

*Supply—External Affairs*

the discussion carried on to-day on the broad questions of foreign policy. There was a time when we Canadians found it very difficult to discuss our own national problems, because in the minds of some people, whenever we asserted Canadianism we were in some way anti-British. Nothing of the kind. As Canada gradually emerges to nationhood; as the complex of the little man disappears and we become powerful and influential in world affairs; as our position becomes more clearly recognized abroad, we are approaching our national questions with a little more sanity and reason. The only vast difference that I see between the Canadianism I have heard expressed from across the floor, particularly by hon. members of the Progressive Conservative party, and that held so firmly on this side of the house is this. While we are all for Canada, there seems to be some doubt across the way as to whether or not we have grown up. They are still in the Kipling age: "Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in my own." That was a very catchy and descriptive phrase when it was written by Mr. Kipling, but that was a good many years ago. The day has gone by when Canada is daughter in anyone's house, though undoubtedly she is mistress in her own. Those were the days when Canada's right to guide her own foreign affairs was still in doubt. Then we were daughter in our mother's house. To-day, however, we are peers in the British commonwealth of nations, in which none is in any way inferior to the other in any aspect of our domestic or foreign affairs. In that attitude I believe we are far stronger than in that advocated from across the aisle; that is to say, an adult nationhood but in some way subservient to some other nation.

Mr. GRAYDON: Who over here advocated that?

Mr. ROEBUCK: My hon. friend came very close to it.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is not the same thing.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Well, there is no question that the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) advocated it. If I understand the English language aright he desires some sort of centralization of power across the ocean. He is not satisfied that Canada should stand on her own feet, make her own decisions and, working in cooperation with Great Britain and the other members of the empire, go forward in unity, in concord and in cooperation. I heard the hon. member say that the strength of the empire is in unity, and of course with that statement I thoroughly

agree. The strength of the empire is in unity; but if that unity is to be brought about by subservience on the part of Canada to any other people, any other government or any other power, then that unity is bought at too great a price. The unity which makes for progress and influence and power is that which is manifest among free peoples, voluntarily associating in their own ways for the accomplishment of some common object.

It is obvious that we cannot have one voice for the whole empire. Each must have its own say in its own way. One is not a realist if he does not see that some of the questions which are important to Australia and New Zealand are not so important to us, while some aspects of our foreign affairs are of little interest to either Australia or New Zealand. We have a coast on the Atlantic as well as on the Pacific. So with South Africa; in her foreign affairs she would not be much interested in our relationship, for instance, with the great country of Russia. It is necessary that each portion of our great commonwealth live its own life in its own way, making its own decisions and expressing itself through its own representatives. In that way we shall develop a powerful empire.

The subject uppermost in my mind at the moment, however, is not the broad question of empire solidarity. On February 1 last I brought to the attention of the house an interesting and, I think, important subject; that is to say, the Palestine situation. A considerable section of our community is looking to me at the present time to say something about that subject, and to bring it up in the course of this debate. It is hoped that a policy will be announced by Great Britain and the United States, perhaps in the near future. I trust that it may be soon. One reason for thinking something of that kind may be in immediate prospect is the fact that Viscount Gort was recently appointed high commissioner of Palestine. Viscount Gort is known to have a sympathetic attitude not only to individual Jewish people but to the Jewish problem in general, and it is hoped that in consequence of his influence something beneficial may evolve. Unfortunately, however, there is also a rumour—perhaps it is nothing more than a rumour—that the policy to be announced will involve the partitioning of Palestine. Be it remembered that when the Balfour declaration was published it was understood to refer to Palestine as it exists to-day together with Trans-Jordania, making an area of some thirty-five thousand square miles. Somehow in the course of the years Trans-

[Mr. Roebuck.]