48, 49
- Functional representation, 63, 68, 80
- League of Nations, 77-79, 87
- Polish problem, 75, 76, 77
- Regional groups, 69
- Security Council, composition and powers, 40, 41, 43

San Francisco Conference—Con.

- Senate debate on, proposal to reprint, 93
- Senate representation, 72
- Sovereign equality of nations, 63, 68, 87
- Trading sections, 60, 61

Senate

- Business and adjournments, 5, 36
- Committees
- Orders and Privileges, 1
- "Its Purpose and Function", address by Hon. Mr. Bench in Hamilton, 29-36
- Procedure in debate, 6
- Representation at San Francisco Conference, 72, 76
- Rules, suspension of, 81
- Sittings, emergency, 6

Senators deceased, 2-5**Speech from the Throne, 1, 99**

- Address in reply, 7-11, 11-17, 37-39, 51-55
- Adopted, 55

Taxation, 13**Vaillancourt, Hon. Cyrille**

- Address in reply to Speech from the Throne
- National co-operation, plea for, 7
- San Francisco Conference, 8

Veterans

- Re-establishment of, 12, 51, 54, 65

Vien, Hon. Thomas (Speaker)

- Procedure in debate, ruling, 7
- San Francisco Conference, proposal to reprint debate in Senate, 93

War Appropriation Bill. See Bills (Public)**Wilson, Hon. Cairine R.**

- San Francisco Conference
- Education, the problem of the day, 79
- League of Nations, activities of, 78, 79
- Senate representation, 76
- The United States and the, 77