

This policy is not based upon a failure to appreciate what the British commonwealth may mean to the world. Anyone who suggests the breaking up of that commonwealth is speaking in unrealistic language. No one is suggesting that; rather the suggestion is that we should maintain it. The way to maintain it is through a policy of inclusion rather than one of exclusion, and that was the policy enunciated by the Prime Minister in London. And that that is a sound view seems to me, in the light of the appraisal made of that speech, to be generally accepted. I have gone carefully over the periodicals, and have had press clippings from newspapers reviewed, and the unanimous view—well, I should not say the unanimous view—but the extent of the view throughout the whole commonwealth in support of the Prime Minister's statement at Westminster recently is so overwhelming that one wonders whether it is necessary at all to spend much time on the point.

It is generally admitted that the only hope for the world, particularly having in mind Moscow and Teheran, is by the pursuit of that kind of policy. It is not an attempt to refuse to speak with one voice, but rather to be able effectively to demonstrate that if it is possible to speak with one voice, that one voice has arisen as the result of consideration in each individual country within the commonwealth. In that way, if you can say to the nations of the world that these problems have been thought out at Ottawa, at Canberra and at Cape Town, just as well as at London, and you have coincidentally the same kind of view, then that kind of one-voice has been and is a voice of strength, and a voice with persuading influence in the councils of the world.

We had an example of that recently at the International Labour Organization. Canada took a certain view with regard to the projected future of the International Labour Organization. Great Britain had not yet expressed her view, nor had Australia, nor had New Zealand. Canada's view was much criticized in many quarters, although, later, without any consultation, except by way of informal discussion, Great Britain took the same stand, Australia took the same stand and New Zealand took the same stand.

I suggest that if at one time we had said, "Here is the view of all of us at once", it would not have had the same effect that it did have, coming as it did as the result of individual deliberation on the part of the various self-governing dominions. It had more effect than it would have had if it had been given as a common expression of opinion, or the expression of view of the whole bloc.

If you can impress other nations of the world—and that is what we must do—that we are simply trying to bring about a healthy contribution among the nations of the world, looking at these matters from our own particular point of view, and always bearing in mind that our own point of view in the big things is not necessarily different from the point of view of the United Kingdom government, we are more apt to have the kind of influence we desire than we would have under the policy suggested, as I gathered, in the observations of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green).

Mr. GREEN: The hon. member did not follow my suggestions very closely, then.

Mr. MARTIN: I read very carefully the speech delivered by the hon. member last year, and I must say that I did not see much difference between that speech and the one delivered this afternoon.

Surely our strength is this: surely the strength of the British commonwealth of nations is that there has been allowed to grow in the various self-governing dominions a measure of autonomy which has affected the personalities and mature developments of those dominions, as a result of the extension of the principle of autonomy. In freedom we have grown—not grown apart, but we have grown to march still within the same grouping, that grouping which is called either the British empire or the British commonwealth of nations.

For instance, when this parliament declared war in 1939, as a result of its own free decision, that was a more effective answer to our enemy than if we had been called into it automatically through the exclusive act of the United Kingdom government. That demonstrated that the liquidation of this commonwealth is not at hand, but that it is stronger, as a result of the extension of the principle of freedom, which freedom has tended to develop each of the units known as self-governing dominions.

I think surely the time has come when we should be able to demonstrate to the world that, apart from a few extremists here and there, in this country there is no desire to break away from that grouping, when the whole trend in the world is toward grouping—toward larger groupings, as well as toward maintaining the same commonwealth grouping. Surely nothing is to be gained from the suggestion that the Prime Minister of this country, or that any individual serving in the government of this country, is motivated by instincts less sincere than those of persons