

*External Affairs*

Yalta who was right in the views that he expressed and the attitude that he held towards Stalin and those associated with him.

I mention the commonwealth because the Department of External Affairs publishes a magazine *External Affairs* purporting to tell the story of what happens, although it is restricted; in the superimposed fine print at the top it is stated that only government views are expressed. But in the last few years we have seen so many examples of that chiselling away at the British commonwealth relationship that it is interesting to find that the external affairs department has joined the others who are always preserving us from something or other. In the August issue they join in describing "Dominion day" as "Canada day". It used to be done with regard to the telephone book. That is the way they knocked "Dominion" out of the "Dominion of Canada". Now they decide to alter the name "Dominion day" to make it "Canada day". It is not a fearful thing but it is indicative. July 1 is not Canada day. Lest someone say that I overstate the situation, I am going to quote from a book entitled "On Being Canadian". In it at page 112, reference is made to this question of the British connection, and it is not brushed aside in the way that is sometimes followed by certain members of the government. The British connection is necessary, says the Right Hon. Vincent Massey at page 100 of this book. I am going to read this because it answers so many of those who today find it necessary to play down our relationship within the commonwealth. This is what Massey says:

I feel sure from my own experience—

And that experience was a great one, including that as representative to Washington and representative of Canada during the days of war in London. He continues:

—that the fact that Canada appears on the international scene, not only as an important country on her own account, but also as a member of a great world association, lends her enhanced prestige. In the international world, prestige means influence.

As far as domestic affairs are concerned, there is a persistent illusion in the minds of some people that the British connection has somehow a limiting effect on our national growth; that the term "dominion" is derogatory to our national dignity.

Then he goes on to say this:

"Dominion" is only a word, and it has all but disappeared. In any event, it is important to consider things rather than their labels. In Canada we have certain institutions and traditions and characteristics which give us, whatever language we speak, our meaning as a separate country.

Then he says this, and it is extremely important in view of our relationship with the United States, fearful to some because they

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

picture the day when that economic and defence relationship will lead to other relationships:

Without the British connection these things would steadily evaporate and we should have less and less significance as an individual state. How long—

—says the Right Hon. Vincent Massey,

—would a Canadian republic maintain its individuality here in North America? The forms of our sovereignty might be retained, but we should be caught inexorably by the southward undertow and completely assimilated to American life. It is thus true to say that the British connection is essential to Canadian independence; we are the more Canadian for being British.

In those words, based on an experience of public service unequalled in our country, the Right Hon. Vincent Massey has not made statements that are not worthy of the serious consideration of Canadians in general and of parliament in particular.

Then what about Dominion day? The magazine *External Affairs* is afraid of that word "Dominion" in Dominion day. Dominion day was not changed by parliament. What does Mr. Massey say? At page 176 he says this:

If we abandon the old name, "Dominion day", for some new and meaningless phrase, as we nearly did officially in 1946, will it be because we have forgotten the significance of that moment eighty years ago when we took the first step towards full nationhood? In effect, we have long since outgrown the original meaning of the word "Dominion", but that offers no reason why we should not duly honour the anniversary of the occasion when we became a Dominion . . . It would serve to remind us of our foundations and the influences which have given us shape.

I read this excerpt and place it on the record of the house because it must not be forgotten that, in the world of today, our position within the commonwealth is one that is based on self-interest and sentiment. When the Prime Minister was in London he must have been impressed by the intangible power for good that exists in a group of nations, joined in freedom and having the common concepts of freedom, consulting for the purpose of assuring the preservation of freedom.

Yes, the house would like to hear the story of that conference from the minister, not the Prime Minister, not in that rather uncertain way that he displayed a few weeks ago when he said that on a later occasion an opportunity would arise to discuss it, namely, during this debate. That conference brought honour to Canada, for it enabled the city of London to confer upon the Prime Minister the freedom of that city, an act of which every Canadian was proud. There are now two Canadians holding that honour, the