

titles shall hereafter require the assent as well of the parliaments of all the dominions as of the parliament of the United Kingdom.

The words there to which I direct attention are, first, "the crown is the symbol of the free association of the members of the British commonwealth" and, second, "they are united by a common allegiance to the crown." Compared with the language used in the declaration of 1926 we have only a reversal in words; that is, the allegiance to the crown is first and the free association is second.

All the nations that comprise the commonwealth, Canada, Australia and the others, agreed to the preamble to that statute. It is true that the present Prime Minister was the head of the Canadian delegation at the time of the declaration of 1926. It is true that another government was responsible for the acceptance of the preamble in the Statute of Westminster in 1931, following the conference of 1930. But I point out that running through the whole, from the beginning of the conference of 1926 which had to deal with these matters because of the conditions in South Africa, is the commitment to a free association between the members of that commonwealth. I always like to refer to it in terms of a family. It may well be that many hon. members do not quite accept that view, but I have always thought that we might refer to this commonwealth of nations composing the British Empire as a family. Some might say it is more a partnership than a family, but I like to think that the members of the family are of varying ages and that they represent different forms of development of our common civilization.

The oldest member of the partnership, or the head of the family if you will, is Great Britain. We are the senior dominion, the other dominions being junior to us, and this family is scattered throughout the world. The partnership extends over the world, and freedom of association upon which the declaration is predicated is a freedom that, in my judgment, contemplates consultation. It contemplates solidarity; it contemplates unity of purpose and harmony, and it contemplates unity of action. That is how I have thought of this family, this partnership of ours in which we share with the oldest member of the partnership certain obligations and responsibilities; in which the oldest member, by reason of her great age and her long series of accomplishments, is looked to by us, as the minister speaking for the government said the other day, for support on the Atlantic; just as General Smuts down in

South Africa said, we have told the other members of this commonwealth that we can care, for our part, South Africa, on land, and we rely upon the other member of the family or partnership, namely Great Britain, to supply the navy. That is what we are doing here. But this, in my judgment, involves consultation. It involves not criticism after the event. It involves in every question that affects the well-being of the Dominion of Canada as a world entity consultation with those other entities which comprise the British Empire or the British Commonwealth of Nations.

That consultation at times is difficult; it is not as easy as some people suggest, and I am not for a moment minimizing the difficulty. But in these modern days of wireless telegraphy, in these days of the telephone, it is not very difficult to maintain communication between every member of this family, between every member of this partnership. I recall that at the imperial conference in London the Prime Minister of Australia was frequently in communication by telephone with his government. I recall that I was able to speak from Cape Town to Ottawa, without difficulty. I know how frequently we are in communication with Great Britain by telephone and by other means as well—because government communications on the wireless have priority.

These consultations should be held and should be maintained, as I say, antecedently to action being taken, so that the free association, referred to in the extract of the letter of Sir Austen Chamberlain which I read this afternoon, which indicates responsibilities and duties, should not be lost. That is what I meant when I said that the foreign policy of Canada has been determined by the unanimous action of governments—in 1926, in 1930 and by the Statute of Westminster in 1931. But how that policy shall be carried into effect is a matter with which successive governments must deal. I think it is so abundantly clear as not to require discussion—the mere statement is sufficient—that the foreign policy of the government is not made by parliament antecedently to being a policy. I wonder if my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) does not at once realize that the foreign policy of this country has been made by the governor in council and approved by this parliament during the last eighteen months?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I do not know, but I should like my right hon. friend to illustrate what he has just stated, namely that the foreign policy of Canada was deter-