

unique alliance of a peculiarly tough and enduring kind whose members act together not because they are under any strict obligation to do so but because they have the will to act together. Our friends abroad, furthermore, have discovered that the primary objects for which the members of the commonwealth act together are objects which can be shared by other countries of good will. They realize that the commonwealth is not a power bloc exploiting its own interests but a group of like-minded nations whose close association has in the past formed, and should form in the future, a most reliable element within the framework of the world order.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I think I had better repeat what I said in London on May 11 last in addressing both houses of parliament. It bears on the important question of commonwealth and world cooperation; and the statement carries with it in this House of Commons the greater authority in that it was made before the entire world, and also because since that statement was made the common sense of it has been generally admitted and proclaimed, and that not in this country only, but in Britain, in the United States and in other countries as well.

I said at that time, and repeat to-day:

It is of the utmost importance to the commonwealth that there should continue to be the greatest possible cooperation among its members. In like manner, it is, I believe, of the utmost importance to the future of mankind that, after the war, there should be the greatest possible cooperation among the nations of the world.

Our wartime cooperation is not the product of any formal institutional unity; it is the result of agreement upon policies of benefit to all. Moreover, they are policies that make an appeal "to all sorts of men in all sorts of countries", provided only they are men of goodwill.

If, at the close of hostilities, the strength and unity of the commonwealth are to be maintained, those ends will be achieved not by policies which are exclusive, but by policies which can be shared with other nations. I am firmly convinced that the way to maintain our unity is to base that unity upon principles which can be extended to all nations. I am equally sure that the only way to maintain world unity is to base it upon principles that can be universally applied. The war has surely convinced all nations, from the smallest to the greatest, that there is no national security to be found in the isolation of any nation or group of nations. The future security of peace-loving nations will depend upon the extent and effectiveness of international cooperation.

It is no less true that it is not the great powers only that are needed to defend, to preserve, and to extend freedom. We should be false to the freedom for which we are fighting if, at any time, we failed to remember that no nation liveth unto itself; and that nations, great and small, are members one of another.

It is not merely the security of nations that is indivisible. Their prosperity also is indivisible. Few would wish to return to the years

before the war, when almost every nation sought economic security in economic isolation from its neighbours. What happened was that the economic security of all nations was destroyed. Now is surely the time for the world to realize that, just as no nation of itself can ensure its own safety so no nation or group of nations can in isolation ensure its own prosperity.

For my part, I profoundly believe that both the security and the welfare of the nations of the British commonwealth and, in large measure, the security and welfare of all peace-loving nations will depend on the capacity of the nations of the commonwealth to give leadership in the pursuit of policies which, in character, are not exclusive but inclusive. How far such policies can be successfully pursued will, of course, depend on the extent to which other nations are prepared to pursue similar policies. But let us, at least, wherever that is possible, give the lead that is in the interests of the world as a whole. . . .

Over many years, Canada's relations with the United States have been especially friendly. Throughout the war, we have followed the path of cooperation. We like to think that our country has had some part in bringing about a harmony of sentiment between the United States and the whole British commonwealth. That harmony is the foundation of the close military collaboration which is proving so fruitful in this war.

It will ever be a prime object of Canadian policy to work for the maintenance of the fraternal association of the British and American peoples. When peace comes, it is our highest hope that the peoples of the British commonwealth and the United States will continue to march at each other's side, united more closely than ever. But we equally hope that they will march in a larger company in which all the nations united to-day in defence of freedom will remain united in the service of mankind.

The leader of the opposition intimated that he might wish to ask me some questions in regard to the meeting of prime ministers in London. As the house is well aware, the meetings were of a highly secret and confidential character. They were concerned with matters pertaining immediately to the war and also with questions relating to world organization in the post-war era. At the time of the conference the press was very anxious to obtain detailed information of what was taking place at the different sessions, but it was not possible to have that information given except to a very limited extent, and at the meetings of the prime ministers themselves it was thought advisable that a statement upon which all could agree be given out at the end of the meeting and that this would be the best way in which to inform the world of those matters which had taken place at the meetings and which it was believed should be made public. I think therefore it would be advisable for me at this time to read to the house—it is not very long—the text of the declaration which was signed by the five prime ministers who were present at the conference. That