

The so-called leaders of public thought in this country would do well to reflect upon Edmund Burke's admonition that "people will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors," and bear in mind the statement of our traditional foreign policy as set out by Sir Eyre Crowe in his famous memorandum of 1907:

"England, as a tiny island power with vast overseas colonies and dependencies, whose existence and survival is inseparably bound up with the possession of preponderant sea power, has a greater interest than any other country in the independence of nations . . . England's traditional policy has been to maintain the balance of power by throwing her weight now in this scale and now in that, but ever on the side opposed to the political dictatorship of the strongest single state or group at a given time. The opposition into which England must inevitably be driven to any country aspiring to such a dictatorship, assumes almost the form of a law of nature."

These observations are every whit as apposite to-day as they were forty or four hundred years ago.

Then in conclusion he says:

Let our politicians no longer grope in the dark for new-fangled forms of policy that lose their substance and fade away as hands are stretched out to grasp them. Let them rather follow the light as they have been shown the light: for in this way only will they be able to find the clue to peace and security, and lead the world once more into the sunlight.

My time is about up, Mr. Speaker, but in conclusion I should like to refer to one remark of the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) in regard to the celebrated atomic bomb and Japan and foreign affairs. I call his attention to the leading editorial in the *Manchester Guardian* of August 1, which states:

The allies believe that the authority of the emperor is essential to make the surrender effective. Without his order the Japanese commanders in the field would continue the fight. It is a strange paradox. On the side of the allies stand immense fleets and invincible armies, the whole panoply of modern war weighted with the new and terrible menace of the atomic bomb. On the side of Japan there is little except an obscure and feeble simpleton who embodies the primitive religion of a Polynesian myth. Yet for this purpose the Emperor Hirohito is more effective than the atomic bomb, and the allies no matter how they may phrase it, have been forced to accept something less than the unconditional surrender for which they asked.

A correspondent to the *National Review* has this to say in regard to the editorial:

A moral force which has a greater power over a nation even than the atomic bomb is something to think about. It is something one would think to preserve at all costs. "Polynesian myth?" We do not know whence the sentiment derived but if, as it appears, it is stronger than death and disaster we should be grateful

[Mr. Church.]

for it in this disintegrating world, and we had better, as the *Manchester Guardian* suggests in the same article, "try to understand the meaning and importance of the imperial throne in the Japanese policy." Unhappy, warring China gives us a picture of a country that has lost its "imperial myth."

I wish to support the charter on the ground that it will do no harm to anyone, but it will not provide any security against war or be of any value to prevent war. I remind hon. members of the pills to cure earthquakes. The only cure I know of for the future is to take our stand as members of the British empire in peace and war alike. If we do that we shall soon find that the cooperation and coordination we had enjoyed with the United States and Russia in war will continue into the peace, so that we can look to the future without fear.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this moment I should like to give my decision on the amendment moved this afternoon by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) and seconded by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), that the resolution now before the house be amended as follows:

(a) by inserting after the word "that" where it first appears in the resolution the word "before", and

(b) by inserting after the figures 1945 the words "it is desirable that an educational campaign for a period of one month be conducted throughout Canada by allotting on the transcanada network of the C.B.C. abundant, free and equal time to those in this house who oppose the charter in its present form and those who support it, so that the Canadian people may have the fullest possible opportunity to study the proposal, and in the light of their matured judgment, to express their will as a guide to the houses of parliament."

It has become my duty to consider whether or not the proposed amendment is in order. No principle in our parliamentary practice is more firmly grounded than the rule that no resolution or vote can be passed upon a motion involving an expenditure of public money before such a motion is referred to the committee of the whole. I should like to quote from page 171 of Beauchesne's Third Edition where, in citation 453, we find this:

The tendency has been in the Canadian House of Commons for the past twenty-five years to rule out all motions purporting to give the government a direct order to do a thing which cannot be done without the expenditure of money. Our Journals are full of precedents to this effect.

The amendment offered proposes that an educational campaign be conducted throughout Canada for a period of one month, by the