

be diplomatic, but I believe they have their *raison d'être*. I believe I have given expression to thoughts which, generally speaking, are in the minds of the people of Canada and the United States.

In conclusion, may I say that I know Canada will be well represented. I know that the "Big Four" will need Canada to be there; otherwise there will be a terrific vacancy, the absence being greatly felt. That has been well said by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. St. Laurent). We all know of the huge sacrifices of Canada during the last two wars. They were undertaken not joyfully but seriously and loyally in response to the call coming from across the sea. Our men fought on every battlefield of Europe and Asia. Much of our young blood was spilled and many young lives were lost on every battlefield known to the world. We go to the peace conference not asking for the pound of flesh, a change of territory or aggrandizement in the Atlantic or the Pacific. Surely the voice of Canada being so clear and resounding should be listened to. It should be possible for our delegates—and I know they will do so—to tell the nations of the world to forget their own nationalism and their own political and ideological pride for the welfare of the whole.

I should now like to complete my remarks by quoting the words of a great humanitarian, a man who accomplished a great work during the last war, and whose voice is highly respected. I refer to Pope Pius, the present Pope in Rome who on the 21st day of February, when speaking to a great peace gathering in Rome, used words to this effect: "Let us try with all our might on the great Christian principle, the primary one being charity, to work for the advancement of civilization and of peace; and may the nations of the world see reigning the angel of peace and that the empires will be led by God and not led by guns."

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): The motion before the house is one to adjourn the house to take up a specific matter of urgent public importance. I am sorry that in dealing with these questions the politicians have thrown away more than our forces gained in the last two wars. They have just thrown it to the four winds of heaven, for a song.

I wish to refer to one or two matters tonight. In the first place, I am opposed to the policy which has been adopted regarding the united nations. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the next meeting is supposed to be held at Moscow. One meeting was held at

Paris. It was started at San Francisco by the late President Roosevelt, who had an idea he was forming a new league of nations which would take the place of the one which caused the second war. None of the leaders went to San Francisco. Mr. Stalin did not attend there; Mr. Churchill did not attend there; President Roosevelt had died and did not attend there. They sent supernumeraries to chloroform the people, with the result that the "Big Four", as they called themselves did not accomplish anything. There is nothing big about the way they are handling the business, because the united nations organization is going to turn out to be a second league of nations, if one may judge from the way it is conducted. Mr. Attlee said on Saturday he was disappointed at the first year of the united nations organization. They give luxurious banquets and pay fantastic salaries. Even Moscow is complaining about the way UNO is carried on, particularly the security council. We all know about the deputies and all the rest of the frills which we have had since they started.

What are the facts on this particular matter? In the first place Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the then leader of the Liberal party, acted quite differently from the present leader of the foreign affairs department. Away back at the time of the diamond jubilee celebration in 1897 Sir Wilfrid Laurier said of the empire: "Invite us to your councils if you want our aid at any time." He was first in the diamond jubilee procession, and he said, "When Britain is at war Canada is also at war."

What is the policy today of hon. gentlemen opposite? I asked this question awhile ago:

Has the government been consulted or advised by either the government of Great Britain or any of the dominions on the abandonment of the Suez canal and Cairo military base by Great Britain.

This is the reply I received:

Commonwealth governments keep each other informed on matters of foreign policy in accordance with the practice prescribed by Mr. Attlee, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, in the House of Commons in London on May 8, 1946, as follows:

"It is our practice and our duty as members of the British commonwealth to keep other members of the commonwealth fully and continuously informed of all matters which we are called upon to decide, but which may affect commonwealth interests. The object is to give them an opportunity of expressing their views in confidence if they so desire. These views are taken fully into account, but the decision must be ours, and the other governments are not asked, and would not wish, to share the responsibility for it. Dominion governments follow the same practice.