

*San Francisco Conference*

Subsection 2 of section B of the proposals reads as follows:

In general the security council should determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression and should make recommendations or decide upon the measures to be taken to maintain or restore peace and security.

The provisions are almost identical with the operative clauses of the concert of Europe and the now defunct 1920 league of nations. But there is one difference. Whereas under the old league of nations the seat of power was the general assembly of the nations, under the Dumbarton Oaks scheme all effective power is transferred to and vested in the security council.

Under chapter V (B) (1):

The general assembly should not on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which has been dealt with by the security council—

And,

... all members of the organization should obligate (sic) themselves to accept the decisions of the security council, and to carry them out in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

In these circumstances is it not farcical to pretend that "the organization is based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states"?

We had a sample of this, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the empire parliamentary association. That was an association for the good of the British empire. They had a sort of executive council inside, and the association ceased to function, and a select few thought that they were the council. They in time turned it into a pan-American organization and forgot all about the empire. Some of the delegates on that association were in favour of disarmament and collective security and the like, and all the sham and humbug of Geneva. Some of them are the very people who are now clamouring for this particular institution.

In connection with this work, if we are to have internationalism let us start with the British empire. In a speech that I made last August 4 on foreign affairs I said:

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. 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.

[Mr. Church.]

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. Then we had a similar debate on civil aviation in March, 1944. Delegates of certain states and countries who belong to these so-called leagues of nations established for the purposes of peace and security go to the meetings and take certain stands, but when they come back home they do not carry out any of the principles laid down by the said leagues. What have the different states that belong to these different leagues done in the last hundred years for collective security? They have been willing to belong to the different leagues so long as it does not interfere with their own status sovereignty and autonomy or aggression within their own borders.

Where would we have been in this war if we had had such an international policy which meant the giving up of Gibraltar and the Suez, the Cape, the Far East and the West Indies, Alexandria and these other bases around the world? We would have been in the position that I spoke of when I addressed the house on March 28 last, when I said:

Our position would have been impossible. We should have been under pressure to keep neutral. Internationalization presupposes a perfect world of the future. It is one of those dangerous principles.

The British bases to be under the control of an international security council are the backbone of the British empire in the seven seas. Upon them the peace and security of the British empire has depended for 200 years. Without them in this war we would be adrift, the empire would be an absurdity on the map, it would be a body without arteries. It is one of the most dangerous principles of the prospectus for a new league patterned by Dumbarton Oaks.

History teaches us one or two things in connection with this work. Let us not forget the lessons of history. It is inconceivable that English people in the Elizabethan or Victorian eras under Bureleigh and Palmerston or the French under Louis XIV or the Americans under Monroe or Lincoln would have dreamt of submitting their personal concerns to state control, or of surrendering the sovereign rights and national interests of their country to the control of international organization. It was never heard of until recently. A great historian wrote a textbook on the subject. Professor S. R. Gardiner, commenting on the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, said,