

In my opinion we are simply wasting the people's money at Lake Success. We are throwing \$10,000,000 into the sink-hole.

The situation in the Atlantic today is dangerous. The British government, Canada consenting, gave up all its bases from Newfoundland to British Guiana to the United States for ninety-nine years. I pointed out at the time what the result of that would be. I pointed out the effect it would have upon Newfoundland's joining confederation, and my predictions have been justified. What was that lease for? It was a 99-year lease, practically a freehold lease, entered into for a consideration that proved of very little practical value. The lease should have been cancelled long ago and charged up to lend-lease. It was entered into in the darkest days of the battle of the Atlantic, and in return for that lease Britain was given some fifty old, out-of-date ships. Many of them had to go into dry dock, being of no use. Others had no coal. Then Pearl Harbor broke and we got a lesson, and Canada was nearly invaded.

I have been talking about a foreign policy. The United States has never had a foreign policy any more than we have had. For 100 years it has been without such a policy. Its foreign policy was that of Andrew Jackson, George Washington and Madison. And what was the essence of that policy? Simply this: no foreign entanglement unless the shores of America are invaded. When the United States fought the Spanish-American war in 1898 that was the ground they took. Afterwards they wanted to abandon Manila. Our foreign policy now is to depend upon the league of nations at UNO and that we have no commitments; we simply yet take the attitude that "Parliament will decide" if war comes. That attitude, as I have pointed out before, has led to the scuttling of the British empire during the past two years. Britain, together with the dominions, stood alone for two and a half, nearly three years, from 1939 to 1942, against the mighty forces of the enemy, and if the war was to have been lost, then surely it would have been lost in those three years, before aid came. But Britain weathered the storm. If Britain and the dominions do not hang together there is little hope for peace so far as the British empire is concerned.

But not only have bases been given up in the Atlantic; we have given up bases in our own country, Canada, to the United States. Why, I do not know. Surely the United States have enough to do to look after their own country. We have a great ally in the country to the south of us. The Anglo-Saxon race, the British peoples and those of the United States, are the hope of the world for peace in the

[Mr. Church.]

future; but they must be up and doing, because we are living in an armed world in which there has been no peace and in which there is no real peace now. This will prove to have been a forty-year war before it is all over, from 1914 to 1954. Let us not talk about peace when there is no peace. Look at the situation in India where millions of people are left to be massacred. Look at the situation in Palestine. Look at the Suez. And we know what the consequences were from the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Thousands of men in the Russian satellite countries in the Balkans and eastern Europe are being put to work on dry docks and more are sent to the Arctic circle as slaves from Russia's satellite states. It is impossible to find out from the united nations organization how many people are so treated. No one can find out anything about them, so what use is the UNO? Roumania is gone; the Balkans are gone and all that kind of thing. I am far from satisfied with what has been done in the British corridor over in Germany. Canada has no say over there. We are just a minor power. We consented to be a minor power at San Francisco when the Big Five insisted on and obtained the veto power and all that kind of thing. You will have nothing to say about the peace plans whereas, if you had hung together with the mother country, you would have something to say about them. The situation in South Africa is hopeless. There are those in this house—and I have never been one of them—who speak in eulogy of the late prime minister, Lieutenant General Smuts, of South Africa. He is a republican. He has all along wanted to set up a republic in South Africa. He has always been against having a British governor general, and would not give the ballot to the black troops who marched across the desert with Alexander and Montgomery. He was one of the cabinet of the pro-Germans there before world war II. He also signed the charter of the league of nations. Yet he says now the UNO have no power and no jurisdiction over the colonies.

No country in the world is going to give up its control of its own affairs or sovereignty to any foreign power or any foreign body like the UNO, unless the country is so small or has such poor defences that it could be captured in any event. Who is going to give up his sovereignty? Are we in Canada to do that? One of the minister's deputies went away down to Lake Success and Washington. He has been making some speeches and he is in favour of giving up sovereignty over our bases in Canada to the UNO. Where would we have been in the first war if Britain had given up these bases at the Cape, at Gibraltar, at Suez, or at Hong Kong to a foreign country