

of Canadian goods and the exchange of commodities between the countries. That is the important point involved.

I have already on another occasion referred to the tribute paid by the Prime Minister to the memory and work of the late Doctor Skelton, Under Secretary of State for External Affairs. I have paid my own brief though inadequate tribute to his memory, and I shall not repeat now what I said then.

In conclusion, I desire to make a few brief observations with respect to Canada's position in external affairs at the present time and during the post-war period. These observations are based entirely upon the theory that Britain will win the war and will not be destroyed, that Canada will assist her in that effort and will not be invaded.

I suggest to the house and to the country that in the present and future circumstances continued membership in the British commonwealth of nations is a fundamental condition of Canada's freedom, prosperity and security; that without the survival of the British commonwealth, Canada's free national life is doomed to extinction; that the friendship and cooperation of the United States are and will remain a condition of survival for Britain and the commonwealth, and the hope of renewed freedom to France and her northern neighbours. For the permanence of this essential transatlantic friendship, Canada has a special responsibility.

The boundary between Canada and the United States is the line of closest contact between the political system of the British commonwealth and its allies, on the one hand, and the republics of the Americas, on the other. Canada has been destined, by geography and by history, to become more and more the bridge, not only between Britain and the United States but between the old world and the new. To fulfil this, her high destiny, Canada must cherish active association in the British commonwealth and must avoid policies that tend to continental or hemispherical isolation which would weaken or nullify Canada's broader connections.

The Americas cannot stand alone. Neither in economic resources, in man power nor in institutional developments can an isolated America find the means of preserving a free world or freedom for any of the nations of the Americas. No matter how desirable closer cooperation with the United States may be—and I welcome such a spirit—every step toward such closer relations must be matched by constructive movement toward continuing full cooperation in the British commonwealth, and especially with Great Britain.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in joining in this debate this afternoon I do so with some timidity because I realize that we are discussing the external affairs of Canada rather than the internal economy of our country and its relation to our war effort. For several days we have been considering the war appropriation resolution, and in all probability we shall continue to discuss it for a considerable number of hours. Consequently the few remarks which I shall make this afternoon will be confined rather to our relations with other countries and to one aspect of our war effort which I do not think has been sufficiently emphasized.

I know it is of great fundamental importance that we should organize our economic strength in order that we may give to the cause in which we are engaged that assistance which we can best give. But there is another phase of the struggle to which I think sufficient attention has not been given, that which I would term the political arm of the struggle. We have been dealing with the military activities, we have been dealing with the economic activities; I suggest that we ought to be giving some attention to the political activities of the allied nations.

What are we fighting for? That question is being asked in our own country, and, particularly, in the United States. Those of us who have been following the debate in the United States congress on the lease-lend bill will have noticed that on more than one occasion a senator or representative has introduced that angle into the discussion. One of the supporters of the measure is Senator Austin. No one can accuse him of being lukewarm to our cause, but I notice that a few days ago he once more raised that question in the discussion of the lease-lend proposals.

It seems to me that we are fighting for the things for which the common people of Great Britain are fighting. In the mighty struggle across the seas the common people of Great Britain are throwing their full weight and support into the war because they believe that out of it will come something better than they or the world have ever known. I am disturbed when I read of prominent people in our own country taking issue with what has been said by men like J. B. Priestley or Right Hon. Ernest Bevin. I read with a great deal of interest the report of a speech made by Senator Meighen, not in the other place but at a public function at Toronto. He is reported to have said:

Mr. Bevin says that universal socialism, with the rights that are the heritage of the common man, is to come all at once upon us. Privileges are to go at once and forever, and the state is to take charge of the nation's affairs, in all departments.