

and Mr. Fraser. I am very sorry to see this conference being held at the present time. We hear very little talk about the London conference of the British nations in early April for empire collaboration first; all we talk is internationalism about San Francisco and California. If we want internationalism let us start with our own empire, which has been the only successful league of nations in the history of the world. The greatest error we have made in this war has been in surrendering too much political, military, financial and economic initiative to Washington; that has been one of our great mistakes. We hear talk about the United States and Canada making bold trade moves. In my opinion it will be fatal to draw up international agreements based on disarmament before we have dealt with the essential questions of trade, quotas, preferential trade, empire trade, defence and migration within the empire first. We must solve these problems first. It is useless to expect harmony when basic principles are at variance. Look at the divergent economic systems of the United States and Britain, these two allies who have worked together so well during this war. Their cooperation after the war is most essential. We must appreciate the economic problems of these two countries and of Canada, for a clear understanding of these matters is needed if we are to carry on in future as we hope we may. For instance, we have the very high wages being paid in the United States. Britain is depending upon her export trade to supply goods and services in exchange for her imports of food and raw materials, while in the United States they consume all but about five per cent of what they produce. I think you will find that the United States will wish to continue its high protective tariff after the war is over. So I contend the first thing to do is to settle these important empire economic and financial questions first.

I wish these San Francisco proposals every success, but let us not forget that the twenty years between the two wars were the most disastrous in the history of the human race. We lost a generation between 1914 and 1918, and the older generation had to carry on until the commencement of this war. After the last war everyone clamoured for collective security, for a league of nations and all that sort of thing, and we saw what that brought about; it caused another war. So that while I hope something will come out of these proposals I do not believe this is the right time to call such a meeting. Further, I believe that for Canada over the head of our own dominions to join any pan-American union would be a fatal mistake, a retrograde

[Mr. Church.]

step, which might lead to the dissolution of the British empire. Many of these southern countries are fascist, they have not the British outlook; they are not large countries. For the last four hundred years, since the time of the wars with Philip of Spain and Louis XIV and Napoleon, through the two wars in our generation, the security of the world has depended upon Britain's supremacy on the high seas, which brought peace and prosperity from 1815 until the invasion of Belgium, and that will be the case equally in the future.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, is this just another attempt to make the world safe for democracy after peace comes? It is a matter of very great importance, and I congratulate all hon. members who have carefully prepared their speeches on this motion. But this is not the first time within the last few years that statesmen have tried to save the world and to end war. There was the treaty of Versailles, which was a failure; but before it was acknowledged to be a failure there was also the Briand-Kellogg pact signed in Paris in 1928, as an added reinforcement to that treaty. Both collapsed, which was very unfortunate. The result of all those efforts was pitiful.

The question now could not be to decide as to peace. We will have peace only when the enemy capitulates. We are discussing now what will be done after peace has come. We are rather ahead of our time. This discussion is premature. A man who is known the world over, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State of the United States, published a very interesting article in the *Readers' Digest* of last February, in which he says there are four corners of the Dumbarton Oaks agreement. I will mention at once the fourth corner, which has to do with disarmament. But see how cautious he is. He does not mention disarmament but says this is the progressive reduction of armaments "which in the modern world have become a crushing burden on the resources of all nations." He does not say we will disarm immediately after peace is signed. He says we will reduce armaments, which is in accord with the aspirations of most of us. Then he adds:

The general assembly of the new international organization is,

(1) To consider the general principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments.

They are considering those principles. That is the first step. What will be the second step, according to Mr. Stettinius?

The security council is to go further in order to achieve the least diversion of the world's human and economic resources for armaments.