

the data so that when a problem blows out of the sky there will be some background on which to base its study.

I place these words on the record because I believe the matter is worthy of further consideration.

It is too much to expect that we can all be of one mind on matters of external affairs and foreign policy in this country at the present time. But I think the subject is one that is too vital to be made a matter of party politics. I do not think it is a subject about which we should endeavour to put the government or the Prime Minister "on the spot". In my opinion the manner in which the subject should be considered was well expressed by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill in the British House of Commons on the third reading of the military training bill on May 18, 1939, when he said:

I submit to you that matters of national defence and foreign policy ought to be considered upon a plane above party and apart from the natural antagonism which separates government and opposition. They affect the life of the nation. They influence the future of the world.

I was disappointed this morning when I heard the Prime Minister say that there was to be no common voice or no one voice to speak for the commonwealth. That is the way I understood him. I have not his speech before me and I may not have understood him correctly. I thought he said that there was not to be one voice to speak on behalf of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is quite wrong.

Mr. HAZEN: I should like to get it correctly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: "No one voice ever to speak." I never uttered a word of the kind.

Mr. HAZEN: I should like to get it right from the Prime Minister if I can. There would not be a single—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not that there was never to be a single voice. That was not the point at all. There are those who are urging that the one voice to represent the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa shall be the voice that emanates from London.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have the right to make my statement. I say that each part of the British commonwealth of nations has an equal right to its voice on matters of foreign policy, and that the great

[Mr. Hazen.]

genius of the British commonwealth as respects the different self-governing nations is that while each is able to express its voice they usually succeed in so converging their views that the voice of the commonwealth is expressed as one.

Mr. HAZEN: I thank the Prime Minister for explaining it to me, and I am very glad that I misunderstood him this morning, because if he had not explained it I would have had a wrong impression. I am very glad I had a false impression of what he said. I thank him for clearing up the point this evening. There were one or two things I had intended to say, but I will stop here.

Mrs. CORA T. CASSELMAN (Edmonton East): I shall not attempt to follow the hon. member (Mr. Hazen) who has just sat down nor the hon. member for York West (Mr. Adamson) in the setting out of the policy of the years after the last war and leading up to this war. Volumes have been written about that and volumes will still be written. I think they oversimplified the case in a good many instances. But they made this clear, that it is not an easy task to organize peace; that there are in the way difficulties that seem almost insurmountable as you come toward them. I have no doubt where Canada stands. Canada stands as a member of the British commonwealth of her own free will. There is no coercion on the part of any country, the United Kingdom or anyone else to cause her to take that stand; but because we find that our ideals are similar, our objectives much the same, our whole outlook on life finds common ground with the dominions and Great Britain. We may arrive at our decisions by somewhat different paths, but those decisions are founded on the same love of freedom, of democracy and of progress, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has just stated in his answer to what the last speaker said. Beyond the commonwealth we have expressed our determination to participate fully in international organizations. Actions speak louder than words. All through this war period we have shown by our policy, by the use made of our armed forces, by furnishing large quantities of food supplies and other aid to our partners in the war on terms designed to leave no aftermath of uncertain post-war obligations, that we are participating in the prevention of another third world war and that we shall continue to participate in endeavours in that direction.

When the director of the International Labour Organization presented his report at the conference in Philadelphia, which I had the honour to attend last April and May, he