

To this must be added the so-called personal requisitions; watches, ornaments, clothes. Houses were completely stripped of furnishings. Even the dwellings of the poor were denuded. The Russians did not care whether they robbed capitalists or workers.

Mention has been made of the recent conference in London and in this regard I should like to quote from the *Congressional Record* of October 1. One of the members of congress gave a quotation from "The Changing World," by Constantine Brown, who is considered to be one of the best informed men in Washington on foreign affairs. He said:

Secretary of State Byrnes is returning from London, a disappointed man. He and his colleagues discovered there is a great difference between discussing lofty ideals, such as those expressed at San Francisco, and the stark realities of "territorial adjustments", when the power complex of the victorious nations emerges as strong as it has existed for thousands of years.

The American government has sought to end the old philosophy of balance of power and has attempted—at the price of giving up many of its ideals about international justice—to put into effect the thesis of "one world". Previously our policy framers had reluctantly thrown overboard such nations as Poland and Finland. But there was a firm belief among them that these were only temporary situations and eventually, after peace and political sanity were reestablished in the world, the nations would all regain their freedom.

The same thought governed the American policy framers in regard to other states in the Balkans, where the Russian "liberation" hand laid heavily on the "liberated" peoples.

Mr. Byrnes was convinced that when the representatives of the big five nations, which had suffered so much devastation from the war, sat around the green table, they would make concessions—not necessarily to each other—but to a peace-hungry world. They all had pledged themselves to work in full harmony and co-operation at San Francisco. The American senate, known in the past for its fear of international entanglements, had almost unanimously voted America's full participation on international affairs. Yet Mr. Byrnes is now reported to be a sadly disappointed man.

Not only was he met with a challenging attitude on the part of Foreign Commissar Molotov on all matters which were discussed in London, but he was told plainly that Russia does not intend to yield on any matter in which her interests are involved. Her "interests" meant plainly the complete domination of all the areas in Europe where her forces have been stationed as a temporary war measure with the consent of the other allies, and the expansion of her influence to far areas such as the Red sea and the eastern Mediterranean.

Mr. Byrnes would have been happy to make concessions to the Russians' point of view if he thought he could obtain some sort of a quid quo pro from Commissar Molotov. But the further the discussions went the more apparent it became that Russia was more interested in territorial matters than in the lofty ideals contained in the U.N.O. charter.

The charter which is under discussion.

The charter, it became obvious to the American Secretary of State, was to have as a principal function in the future the guaranty of the territorial grabs.

I might quote very briefly from an old country Liberal weekly paper called *Truth*, one of the oldest and most respectable political papers published in Great Britain. When I was a young man I used to read it when it was edited by the late Henry Labouchere, and no greater Liberal, I suppose, lived than he, certainly in our lifetime. Let me quote from an article in this paper. I shall be as brief as I can, but I think it is of importance. Somebody, probably some member of the house, was kind enough to send me a copy for my perusal, and I think it is so good that I am going to put part of it on *Hansard*. This extract has been checked from the original. I should like to thank my unknown friend for his kindness.

Nothing but harm can come from ignoring the fact that it is the desire of certain American financial interests to break down this sense of community between the members of the British commonwealth. So long as identity of interest continues to serve as a basis of common action there will always be a drive to maintain imperial preference and a sterling area, which together challenge the economic omnipotence of New York just as surely as the presence in the world of a vast empire challenges the political omnipotence of Washington. It is to remove these stumbling blocks to increased world power that American realists pick devices such as that evolved at Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks. There would not be a great deal of danger in the situation if the facts were faced and if the empire countries remain united. Unfortunately however empire unity cannot be taken for granted. It has been undermined for years, chiefly by fifth columnists both here and in the dominions, magnificently as it displayed itself during the war.

As I have said many times in this house, the empire has been undermined by the agents of Shylock and Marx. If anybody asks me what I mean by that, I mean international finance and international communism.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member is right, but I should like to know who they are.

Mr. JAUQUES: I have put that on record before now. Some of the names are on *Hansard*.

Mr. POULIOT: But you said that only in the abstract.

Mr. JAUQUES: The article continues:

Who are these fifth columnists who still keep in step to betray Britain? For the most part they are idealists, sweet innocents convinced that Britain has only to merge her sovereignty and empire in some form of international huffer-mugger to institute the reign of law and perpetual peace on earth. One could smile at