

Mr. Churchill, Mr. Stalin, and the late President Roosevelt entered into what might be called a complete review of the world and came to certain agreements which afterwards came up at the San Francisco conference. All parties in the house were represented in the San Francisco conference, excepting one, which I regret was left out. They performed their duties very satisfactorily.

I wish to say that foreign affairs should not be a party matter. I am not now speaking for any political party; I am speaking simply as a private member who has supported what has been the consistent policy of the Conservative party on foreign affairs and the empire during all these years, and I have not changed my opinions. When all is said and done, if we are to embark upon internationalism we would be wise to stay in the pond and not wander out into the lake. Let us start with our own empire, which after Dunkirk saved civilization in this war, and saved the United States and Canada. But for that stand we know what happened to the countries of Europe and would have befallen Quebec and Ontario, the maritime provinces and all the other provinces. That fate was averted by the protection which Britain, save for the dominion's aid, gave after Dunkirk, when she had to face the world alone. As I said on March 21, 1945, speaking on the subject of the San Francisco conference, and on August 4, 1944, dealing with foreign affairs in general, we should get back to primary objects and not concern ourselves so much with secondary objects.

How is it that more of the dominions are not willing to make an agreement of that sort? We are not real internationalists, if we are not ready to join with other branches of the empire, the other dominions, as one family in a united empire policy of cooperation and collaboration with the mother country.

That is what the late Prime Minister Curtin of Australia and Prime Minister Fraser of New Zealand proposed when they visited us and spoke in this chamber.

Why should we not have a league of nations of our own? As has been well said to-day, the only league of nations that has ever achieved any success is the British empire. The United States knows that; the world knows it; and out of this war there should emerge a great league of nations, namely, the British empire.

As Lord Milner said in 1919, speaking at Oxford, it was a most strange anomaly to hear that the self-governing parts of the British empire should be joining a league, binding themselves by a formal tie to a number of foreign nations, when they had theretofore been unwilling to enter similar obligations with one another.

That is a fact. I pointed out that we had had experience of internationalism and international policies before the last war, and what

happened? Where would we have been if we had had such an international policy as would have meant the giving up of empire bases like Gibraltar, the Suez, the Cape, the far east, and the West Indies? The empire would have been destroyed, and further it would have meant the fall of civilization. Already the United States have secured ninety-nine year leases on various territories in British Guiana, Trinidad and the West Indies. But these bases, which it was proposed to sell before the last war started, and the others I have mentioned, are the back-bone of the British empire on the seven seas. Without them where would we have been? Germany would have won the war after Dunkirk. Upon such strong bases as these the British empire has depended for two hundred years, and will depend in the future. Without them the commonwealth and the colonies would go adrift and the empire would be a perfect absurdity on the map. Imagine what would have happened in 1940 if we had surrendered Gibraltar, Malta, the Suez, Alexandria and all these other bases! In 1940 the United States and Russia were not in the war. Britain entered the war because of her pledge to Poland. The United States entered the war because she was attacked at Pearl Harbor. Russia entered the war because she was invaded by Germany. Upon what would we have been able to depend in the first two and a half years of the war if all these ideas of internationalization had been carried out? Internationalism is all right if we have a perfect world, but we have not a perfect world yet, and are not likely to have it for some time to come. It is a dangerous policy unless we can see far ahead. We should be ready to cooperate with our allies, and allow them to use our bases, but the empire should retain its sovereignty over them.

As regards the proposals which were made at San Francisco. In a previous speech I gave some reasons why I believed the conference could not succeed, although I hoped, and everybody in the world hoped, that it would be a success. I support the charter, although it does not mean very much. I shall refer to it in more detail in a few minutes. I believe, as Napoleon said, "we must look upon things as they are and not as we wish them to be", and I believe that any foreign policy which is resolved upon will have in the future to be supported by power; otherwise it will be treated, as such policies have been in the history of the world for centuries, as a scrap of paper.