

*Supply—External Affairs*

observers. I do not know whether we will participate in any of the organizations. It might be that we will become involved in the American inter-parliamentarian regional group. I know we are not members of the O.A.S., although the article in the *Globe and Mail* today indicated that we might be coming close to some sort of associate membership.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** We belong to about five related organizations.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Perhaps the minister can indicate later on whether there will be some representation directly or indirectly at this particular conference. Possibly he will consider sending greetings and best wishes from this parliament, which I think would be useful. It is for us to do more than simply attempt through private means to expand our trade; it is up to us as a government and as a people to indicate our interest, care and concern.

It is no good being critical unless one also makes suggestions, so I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that while it is for the government and the minister to come to a decision and make these representations, these representations when implemented will involve parliament and the people of Canada. This is a problem about which not enough is yet known in the country. I suggest to the minister that he give consideration during the next session to having this matter referred, by means of a specific term of reference, to the very able and active external affairs committee; that a debate might be initiated, the impact of which would be heard and felt throughout the country so that people would then be better prepared, through knowledge and understanding, to participate in the decisions which will have to be made, and will give their support. Because without the support of the people it is obvious that not too much can be done. I throw that out as a suggestion for the minister to consider in regard to the problem, which has been pretty well ventilated.

There is one other issue with which I should like to deal, Mr. Chairman. It touches the whole future of the Department of External Affairs and its course of conduct in connection with transacting the business of that department. I think my hon. friend from Battle River-Camrose referred to the good old days when the minister was in politics on this side of the house. Since then for a good part of the time he has been riding very high on cloud nine, looking down on the struggles, the thoughts, and the toil and sweat of us ordinary politicians over here. But despite that he must be aware of the fact there is

a very considerable debate raging in this nation on matters involving federal-provincial areas of responsibility and powers, and I am sure he must be quite interested in this problem.

This, then, brings me to a question which I posed to him which was based on a speech—I tried to introduce this question in the house the other day but without much success—which was made at Victoria to the Kiwanis club by Mr. Lucien Saulnier, the chairman of the executive committee of the city of Montreal, who I understand is a very responsible individual. This speech was not made in the province of Quebec but in the province of British Columbia. With much of what was said I am in thorough agreement; it was a good and an excellent speech. But toward the close of his speech Mr. Saulnier indicated what in his opinion, in this very delicate and sensitive area of federal-provincial responsibilities, should be matters which might well go to the provincial government. Included in these items was—and I am using his own words here—power to participate in drawing up external trade policies.

I suggest that there is no doubt that the minister has consulted, and will in future consult, as will other responsible ministers, the provinces when negotiating with other countries in matters specifically affecting one or more of the provinces. We had a fair example of that during the negotiations on the Columbia river treaty; I am sure he had many hours of negotiations with Mr. Bennett and his officials. However, this was not really a constitutional responsibility.

What alarms me, and what I wish to question the minister on, is this. As minister who, under the Department of External Affairs Act, is given statutory responsibility to conduct the transactions which this country must enter into with other countries, a responsibility which is augmented by constitutional practice, under circumstances where the constitution of the country provides that he must when entering into trade or other external negotiations consult with provincial governments, does he feel that he can adequately deal with the external affairs of this country? We have heard talk from time to time in connection with the nuclear arms policy, of various alliances where there are one or two or three or four fingers on the trigger. What about a situation where, in negotiating for a treaty or in writing a treaty, we find there are 11 hands on the pen which signs the treaty? I think, having put this matter succinctly to the minister, that I should like to hear his view