

and all that kind of thing. They are the ones settling the peace of the world. They are also immune from the law. Their officials live in luxury, pay no taxes, aiming to control the world's finances, the world's food, the world's shipping, the world's aviation, and to dictate to nations and taxpaying individuals how they shall live, what they shall spend, what food they shall eat and the very way they shall travel. A most dangerous set-up, a danger to human freedom, a danger to freedom of trade, and most certainly the fertile breeding ground of the next war. Then *Time* magazine, commenting on this London newspaper, the one article of *Time* reproduced in the Canadian *Social Creditor* just last month, referred to the united nations educational, scientific and cultural organization:

United nations organization is an evil organization at the back of which are dark forces who would trap the Anglo-Saxon race and enslave the world.

U.N.O. is built upon the sand and its doom is as certain as the league of nations which faded away unwept, unhonoured and unsung.

From the international standpoint the only coalition which can save the world is a coalition of the British empire and the United States of America.

That is correct. In addition to that, what have we? We have *Time* magazine saying that the UNO has deliberately ignored the Almighty in all its deliberations. I believe that is right. How does it come about that the government of the day can send a group made up of its members and of other leaders of the house to New York, others to Paris, some to London and now some are going to Moscow? How does it come about that we are ignoring the policies of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier? How is it that the dominions are not willing to make an agreement of that sort? They are not international at all. If we are not willing to join with other branches of the empire, the other dominions, as one family in a uniform empire policy of cooperation and collaboration with the mother country, as the leader from Australia and others told us in this chamber, we were together for war and we should continue to be together for peace in the interests of the country, instead of relying on all these outside organizations. Internationalism is a funny thing. It consists of a whole lot of sham. One war led to another. Why should we not, I said, have a league of nations of our own, to start with the British empire? As has been well said today, the only league of nations that has ever achieved any success is the British empire. The United States knows that; the world knows it; and out of this war there should emerge a greater league of nations, namely, the British empire.

[Mr. Church.]

Lord Milner said in 1919, speaking at Oxford, it was a most strange anomaly to hear the self-governing parts of the British empire should be joining a league, binding themselves by a formal tie to a number of foreign nations, when they had heretofore been unwilling to enter similar obligations with one another.

That is a fact. Where would the United States be if they spoke with forty-six voices, the way this country is supposed to speak by separate empire views with the dominions all separate? Clemenceau has said, as have other French leaders, that we were the hardest country in the world to make a treaty with, for the reasons given, that we speak with so many different voices. As I say, I protested against the thing. The mother country went to war on account of Poland. She declared war. She sacrificed everything she had for that great little land. But here you have had a meeting at Moscow of the "Big Three," and what did they do? They signed away the rights of the countries on the Baltic, Finland, and the rest. We had nothing to say about it. This is what a great writer said—and I think he is one of the greatest writers and the greatest missionary bishop of the Church of England; and I am very proud of him and the empire part he has played in two wars; I refer to the Right Reverend Bishop Renison of Moosonee diocese, who comes from the riding of the hon. member for Cochrane. I am a great admirer of his whole life work for God and king and country. He said in a brilliant article of February 26, in the *Globe and Mail*; that what we need at the present time is a Job among the nations of the world. We have never had one. The bishop just last week was referring to this need on the very same day of announcements of the UNO and Moscow we that day had up in the house. What does he say? He says: of the glories of Britain and her empire!

We wonder whether there has ever been a Job among the nations of the world; if not, it would seem that we have one now. The legend of the British empire is only about seventy years old. It was Disraeli who first proclaimed the little white queen as empress of India, but ever since the diamond jubilee, this ancient conception of might has dominated the world's idea of the British family of nations. We almost forget that Shakespeare and Nelson did not live in an empire.

Let us look for a moment to what this people have done during a thousand years. When the Roman legions were withdrawn in the fourth century, the little islands off the coast of Europe seemed to have no future, but from this cradle something has gone to the ends of the earth which will never be forgotten. The spirit of adventure, the genius of the seas, the pioneer-