

peace as much as Canada did since 1918. We joined the league of nations; we aided in every plan for disarmament; we suggested to the world that we had experience in negotiating and in arbitrating of our difficulties with our neighbours; that these methods might very well be adopted by other nations, and we did on every occasion what we thought would advance the interest of civilization.

It is true we felt extremely disappointed that the United States did not join the league of nations. We also felt that the United States did not advance the cause of peace when she refused to join with Great Britain in guaranteeing the security of France for fifteen years if France did not insist on occupying all lands west of the Rhine; but we did admit that the United States and all nations would have to make these decisions for themselves. And in so far as we could as a good neighbour we attempted to show the United States that her interests as well as those of the world could best be served if she joined, if not the league, then every other body which attempted to solve any differences which might lead to war. At the same time we appreciated the fact that isolationism as it grew up in the United States was understandable, because a similar opinion developed in this country, particularly in the period from 1929 to 1935; and many public men in this country in all sincerity and after considerable thought made it clear that it was doubtful what Canada might do if another European war occurred. Of course, we know that when the time came there was no doubt about it and that we did go into the war, if not united, at any rate united except for a vote or two in this house. I repeat these things to remind ourselves that isolationism is a condition of mind which grows, I think, through weariness and cynicism; that that opinion may very well rise up again in Canada in the future if it does not already exist in some parts, and that it is an error into which we must never fall again lest we lose the hold we have on ourselves and cease to work for peace so that we may avoid future wars.

I believe we ought to consider realistically the position of Canada with respect to the world. We are members of the British commonwealth of nations and as such we are bound by sentiment and common interests to at least six self-governing nations which are scattered around the globe, and in the commonwealth, or empire, if you like, there are colonies in various stages of self-government and there are dependencies and there are what are known as crown colonies. In this very large group there are many countries which from a strictly military point of view, must,

[Mr. W. E. Harris.]

for our security, remain in friendly hands. It is only necessary to remind ourselves of the real fear which arose in this country in June, 1940, of the thought of Great Britain being invaded to realize what I mean. We could not contemplate the possibility of Great Britain being in unfriendly hands, and I suggest—and it is my own opinion—that for some time to come we could not contemplate that happening. In this country there is an honest realization that Great Britain was the first country which taught the world that a man might be free if he so willed; that individual freedom is restricted for the sake of the common good, but restricted as little as possible, and that these principles were not only given to the dependencies and colonies, as they started out to be, but encouraged as the various countries became self-governing. When one contemplates that situation and realizes this is the inheritance which this country received from Great Britain, I for one at any rate feel that we owe so much that time alone will tell when we feel we have paid the debt, if we ever have that feeling. I pass over the other members of the commonwealth, not because they are different but because they are the same. Each is going its own way, yet the roads are not diverging very much. They are trying, as we are, to improve their inheritance in order that they may pass it on to succeeding generations.

With respect to the United States, we have been at peace with that country for 130 years and in each of those years we have seen an improvement in our methods for the negotiation and arbitration of any differences. We have now reached a point in our relations with that country where I believe we have eliminated the suspicion which is so often the bar to countries having confidence in dealings with each other. I think we have reached the position, indeed, that not only in this war but in peace each country counts on the other to resist aggression on the continent of North America. I am sure we feel the United States would do so, and from what happened in 1939 and 1941 I know the United States counted on us if aggression came this way. However, our two countries face the Pacific together, and our interests there may be the same; at any rate I do not believe they are very different. I cannot conceive of an occasion arising in the Pacific in connection with which we will clash with the United States; nor can I conceive an occasion arising in the Pacific in which, if their interests are adversely affected, our interests at the same time will not be adversely affected. Under these conditions, concerned as we are with Great Britain in Europe, with the United