

military strength at that time. They are to be included and have a very important voice in the future. I would say that no nation of the Big Three or Five is bound under this new security council. Any one of the five can, if against them, veto the proposals. Suppose something is proposed against Germany, Britain, Russia or the United States. They have now added China and France. Any one of those five can veto everything that the general assembly does contra to their programme and everything that the small states do. What kind of agreement is that? As Mr. Churchill said, we have sacrificed everything on the altar of war.

I have referred to the fact that we should first of all try to solve the empire problems and not advance until then into these international field agreements. Let us consider and reconsider our own problems. Nations as well as individuals must have a conscience, and every person in them is responsible before the bar of history for what is done in that nation's name.

As has been said, we should first try to solve our own empire problems along the lines I have indicated. We ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of Providence has called us. By adverting to the dignity of that high calling our ancestors have turned a savage wilderness into a glorious empire, and have made the most extensive and the only honourable conquests, not by destroying but by promoting the welfare and happiness of the human race.

Unless we revive that faith which inspired us, the faith in ourselves as a nation and in the mission which is ours to serve the world, we shall have fought this war in vain. Even in the darkest days there were few, except a few intellectuals, who lacked confidence that in the end we should win. That was after Dunkirk when Britain was thrown back with but a few arms left. The whole world thought Britain was done and gone, and only the people of Britain and the dominions across the seas had faith that she would save the world and civilization.

I like to look at the real picture. I should like to look at another more realistic side of this picture. At Yalta the terms of peace for Europe and practically the whole world were settled. Those present understood Mr. Churchill's great persuasive powers, because he had great persuasive powers, with the head of Russia and the head of the United States. Notwithstanding his persuasive powers, he could not persuade Russia to alter its stand regarding Poland. Russia claimed that that was their territory and that

others had nothing to do with it. Notwithstanding the protests of Mr. Churchill and of the President of the United States, the great head of Russia announced that nothing could be done. They looked upon it as their own Russian preserve, which it was, and they continue to say that. They do not mind United States and Britain having something to say regarding their own territory that does not concern Russia. But Russia has insisted from the start that they look upon Poland as concerning themselves alone. They have objected very strongly to the United States, Britain, or any other great power and the rest of the world having anything to do with what they look upon as their own territory.

British imperialism has been attacked in this house for years between the two wars; but what about Russian imperialism and United States imperialism? I do not say that Russia and the United States want to grab territories; that remains to be seen; but both those great nations are imperialists and have always been imperialists. They want to have a much larger share in world affairs, and if we are to divide up our empire into a lot of small states and leave the mother country over there all alone to become a second Denmark, then so far as the British empire is concerned it will go into liquidation. Mr. Churchill, that great prime minister, said that he was not going to preside over the liquidation of the British empire. That is a fact. Are we going to throw aside the mother country in her darkest hour? She depends on us very largely for her food. She might have been starved out by the U-boats. She had only six weeks food on hand. She needs our imports and an exchange of her exports and services to pay for them. Are we to throw her aside in so far as trade and commerce is concerned, in favour of Argentina and a lot of other South American republics and others, or are we to stand by our own people within the empire first and trade with our empire and those who supported us against the axis, and then branch out into internationalism? That is the question before us to-day. In my opinion we are back to the old policy of balance of power. It was a good policy for the world for four hundred years. As Mr. Churchill said in the House of Commons when he spoke in regard to this matter:

The expression "power politics" has largely been used in criticism against us in some quarters. I have anxiously asked the question, "What are power politics?" I know some of our friends across the water so well that I am sure I can always speak frankly without

[Mr. Church.]