

thing about this atomic bomb; science and religion are marching more closely together, and if we are to have everlasting peace we shall have to carry out what the apostle said in the verse which I have quoted. We should send missionaries to the UNO to help change the hearts of men. The budget forgets all about these things; it says nothing at all about these things.

I hold in my hand a copy of an address given at Winnipeg by Mr. Edward Mallory, of the Department of Trade and Commerce, in which he points out the effects of preferential trade upon industry. Over 2,500 industries have come in the country because of it. As I said the other day in this house:

The Ottawa agreements increased the trade between Canada and Britain by forty-one per cent and between Britain and Canada by forty-three per cent, and we have had multilateral trade. Formerly it was known as most favoured nation treaties. We made these treaties with some thirty-two different countries between the two wars, but they brought us very little in the way of exports. What countries can afford an export market for Canadian goods? Upon exports we live. Markets are available with respect to many things, but the only great agricultural market left in the world for Canada is Great Britain. We acquired a preference in that market for wheat at six cents a bushel, which Sir Wilfrid Laurier once said he would give almost anything to obtain. It is equally true that the preference on apples, pears and so on meant the sale of a million barrels of these fruits from Nova Scotia in one year. What we lack is markets for our exports; and if anyone thinks we are going to find in the United States a market for either our agricultural products on any substantial scale, or for manufactured goods, I am afraid he will be disappointed. The only things they will be willing to take from us are the raw materials from which to manufacture finished products, as they have done previously.

I am much disturbed at the present state of the world. I do not like the terms of the loans made by the United States. In my opinion they are much more like the ruthless and vindictive demands of a victor made upon a vanquished foe than arrangements between allies. It must be apparent by this time that, had it not been for Britain alone, and with her holding out as she did, all would have been ended, and there would have been a complete collapse of civilization.

Then again I said:

I refer to the subject of the bases. The principle of the joint Anglo-American use of bases is now in full operation. But the precedent of long-term leases of bases from Newfoundland to British Guiana, under the fifty-destroyers agreement of 1940 contains the seeds of future conflict. That agreement, which confers 99-year leases on the United States, does not provide for the British use of these bases and apparently contains no release clause in any form. If bases are to be held jointly such arrangements should be made on terms of strict reciprocity. In the present case, the use of land and the cost of bases in allied territory should be charged to

lend-lease account and an agreement should at the same time be made to terminate the 99-year lease and cancel it and to transfer the costs of the destroyers to lend-lease account.

That should have been done long ago. I hope it will be done later on. What Mr. Attlee said yesterday is true. Much talk has gone on about British imperialism. As Burke said, we should elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of Providence has called us. That glorious empire has gone to the seven seas and has won the admiration of the world. In the places to which the empire has gone it has given freedom, liberty, good government and civilization. Britain went to war because of her pledge to Poland. The United States and Russia went to war because they were invaded, which is different.

The two bases of Russian expansion are political and economical. As I said last year, quoting the great *National Review*:

There have been no public claims like Hitler's demands that people of German origin everywhere should be brought within the German sphere. But at the Paris conference there have been statements from the Russian group raising the racial issue. In arguing for the acceptance of Bulgarian claims the Polish delegate, Mr. Rzymowski, declared: "In our opinion Bulgars should receive humane and indulgent treatment. It is the only Slav people among the ex-enemy states." While Molotov was greeted with enthusiastic applause from the Russian group when he said: "The time is past when Slav lands were material for partition among the European powers, when Slav peoples groaned under the yoke of western or eastern invaders. It is well known that the Slav nations have now found their place in the ranks of the allied states and that political life in all Slav countries is being built up along progressive democratic lines.

The prospect for the future looks dismal. There have even been threats from the Russian group of a third world war put in typical Soviet fashion, inversely. Opposition to the aims of the Russian group is said to be due or encouraged by reactionary cliques and fascist remnants who wish to see a third world war. Must, then, the Soviets be allowed a free hand to avoid such a catastrophe?

Recent history surely proves that opposition in time to the nazis might have averted a war which President Roosevelt once declared should be named the war of survival. Opposition now to Russian pretensions is one way in which another world war, another war of survival for our western conception of life, can be avoided.

Here is what a great British newspaper said the other day, quoting a recent speech delivered overseas by Lord Bennett, who used to be prime minister here, in which he made reference to "those powerful factors that are at work in a conspiracy to undermine the unity and destroy the life of the British com-