

lined. Would it be asking too much to request that the Prime Minister give us some idea of what further might be required?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not care to attempt in any way to interpret the views of Lord Halifax, but in order to make the position quite clear I think I should say that Lord Halifax was speaking entirely for himself. I have been informed that he was not making any pronouncement on behalf of the British government. He was speaking as an individual who came to Canada to address a large organization in Toronto, and he gave his views on a subject which has been very close to his heart all through his lifetime. I believe a close reading of the address by Lord Halifax will show that in many particulars it has not been understood as he would wish to have it understood. Lord Halifax is a political philosopher as well as a very eminent statesman. He was reviewing the past century and the developments which have taken place during that time, and allowing his mind to travel into the next hundred years as to the possible changes that might be necessary in commonwealth organization. I do not think he meant to do more than put before the particular audience he was addressing, and through it before the public, certain thoughts which he believed it would be well to be considered by all of us who have the future in mind. But I think it was unfortunate, as it has certainly proved, that the speech should have been delivered at this particular time, because it has raised certain issues; and I am speaking here this afternoon very much against my own will in developing this theme at all. I am doing so only because the hon. gentlemen whom I am immediately facing, the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) and the hon. gentleman who just interrupted me, the leader of the Social Credit party, have given their views on the subject which was brought up, and on that account I feel it necessary to give mine.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I am just wondering if perhaps the hon. gentleman from Britain was not expressing the very idea that has been outlined by the Prime Minister. The right hon. gentleman will remember that my comment was to the effect that the ideas expressed were good but that it was unfortunate he did not tell us how they might be put into effect.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: One concrete issue in external policy has been raised not only by Lord Halifax but also by Field Marshal Smuts on which I feel that I should state my position. In this I am stating the position of the government on what was said in recent speeches by these two eminent public men. I shall read what I have to say on this matter,

because I feel the great importance of any utterances on matters of this kind at this time, but I think it well that the position of the government should be stated. I should like to have hon. gentlemen immediately opposite make an equally clear statement, some time during this session, as to their position.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the Prime Minister if he prepared the speech he is about to deliver?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I prepared this. These are my own views and the views of this government.

A concrete issue in external policy has been raised in recent speeches delivered by Lord Halifax and Field Marshal Smuts. It relates to the domination of certain great powers. Both speeches expressed the view that the future peace of the world depended on the attainment of an equal partnership in strength and influence between the great powers among the united nations. Both took the position that the resources and man-power of the British isles were too small to enable the United Kingdom to compete with the United States and the Soviet Union in power and authority after the war. Both, therefore, argued that it was necessary that the United Kingdom should have the constant support of other countries, in order to preserve a proper balance. Field Marshal Smuts thought that this might be achieved by a close association between the United Kingdom and "the smaller democracies in western Europe"; he had little to say of the place of the British commonwealth as such. Lord Halifax on the other hand declared:

Not Great Britain only, but the British commonwealth and empire, must be the fourth power in that group upon which, under Providence, the peace of the world will henceforth depend.

With what is implied in the argument employed by both these eminent public men I am unable to agree.

It is indeed true beyond question that the peace of the world depends on preserving on the side of peace a large superiority of power, so that those who wish to disturb the peace can have no chance of success. But I must ask whether the best way of attaining this is to seek a balance of strength between three or four great powers. Should we not, indeed must we not, aim at attaining the necessary superiority of power by creating an effective international system inside which the cooperation of all peace-loving countries is freely sought and given?