

reason that there were so many separate states to deal with. That was what Clemenceau and the Premier of France said. That is true, because we are not banding together; we are not working along with the mother country, but acting with so many different voices.

We have a deputy minister suggesting that we should give up our sovereignty in connection with the security council. Fancy that! I am opposed to the policy of the government. We have given up our bases. Where would we have been in the last war if we had given up Gibraltar, the Cape, the far east, the Suez, Alexandria and the West Indies, and the other bases around the world? Our position would have been impossible. The fact is, we have been under pressure to remain neutral. I cannot understand why the deputy head of the external affairs department should suggest that we must throw away our sovereignty. I do not know where we would have been in the last war if we had followed any such advice. The Right Hon. Mr. Nash, referring to the status of the British empire, proposed that meetings should be called to decide all these matters through an empire council.

The fact is that we need a good ambassador at Moscow. Why do we not send a man like General Montgomery? Why not follow the practice that was followed after the war between the north and the south on this continent, when great soldiers and sailors demonstrated that they could make good representatives in foreign countries. Field Marshal Montgomery's visit to Moscow has shown us the possibilities in this direction. He received every honour at the hands of the Russians. Premier Stalin went out of his way to entertain Lord Montgomery. He was given a fine fur coat and was also photographed in the uniform of a Russian marshal. He invited the chief of the Russian general staff to visit England. His portrait appeared in Russian newspapers together with accounts of his military service. The newspapers in England were greatly taken with it.

What was done so far as the Paris conference was concerned? We sent a whole carload of people there, twenty-five in all. Everyone had an advisor—first secretary, second secretary, third secretary; all kinds of people, where two or three would have done with a whole lot of advisers who were only amateurs as diplomats and learned by experience. The list is given on page thirty-five. There was one more sent to New York, to Lake Success. And what success did they have? They would have had more success if they had stayed at home; if they had stayed away from Paris they might have done better. Did they say

anything about the German peace treaty and the Austrian peace treaty? No. Just more talk and nothing done, and it was turned over to the deputies to meet with the smaller nations.

As you well know, Mr. Speaker, the smaller nations will have nothing to say in the peace terms. Why? Because in the general security council any one of the "Big Four" can veto what the others do, and we agreed to all this at San Francisco. Have they not done that? They used the veto at Paris where we had all this delegation. Messrs. Truman, Bevin and Stalin agreed on Poland matters and on the Baltic countries, Finland and Norway. They will do it all over again at the meeting in Moscow on March 10. The small dominions will have very little or nothing to say over there. If we had acted with Britain and the other dominions we would have had a share. The papers reported, the *Toronto Star* and *Telegram* and others: "Canada Snubbed by Big Four". Her request to have something to say in the peace terms was vetoed. Then we have the Russian delegate, Feodor Gousev, wanting to ignore Canada altogether. Then we have the reply of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent), in which he is reported to have had correspondence and tabled it in *Hansard*. Then we have the newspapers reporting with regard to the smaller nations and the way they were treated by the "Big Four" and the terms set up to ignore them and snub them. What a spectacle and show this whole UNO is!

It serves us right, after the experience we had with the first league of nations. Why do we go on then relying on the deputies and security councils and all that sort of thing when there is no world security? Another article reports that the Secretary of State for External Affairs warns Canada not to forget United States ties, and that is the correct thing to do. Britain got out a white paper on the security council, on Paris, about the meeting over there of the deputies, and all that. It has called forth a great deal of criticism. Britain has at the present time a million men and women under arms and 450,000 labour men to support and service and produce for them. The United States has practically no force in Germany. Neither has Canada, which has withdrawn its forces. Where is security going to be? Security will be just a scrap of paper as they leave Britain to do it all. You have here these deputies, we are told, some of them sitting in security committee now. We are told that they get into these Lake Success halls, with all the luxury described by the *Patriot*; the luxurious banquets, of about fifteen or twenty courses, the fantastic salaries,