

*United Nations Agreement*

What was the result of Britain's supremacy on the seas? It proved the salvation of the world in the days of Philip II of Spain, in the days of Louis XIV and Napoleon and twice against Germany in our generation. Britain has had a long connection with European history; and as a result, as I said in the last debate, this vast collection of European peoples of various races, colours, creeds and civilizations have had for four centuries three of the freedoms of the Atlantic charter. They have had them ever since Britain first invaded the continent of Europe hundreds of years ago. What were the freedoms which Britain gave and which she has continued to give all down the ages? Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom from fear, three of the clauses of the Atlantic charter, have guaranteed to Europe by Britain's command of the seas. She also conferred on the world by the same agency a hundred years of peace, from the signing of the peace treaty after Waterloo in 1815 to the invasion of Belgium in 1914.

Therefore I say again, that if we want internationalism let us start with the British empire, because none of the dominions are able to go it alone; unless the dominions hang together with the mother country they will hang separately, and they will have nothing to say whatever about peace terms. That is something which we might reflect upon when we are considering the charter.

We have no reason to apologize for what the mother country has done for the world and for civilization. I have referred to that matter briefly, and time will not permit me to go farther. The task which remains for the mother country is a prodigious one, and one which will test all her strength.

As regards these security pacts, we have had them for more than two hundred years and we have had various mythical leagues of nations.

When the San Francisco conference was proposed and the subject was under discussion on March 21, 1945, I pointed out that this treaty would teach us one or two things which we should bear in mind. As I said then, we should not forget the lessons of history, because it is inconceivable that English people in the Elizabethan or the Victorian era, under Burleigh or Palmerston, or the French under Louis XIV, or the Americans under Monroe or Lincoln, would have dreamt of submitting their personal concerns to state control, or of surrendering the sovereign rights and national interests of their countries to the control of any international organization. A great professor, I pointed out, had written a textbook

[Mr. Church.]

on the subject—Professor S. R. Gardiner. This historian, commenting on the treaty of Utrecht, said:

The truth is that states combine readily through fear and very seldom through a desire for the common good, and when Louis XIV ceased to be formidable each state thought exclusively of its own interests.

It was in the same year, 1713, that the great scholar l'Abbe de St. Pierre, first set out the theory of collective security in France. He went to an able cardinal of France, Cardinal Fleury, and asked him to consider the scheme. The cardinal replied, "Have you sent out missionaries to turn the hearts of men?" I think that is what we should have done in San Francisco. We should have sent missionaries among some of these forty nations.

Nothing more was heard of collective security until in 1815 Emperor Alexander I of Russia proposed what is known as the Holy Alliance or the Concert of Europe. Between whom? Between Russia, Prussia and Austria. They were to meet every few years, the contracting parties look over the face of Europe and see how peace and security was. What did it lead to? It led to the great prime minister of Great Britain, George Canning, urging that Britain should get out of Europe and seek a new alliance for a while; and it led by provocation to the United States adopting the Monroe doctrine in 1823. As Lord Castlereagh, the great foreign minister wrote to Lord Liverpool in 1815 at the Quai D'Orsay, "It was not without difficulty that we went through the interview with becoming gravity." It was the spiritual force behind the Concert of Europe of which Russia, Austria and Prussia were the protagonists. They were the high contracting parties. It lasted eight years, its most notable achievement being that it provoked the United States into establishing the Monroe doctrine in 1823.

Then another century passed and you have the league established which I have referred to before, and now Dumbarton Oaks.

I have here an article written by the Right Reverend R. J. Renison, of the Church of England, in the *Globe and Mail* of August 13, under the title, "The Tower of Babel," in which he says:

The legend of Babel may be untouched folklore, but it is an uncomfortable picture of man. For man always has built his towers, and the end always is the same. The latest lies in ruins on the Bavarian Alps, and now, God help us, we have the Big Three and the San Francisco conference.

Let us translate Genesis into modern English: "And they said: 'Come on, let us make a new world which will give us heaven on earth.'" The effort of man to work out a scheme of life for