

their ingenuousness were it not that they influence men of the power and standing of Lord Astor and Sir Walter Layton, both of whom were connected with the notorious British commonwealth relations conference held under the auspices of Chatham House in February of this year.

We were then in the midst of war, which did not prevent passages in British ships being reserved for mysterious gentlemen from the dominions who had apparently been brought to this country to discuss the desirability of the empire's dissolution. The press was not admitted, but it is known that the talks ranged from internationalizing her colonial service to making the dominions' office part of the foreign office. An economic policy for the empire was spurned in favour of one "transcending national frontiers." So with defence. Every kind of separatism was urged,—all under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

"Royal!"

"Truth" published an attack on the conference in April, but further light has since been issued on its subversive tendency by Mr. Lionel Curtis in a "Comment" addressed to the Royal Empire Society. Mr. Curtis describes how he endeavoured to secure agreement on the need for a unified empire strategy, only to be told that the question had become "obsolete". The chairman of the conference (name not disclosed) desired the word "institutions" in relation to the empire to be soft-pedalled, but "attached the greatest importance to the joint defence board of Canada and the U.S.A. becoming a permanent 'institution'." A Canadian delegate observed that the "U.S.A. might not approve of Canada allowing the training of commonwealth forces on Canadian soil"—in which statement Mr. Curtis declared that he "recognized the policies of the Liberal party machine in Canada and the C.C.F. party machine." Mr. George Ferguson, editor of the *Winnipeg Free Press* asserted that Canadians were furious when people in Great Britain thanked them for coming to save this island from conquest by Germany, since they had been serving their own interest alone. . . .

Still uglier, however, is the total picture of the conference which Mr. Curtis gives. After describing how the promoters and founders of the league of nations had hoped and expected that the British commonwealth would be "liquidated" into the league and how, when this vision faded, the commonwealth, still not disintegrated, was able to stand alone to save civilization. Mr. Curtis rounded on the delegates with these words, "In face of these facts you are now asking for the liquidation of the British commonwealth into Dumbarton Oaks. . . . Once more you are luring public opinion down the primrose path which leads to another butchery, a third holocaust. It is my fate in my old age to attack my oldest and best friends." He names some of them—Lord Cecil, Lord Samuel, George Ferguson, Edgar Tarr.

Also of Winnipeg.

It should be remembered that the man uttering this denunciation is not a nationalist, as "Truth" readers understand that word: on the contrary his book, "World War: Its Cause and Cure" was criticized in these columns because of its starry-eyed internationalism. His courageous exposure of the conference is, on that very ground, not less but more significant.

[Mr. Jaques.]

We have heard quite a lot about "collective security." To my mind it is a very curious and suggestive thing that those who talk the most about collective security are the very ones who would destroy the only effective collective security which there was in the world in 1939. The British empire then, by standing together, saved the world from destruction by the forces of totalitarianism, and it is those people who are so anxious to save the world from another war who are trying so hard to destroy that very collective security. That is why I take the stand I do.

I do not understand the sense of this idea of global security. If you want to protect a forest from a holocaust of fire, do you not, if you can afford it, and if you have the time, divide that forest into sections, so that if there is a fire you can isolate it and prevent it from spreading? But what is this global security? What do these global ideas mean? Suppose Bulgaria in a few years' time, or some other Balkan state, starts a war against Greece or one of its neighbours. Instead of the war being isolated, it would be made global and the whole world would be engaged in it one part against the other, so that there would be an international holocaust. Sometimes I think that is the purpose.

I heard some very strong ideas expressed before the six o'clock recess by an hon. member to my right in criticism of this group. Apparently everything is lovely in the garden of Europe, but I will say this. Instead of the Atlantic charter and the freedom promised to those people who were the victims of Hitler, what have we to-day? From the Elbe to the Adriatic there are perhaps 120,000,000 people who have become enslaved by Stalin, and so far I have not heard one word in this house in defence of them. There is altogether too much smugness about this business. Yes, we are to have peace, but at whose price? Who is paying the price?

I could quote what Winston Churchill said as reported in the *British Hansard*. He said: "What is the condition of millions of people in Europe to-night? Not fear of invasion by a foreign foe, but fear of the Red policeman." Then he goes on to say, "Here is a family sitting around the fire talking and presently there is a knock on the door and the father or a brother is called out and the chances are he will never return, nor will the family know what his destiny is. And, "Mr. Churchill adds, "they know better than to ask".

If things are as they have been represented to the people of Canada and if all the atrocities have been committed by Germany. I