

*External Affairs*

In my opinion the pilgrimage of the Prime Minister was of unique significance. He went with the good wishes of the House of Commons; he has returned with the same good wishes. He met and talked with leaders in various countries of the commonwealth. He represented Canada, and placed before various nations of the world a concept of the responsibilities and mission of Canada in the world of today.

I think trips such as he took, and as have been taken by other prime ministers in the commonwealth, have an abiding effect in the world in which the major strategy of the U.S.S.R. is to undermine the objective unity of the peoples of the commonwealth, and to drive a wedge between some of them and the United States of America. Without regard to party considerations, when he pointed out the contribution of the United States of America, and when he endeavoured to counteract what has become a strong anti-American feeling in some parts of the world, he performed a service worthy of this parliament.

I refer particularly to the words he used when he spoke before the parliament of India and said:

We who live alongside this great and dynamic nation know from our own long experience that the United States is the most unselfish country ever to play this role, and that it has no other ambition than to live, and let others live, in mutually helpful international intercourse.

As their neighbours, we have special reason to know and appreciate the qualities of the American people. We in Canada see millions of good people who are working hard and unselfishly to build a good and free society in a world of peace. These people differ little in their essential qualities from the great majority of people in your country or mine . . .

I believe that that message is necessary. Sir Winston Churchill expressed analogous views when he spoke in the British House of Commons on February 1. There are some "who are always looking around in every controversy . . . to find fault with the Americans".

That type of anti-American attitude is a detriment to the maintenance of world peace. I do not mean that we should agree with or accept everything the United States may do. Indeed, in so far as Mr. Dulles' declaration in regard to retaliatory action is concerned, that declaration, in my opinion, was dangerous in its implications, and I am glad to learn from the Secretary of State for External Affairs that Canada has taken a firm stand against the automatic reflex policy that was enunciated by the Secretary of State of the United States.

Canadians will not consent to be committed to war on any snap decision made by another

country. The Dulles' statement that communism should be met "instantly" with weapons at the place of choice seemed to me to be dangerous in its implications. However, these implications have been watered down by the President's statement that congress must decide, and by Mr. Dulles' statement at a recent press conference which interpreted the meaning of that policy. The secretary of state has said that consultation is necessary. We have learned that within the commonwealth, and that is something that must be learned by the free nations of the world, joined together in a common endeavour and in common ideals.

As the Prime Minister travelled throughout the commonwealth I am sure he must have been impressed by the tremendous power for good inherent in this commonwealth, by the bridgehead it constitutes in Asia against communism, and by the contribution being made by the United States of America in co-operation with the countries of the commonwealth in the preservation of peace.

I came on a constitutional document recently which represents a condition of affairs which is of interest. Our commonwealth is built on a concept of generations of political wisdom based on the trial and error of experience and culminating in the Statute of Westminster. Few Canadians—indeed few Americans, realize that in the year 1775, on July 3, the first pronouncement ever made in all history of the spirit of co-operation and unity with independence then contained therein the embodiment of the commonwealth principles of this day.

In the course of casual reading I came upon a document which was presented to George III in 1775. After the battles of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill, a document was signed which, as Mr. Butler, late president of Columbia University, said, is not known to one out of every million inhabitants of the United States. That document represents the attitude of the American colonies. They sent representatives to Britain to present this document to George III. It is rather a lengthy document and I do not wish to quote from it, but in it they asked for the very principles which were ultimately achieved in the Statute of Westminster. They asked for the right to legislate for the 13 colonies without interference by the mother country; they contended that taxation should be applicable to the 13 colonies only if passed by their governments. That document was signed by 45 of the representatives who one year later