

and freedom to 400 millions of India with security and none were armed. If she stepped out tomorrow, somebody else would step in. I fear that soviet Russia would come in and draw an iron curtain across that country. It is my view that a tragic mistake has been made by the government, and it is my hope that before many months have passed something will be done about it to repeal such a foolish proposal to withdraw British control of India, a blessing for over 100 years. The same of the Suez and the Nile. It should be held by Britain for security reasons.

I have mentioned bases in the Atlantic, the Arctic and the Pacific. At the present time the United States is saying that the Pacific is her territory, just as Mussolini talked about *mare nostrum*, meaning the Mediterranean. The truth is that Great Britain, before the war had control of the Pacific entirely. She was mistress of the seas. The mother country gave the world peace for 100 years between Waterloo in 1815 and the outbreak of the first world war in Belgium in 1914. She gave the world peace and security, just as she has given India peace, justice and security for the past 100 years.

May I say in conclusion that I should like to read briefly from Green's "Short history of the British People." I am sorry this book is no longer found in our schools. It was Woodrow Wilson's favourite history. In this extract the author is referring to Great Britain's losing the American colonies, but Britain survived that disaster, and he says:

What startled men most at the time was the discovery that England was not ruined by the loss of her colonies or by the completeness of her defeat. She rose from it indeed stronger and greater than ever. The next ten years saw a display of industrial activity such as the world had never witnessed before. During the twenty years which followed she wrestled almost single-handed against the energy of the French revolution, as well as against the colossal force of Napoleonic tyranny, and came out of the one struggle unconquered and out of the other a conqueror. Never had England stood higher among the nations of the old world than after Waterloo; but she was already conscious that her real greatness lay not in the old world but in the new. From the moment of the Declaration of Independence it mattered little whether England counted for less or more with the nations around her. She was no longer a mere European power, no longer a mere rival of Germany or Russia or France. She was from that hour a mother of nations. In America she had begotten a great people . . . Her work was to be colonization. Her settlers were to dispute Africa with the Kaffir and the Hottentot, to wrest New Zealand from the Maori, to sow on the shores of Australia the seeds of great nations. And to these nations she was to give not only her blood and her speech, but the freedom which she had won. It is the thought of

[Mr. Church.]

this which flings its grandeur round the pettiest details of our story in the past. The history of France has little result beyond France itself. German or Italian history has no direct issue outside the bounds of Germany or Italy. But England is only a small part of the outcome of English history. Its greater issues lie not within the narrow limits of the mother island, but in the destinies of nations yet to be. The struggles of her patriots, the wisdom of her statesmen, the steady love of liberty and law in her people at large were shaping in the past of our little island the future of mankind.

(Translation):

Mr. GEORGES H. HEON (Argenteuil):
Mr. Speaker, I should hate myself for speaking after my hon. friend from Broadview in any other language but French. Knowing as I do that he and his constituents have always favoured bilingualism in this country, I wish to pay him a tribute that will help him secure re-election and shall therefore preface my remarks with a few words in French.

It is a matter of deep regret to me, Mr. Speaker, that the adjournment of the debate on the address in reply deprived me of an earlier opportunity to congratulate my two French-speaking colleagues recently elected in Pontiac and Richelieu-Vercheres. Their maiden speeches in this house have been rather remarkable although they probably realized that parliamentary oratory has little in common with the hustings, for enthusiasm is not as easily stirred up here as it is in an electoral campaign. Nor could my hon. friends fail to realize that French-speaking members are to be found on both sides of the house and that, while the latter are not uniformly smitten with the liberalism practiced by the present government since 1940, and while they have not applied for membership cards in Union des Electeurs, they will none the less work with the liberalism practised by the present in any concerted effort in the service of their country, Canada.

(Text):

Mr. Speaker, at this date and therefore quite belatedly I want to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Miller) and the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Timmins) upon having been elected to the house. Winning a by-election when one's political party is in opposition is a considerable achievement, no matter how you look at it and whether you sit to the right or left of the Speaker. In the case of these two hon. gentlemen I am informed that this is a richly deserved reward for their excellent record of public service in the realm of municipal government, which is indeed the government nearest to the