

External Affairs

Mr. Pearson: In that gloom the hon. member had some other company also because the hon. member for St. John's West considered it appropriate to say on April 23 last—and I quote from his remarks:

It seems to me that we are copying the bad example of the Russians who, by their brazen, openly aggressive and even insulting tactics, have made diplomacy so difficult today.

Such a comparison, such a statement, indicates that the hon. gentleman does not know very much about Canadian diplomacy. The leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Greenwood did not go so far as that about our diplomacy, but they took an anxious line about this talk of mine and other talks on Canadian-United States relations to which they did me the honour to refer. The hon. member for Greenwood quoted from a couple of Canadian papers to support his words and he suggested, and I am quoting his words, that I left "a rather widespread impression that we in Canada have in fact a lot of grievances and that we feel rather edgy towards the United States of America." He thought that very unfortunate indeed.

The leader of the opposition went further when he spoke on May 1 and again this afternoon. On May 1 he said that concern had been occasioned as to whether we are still operating on a friendly and frank basis with the government of the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite may rest easy. I think nothing has been said by myself or any other government spokesman which would warrant the concern they have expressed. Our relations with the United States continue to be on a good and friendly basis.

I admit very frankly that the nature and purpose of the statement I made in Toronto have been misunderstood by some critics in the United States who have based their criticism on press stories and on press excerpts from what I said. Other critics, such as the newspapers owned by Colonel McCormick of Chicago, the columnist George Sokolsky and a United States weekly news magazine seem to have read the text all right but to have drawn unfounded and totally unwarranted conclusions from it.

On the other side were those in both countries who thought that the effect of a frank and friendly analysis of the problem of our new relationship with the United States could only be helpful in the present circumstances. For instance, the Akron *Beacon-Herald* was surprised that my Toronto speech had caused criticism. They thought it "gently phrased and friendly" and that it demonstrated "a greater degree of unity between Ottawa and Washington than

exists between the Democratic and Republican parties." The *Boston Post* concluded that "happily" the speech "stressed the solidarity of the North American neighbours far more than their differences," while the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* welcomed the Toronto speech as "a sign of common sense and maturity in Canada." The *Providence Journal* had this to say:

Our good friend to the north has just read us a lesson in maturity that, if taken in the spirit of maturity, should be of compelling benefit all around.

Then finally, just to reassure the hon. gentleman, I could quote from a good many Canadian newspapers in order to match their quotations, but I shall confine myself to quoting just one paragraph from an editorial which appeared in a newspaper with which my hon. friends will be familiar. The *Sydney Post-Record* had this to say:

External affairs minister L. B. (Mike) Pearson has the support of all Canada in his firm but good-tempered determination to maintain the dignity and prestige of our country in her relations with the United States as well as with all other nations.

Apparently these papers and others did not think, to use the vigorous expression of the hon. member for Greenwood, that in that speech I, and I quote his words, "was banging the United States on the nose." I can assure the leader of the opposition also that in that speech and others I was not speaking from personal pique. I hope that when I speak as Secretary of State for External Affairs I shall speak as a Canadian anxious that Canada's views should not be misunderstood in these difficult times in international affairs and as a Canadian who sees Canada standing on her own feet but marching in step with her neighbours and her friends, especially the United States and the United Kingdom.

If I had more time I could devote some to the remarks this afternoon of the leader of the opposition about what he called "hoop-la diplomacy" and to which I referred in a speech which I made recently. He was directing my remarks to developments that have taken place recently in the United States. If the leader of the opposition had read my speech and not a newspaper account of the speech into the records of *Hansard* he might have come to a different conclusion concerning it.

I made that speech, first, some time ago in Toronto and subsequently in Renfrew. When I made the speech in Toronto none of these developments at which he was hinting this afternoon had taken place. I was talking about the difficulties of conducting diplomacy in this television age, and they are very real indeed. To explain those difficulties, to emphasize them and indeed to dramatize