

*Supply—External Affairs*

That statement by Khrushchev emphasizes the warning given by the secretary of state.

The period of good will during negotiations for and immediately after the signing of the test ban treaty had been followed by renewed polemics against the west. With regard to the division between red China and the U.S.S.R.—this is only one view and may not be accepted—I point out that this division first became apparent to the outside world after we in Canada did that which the U.S.S.R. could not do, and that was supply communist China with wheat to relieve famine and starvation. The U.S.S.R. refused that. The previous government entered into an agreement in that connection. All I can say is that the cleavages between those two nations were intensified following the delivery by Canada of the first shipments of wheat. What the future will bring in the relations between communism and the western world no one knows, but certainly the events of the last few weeks have been anything but hopeful. The detour of smiles of a few months ago has now had a change, and the highway seems to be one fraught with great difficulties.

The minister mentioned the organization of American states. I am surprised that he did not go further than he did, but as I said a moment ago the responsibilities of office and the knowledge that comes therefrom often brings about a change in thinking. I want to point out what he said only a few months ago, in January of 1963, which was a repetition of what the Prime Minister had also been saying. As reported at page 3078 of *Hansard* he said:

Do we have over-all planning and co-ordination of effort in the government at the present time which gives its total attention to a particular problem in external relations and is continually casting its eye up and down the radar screen looking for problems in areas where Canada can exert an influence?

Then he pointed out one of those places in which the influence could be exerted, and that was in the organization of American states. These are his words, which he uttered as far back as September 7, 1961, as reported on page 8067 of *Hansard* for that year:

We were told by the Prime Minister some months ago that this house would be given the opportunity of expressing its view with regard to the desirability of Canadian membership in the organization of American states. I express once again my own strong personal view that the time has come when Canada must accept its responsibility in this organization.

Then the present Prime Minister, in September 1961, mentioned the necessity of giving the United States advice of the kind that we did, and rightly, during the Cuban mix-up. He said that if we were to interest ourselves in these developments, then we have to take our responsibility in the organization

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

which is concerned with these matters, namely the organization of American states.

Then on January 24, 1963, the present Secretary of State for External Affairs said, as reported on page 3073 of *Hansard*:

—it seems to me that the time was never more urgent for us to accept the long-standing indication of every member of the organization of American states and to join this organization.

I wonder what has happened? Why the change of viewpoint. I also point out—

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** I know my hon. friend wants to be very objective today, but I am sure he will agree that nothing I have said this afternoon would warrant the conclusion that there has been any change of personal view.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Chairman, that is an example of the turning of words. A year ago he said "now". Today he says "maybe tomorrow". I dislike bringing these things up, but I could go on with quite a number of other quotations in this connection. He also said this, as reported on page 3074:

—it seems to me the Cuban crisis highlighted once again the need for Canada to take part in the organization of American states.

Then he goes on to point out the need for joining the organization; but today, with the sophistication that comes with knowledge, he is not so certain as he was. Does he suggest that he is? I do not think so, because this is a problem of great difficulty. It is so easy to solve it when on the opposition side, but it is a different thing when one sits over there and has the responsibility. We considered this matter and looked into it very carefully, but decided that we should expand the number of our trade missions and the number of our diplomatic posts in South America. I visited Central America two years ago and wherever I went there was a widespread suggestion that we should join. I asked what the reasons were and the answer given was: "So that we will have you with us to stand up to the United States". Is the government today finding out that the happy euphoria that they showed to the organization of American states for five years has been dissipated in the light of experience? These are questions which will be asked when we are considering the items in committee.

**The Chairman:** Order. In order to permit the house to proceed with the consideration of private members' business, it is my duty to leave the chair.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** When the Secretary of State for External Affairs was introducing his estimates in committee of supply he stated he wished to table copies of the treaty