

External Affairs

The *Telegraph-Journal* of Saint John, New Brunswick, carried an article in the November 23, 1959 issue entitled:

Pearson Hits P.C. Policy, Record.

Another taken from the *Toronto Star* of November 20, 1959, bore the title:

Pearson Raps Dief on U.S. "Domination".

Apparently "domination" is a terrible word. It is claimed that the United States is dominating us. We are losing our sovereignty and becoming an appendage of that country. Another article taken from the *Halifax Chronicle* of November 20, 1959, bore the headline:

Pearson Opposed to Weapons in Canada.

I invite hon. gentlemen to consider what these headlines and speeches accomplish. These headlines may please the vanity of the Leader of the Opposition and may please the vanity of his supporters; they may even foster in hon. gentlemen opposite the hope that they will some day sit on this side of the house; but what effect do they have on us poor Canadians at home? What effect do they have on the average Canadian? It is my belief that such propoganda destroys the confidence of the Canadian people in themselves. What would an average Canadian think when he hears or reads words like these: "Pearson Opposed to Weapons in Canada" or "Pearson Raps Dief on U.S. 'Domination'"? Does not the average Canadian become suspicious that the United States is trying to dominate us, that our sovereignty is endangered and that we are becoming nothing but an appendage of the United States? I invite hon. members to consider the impression this campaign makes on the average Canadian.

Second, I believe the effect of such propoganda is to destroy the confidence of the Canadian people in the only ally that can defend this country in the event of an emergency. The only country today that could serve to protect the sovereignty and independence of Canada is the United States of America and I challenge anyone to take issue with that statement.

Let us consider what effect headlines like these has on the United States. I remind hon. gentlemen that that country has poured millions of dollars into the defence of our north. It is true that the money was expended for the defence of that country as well but we also benefit. What effect does it have on them? Do hon. gentlemen not think it would have the effect of shaking and weakening any feeling of confidence and friendship they have in us as an ally? Do hon. gentlemen not think it would disturb the people of the United States?

[Mr. Mandziuk.]

We must also consider the effect that this sort of bosh has on our opponents. I refer, of course, to comrade Khrushchev. I remind hon. gentlemen that this kind of thing is reported to him and, of course, the communists read everything of this nature. I suggest that comrade Khrushchev must rub his hands with glee and pleasure as he concludes that Canadians are divided and that there is no feeling of unity in Canada. He must be delighted at the thought that those poor Canadian jokers are fighting among themselves as to who owns the weapons and who will push the button or pull the trigger in event of attack. I suggest that headlines of this nature create the impression among our opponents that we are a weak nation ready to fall apart and that all is not well with us. It must also give an indication to our NATO allies that all is not well in Canada.

I have great respect for the Leader of the Opposition. He is a distinguished politician and an able and educated man. But with all due respect to that hon. gentleman I would point out that statements like this are irresponsible. If the press has twisted them to suit themselves the Leader of the Opposition should challenge the press but if he stands behind those statements I think he must accept the fact that they are irresponsible and disturbing to both Canadians and their allies.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It being 5 o'clock it is my duty, pursuant to standing order 15, to interrupt these proceedings and proceed to the consideration of private and public bills.

Mr. Green: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the leaders of the other two parties have agreed that this debate should continue from 5 to 6 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the unanimous wish of the house to waive the hour which is normally provided at this time for the consideration of public and private bills?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mandziuk: Thank you. I have only a few more remarks to make before concluding my address. I submit that in these times of stress and danger Canada expects statesmanship and guidance from responsible leaders or those who claim leadership. It expects some unity in matters such as external affairs and those that preach unity are sometimes the ones who disturb it as did the previous speaker. At any peace conference we cannot negotiate from weakness while our opponents negotiate from strength.

These last few observations are submitted to show what I feel the average Canadian is distressed about, and I suggest that it is the duty of those who aspire to leadership or