

recent days, and which in the past considering its trade has not been a great maritime power. I submit that if we leave the thing as it now is and do not take into consideration the importance of the freedom of the seas we will destroy our best chance for world peace by merely including in these proposals as the third member of the power group the United Kingdom rather than the British commonwealth.

That is my first reason for disagreeing with these proposals. You may say that if the British commonwealth acts as a unit there will be the danger of imperial commitments. I think I have shown that if we are going into this thing at all we will be undertaking very great and serious international commitments, greater than were ever asked of any nation before. Surely any British or imperial commitments we might be asked to undertake would be light as compared with the commitments we are hoping and willing to undertake under these proposals.

We have to look at the British commonwealth from the point of view of population and production. Great Britain is a country of some forty-three million people, with perhaps two-thirds that number of white people in the remainder of the empire. If we include India the empire population other than that of the United Kingdom is many times greater than the population of the United Kingdom; but if we base our strength on population and industrial production we find that even now the commonwealth, with India and the colonial empire, has a greater industrial potential than the United Kingdom. With the commonwealth acting as a unit in this power group we would have an equal voice with the great military and industrial powers of the world.

To me, Mr. Speaker, that is imperative. But there is another danger if we do not come into this thing as a commonwealth unit. To-day we find England virtually bankrupt, with her foreign investments gone. We have taken some of them, I think unwisely. She has been forced to endeavour to form what is known as a sterling bloc, a group of empire countries outside Great Britain, including also probably the trading countries of Scandinavia and the lowlands, two of the Mediterranean countries and the greater part of Africa. On the other hand Russia and the United States have definitely intimated that they believe in trading on some form of gold standard. In the past our prosperity resulted in large measure from being the sterling broker for Great Britain in New York. We sold to Great Britain and bought from the United States, to a very large extent. If we find ourselves,

depending on sterling for our exports, situated between two great gold countries, we will find ourselves in perhaps the worst economic dilemma we could imagine. I believe we must point this out with brutal frankness to both the United States and Great Britain, and I see no better way of doing so than by demanding that we take our place as a member of the commonwealth in the permanent seat on the security council. If we do not do that we may find ourselves ground between the upper and nether millstones of gold and silver.

There is another clause which is of some interest; that is the provision with regard to the world court. The world court was a judicial device brought about in the first place at the Hague as long ago as 1904. We know there have been many other attempts at a world court, but the great attempt was made in conjunction with the league of nations. It was upon this world court that we very nearly got joint action and cooperation from the United States. But the stumbling block on which the United States refused to enter the world court was that clause dealing with advisory opinion; that is, opinion of the court in an advisory capacity with regard to a dispute between two nations.

In the Dumbarton Oaks proposals it is definitely stated that the court could also be asked to give advisory opinion to the security council on questions where a legal issue arises. That fact is stated, and stated clearly. It has been decided, and I think rightly so, that the world court shall be empowered to give advisory opinion. I think that is one of the functions of any international judicial body, and one of its most important functions. But it is on that stumbling block that the United States senate foreign relations committee refused to enter the world court before. We must be prepared for that contingency this time.

One thing further I should like to suggest to the delegates who will leave for San Francisco, is in connection with the manufacture of armaments. We have seen an attempt—an abortive attempt it is true—to restrict the manufacture of armaments. All during the unquiet years of peace, from month to month one would see stories in the newspapers telling about some country that had a new gun, or some other country that had a new tank, or some other one that had a new type of lethal gas, or one that had an extremely powerful bomb, or a new type of aircraft. All of these things were developed and kept in secret in the war departments of the various countries concerned.