

They do not. That was never the policy of the dominions and Great Britain at any time. I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that in the first great war one million men went of their own free will from the dominions to the aid of the mother country, went over under their own status, sovereignty, and autonomy; 130,000 of them fell on the field of battle, and what they did changed the whole history of the civilized world. But do we ever hear now of their achievement? I say, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is not going to be talked out of the British empire by all the Attlees, the Morrisons, the Cripps and the rest of them. Canada will have to be fought out of it. These British members never believed in our empire and want it to go into liquidation as their speeches for years show.

I was opposed to the policy of the government in connection with the meeting in Paris, at Moscow, Potsdam, Yalta, Casablanca, London, Washington and Quebec. The policy which I humbly suggest is this. It is not in the interests of responsible government that we should have a number of different parties to represent Canada in foreign affairs. The government of the day, so long as it is the government, must be responsible for deciding these foreign affairs questions, instead of trying to shunt them off onto somebody else, asking the opposition to throw out the lifelines, so to speak, in order to save them and their separatist policies; for that is what they do when they invite the various parties in the house abroad to take part in foreign meetings.

We had a number of distinguished visitors in this chamber addressing us at one time or another, such men as Prime Minister Curtin of Australia, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Mr. Fraser, Anthony Eden, Mr. Churchill and others. They came and made certain representations to us and they did not propose that there should be any interference with our autonomy or sovereignty. What they did advocate was empire councils, as in the days of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, which would go into all these matters and come to some satisfactory conclusion, some basis upon which the members of the British commonwealth could take joint action. But they did not succeed in their efforts to secure an empire conference to deal with defence, trade and immigration and for a common empire foreign policy to speak with one voice.

For four hundred years the mother country has saved the world and safeguarded its freedom. At the time of Philip of Spain, of Louis XIV, under Napoleon, and twice in our own generation under the Kaiser and Hitler, the mother country has saved mankind from slavery and dictators.

[Mr. Church.]

But what is being done today in connection with Germany and Austria? It is inconceivable that English people in the Elizabethan or Victorian era under Burleigh and Palmerston or the French under Louis XIV or the Americans under Monroe or Lincoln could have dreamt of submitting their personal concerns of state control or of surrendering their sovereign rights and national interests of their country to the control of any international organization. It was never heard of in the old days. Why is it now suggested to hand over sovereignty by the deputy minister of foreign affairs in an address in Toronto?

At the time of the Venezuela controversy an eminent prime minister of Great Britain, Mr. Arthur Balfour, made a famous speech in 1896, in which he declared that the time must come when some statesmen of greater authority than Monroe will lay down the doctrine between English-speaking peoples that war is impossible. For my part, so far as a private member has any say in such matters, I refuse to be a party to the liquidation of the British empire. The British empire has stood for centuries like the rock of ages, for the peace and security of the world. Next to the Christian church, the British empire has been the greatest agency for the good of humanity, the greatest civilizing force in the world. No human organization has done so much to preserve the liberties of mankind as Britain has done for four centuries now.

As I say, the Prime Minister of Australia and New Zealand came here and asked to have a conference with this dominion, and to create an empire council. What was our reply? Canada replied that we had no commitments; that parliament must decide. Then came the meeting at Lake Success. I think we shall have next year to change the name to "Lake Failure", for what success did we have there? None whatever. Australia and New Zealand were anxious to have a conference in 1946 on these various empire matters, but they got no satisfaction from this country.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that Canada must accept her responsibility as the senior dominion for what has been done, and failure to have the empire act as a unit. But one reason why we have nothing to say in connection with the peace terms is that instead of banding together with the other dominions and with the mother country, we have pursued a separate policy and separatism is the cause of our not having anything to say in the peace terms. If we had hung together we would have had a large say in the peace terms, not none at all. It has been said that Britain was the hardest country in the world to make a treaty with, for the