

country has. It was the first party to promote on a gigantic scale public ownership of the resources of the country in light, power and transportation. It pioneered in taking over the Canadian National railway and in the important development of preserving the water powers for the people of this country. It also gave the province of Ontario the workmen's compensation act. In federal affairs it was the Conservatives who first proposed, in 1921, a national system of unemployment insurance, prison reform, health and hospital insurance and other social measures. It cannot be denied, says the *National Review*, that Conservatism has given to the country a long line of great statesmen, in this country as in Britain, who have known how to tread the middle path of ordered progress, and to sow a political harvest which subsequent generations have reaped a thousand-fold. It was Clarendon who restored church and king on the basis of "those admirable and incomparable laws of government"; Danby who founded the party system; Edward Seymour who, by sponsoring the act of settlement, paved the way for the Protestant succession; Harley whose practice led to the adoption of the principles that the crown acts through responsible ministers; William Pitt, the younger, who revived the idea of the strength of parliamentary government when compared with the rule of the terrorist mob and who gave the world and his country a priceless legacy of British opposition to arbitrary government and dictatorship; Peel who brought free trade to his country and converted the middle classes to Conservatism; Shaftesbury who stirred the conscience of his party on the urgent need for social reform; Disraeli who linked imperialism with democracy and issued his resounding appeal for the "two nations" of rich and poor to unite; Randolph Churchill, who in a brief life of intense activity gave colour and direction to the policy of Conservative democracy; Joseph Chamberlain who fought for imperial trusteeship and brought idealism into imperialist economics; Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain whose industrial revolution gave new life to British industry in the thirties and unconsciously paved the way in no small measure for the mighty war effort of the forties; Winston Churchill who led the country in "their finest hour." It is an impressive record of great names, despite the tarnishing that each has known in his day. I say it is an imperishable record.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I believe this country is all wrong in its conduct of foreign affairs. Certainly we were all wrong about India. There should have been a debate allowed on

[Mr. Church.]

that question. The situation in India is intolerable. Britain was in charge there for over 200 years, and now all that work is undone in two months. Neither India nor Pakistan is able to deal with the situation. All the members of the Indian civil service have been scattered, says the *Review*, and there is no one to replace them. Half a million people have been murdered; five million are homeless wanderers. Hundreds of villages have been burned; roads, bridges, hospitals, railways and canals have been destroyed. Cultivation has ceased over a wide area, and no Indian is safe. In my opinion, that certainly beats anything Hitler did, and I believe our policy has been all wrong. India and Pakistan will not be ready for dominion status for another thirty years, either in regard to education or in any other way, and both countries are facing disaster and ruin and hunger.

I do not wish to detain the house longer; no doubt I shall have a chance later on to deal further with these matters. But I want to say we must do something, Britain, Canada and the other dominions, to stand up to the disaster which is surely facing us in regard to Russia. It is difficult to understand the attitude of some of our leaders toward foreign or imperial affairs. No one can foretell what the future has in store for us, for no one can predict what will be the outcome of the conflict between communism and the western way of life. But appeasement is not a policy, nor vacillation a source of strength. Foreign policy conducted on such lines merely emboldens our enemies and perplexes our friends. Yet it is upon these lines that successive foreign secretaries have proceeded for at least the last forty years.

No one doubts Mr. Bevin's sincerity or that he has displayed great resilience and energy, but has he really stood up to Russia? What has been the result of his policy? Has it prevented the complete incorporation of the Baltic states into the Soviet Union? I say no. Did it save Mihailovitch or the Poles? I say no. Has it kept Egypt or Palestine or India or Burma within the ambit of British influence? No. Has it prevented Austria or Hungary or Bulgaria or Roumania or Yugoslavia or Czechoslovakia or eastern Germany from becoming the satellites of Russia? No. How far has it succeeded in enabling Great Britain or the sister nations of the commonwealth to play a part in the settlement of far eastern problems? In what quarter of the globe has it succeeded in winning a single victory for British diplomacy? It has not; and the reason is that it has not had the support of the dominions. If we had