

today is that he should take up this matter also with the Prime Minister in the hope that the Senate will be represented at the United Nations by a delegate and by observers.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

PRESS REPORT ON CANADA'S ATTITUDE

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Vincent Dupuis: Honourable senators, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to call the attention of this house to an article published in the *Daily Telegraph* of London, England, concerning the attitude of this country toward international affairs. This newspaper's correspondent is Mr. Eric Downton who, I am told, is a member of the Press Gallery here. I was unable to obtain the issue of the English paper in which the article appeared, but I have a copy of *Le Devoir* of Montreal, which carried a translation of it. I don't intend to go into this matter fully now because I have not the original text of the article, although I believe that the translation is quite accurate.

This correspondent says that in the course of the last few weeks the mind of the Canadian nation has changed altogether, to the point of discovering that "we could very well become the Belgium of the Third World War". He proceeds to say that Canada is seldom isolationist, except in Quebec—meaning that the Canadians of French origin in Quebec have always been isolationists. He said that Canadians have been isolationists to the point of feeling a kind of egoistic complacency and of detachment toward international affairs.

To find out the real meaning of the word "isolationist" I took the trouble of going to the Parliamentary Library, where I consulted the *Britannica World Language Dictionary*. According to that dictionary isolationist means "one who advocates national self-sufficiency and freedom from foreign political and economic alliances".

Well, I am sure that this gentleman's views do not represent the British Government's opinion about our country at all, because the British Government knows better. It knows that we never have been isolationists, that indeed the fact was very much to the contrary during the last war and the previous World War, when this country did its duty to the full. I am sure that the British Government and in general the people of the British Isles were very grateful for our unlimited contribution to the cause of our allies in those wars. I would like to ask the correspondent through the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Aseltine), why he describes us in this country as isolationists.

Is it because the former Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Mr. St. Laurent, advocated the organization of NATO to show the other part of the world which had not our philosophy of life that we were able to prepare a policy for the maintenance of peace? Is it because we in this Parliament have voted unanimously, every year since the end of the last world war, billions of dollars for our national defence as well as for aid to other countries? Is it because the then Minister of External Affairs, Lester B. Pearson, owing to his wisdom and his great experience, prevented a Third World War over the Suez mishap?

I will not say much more at present about the attitude of Quebec in answer to this writer. Yet, I would like to ask him why he considers that as a people we had an exceptional attitude toward the last World War. Is it because our men enlisted freely, without having guns held at their backs? Is that why we are called isolationists all the time? May I point out that in my own family eleven nephews went to the war, and two of them paid the supreme sacrifice. Are we in Quebec called isolationists because of all those Canadians of French origin who did their duty without being forced to do so? These are questions I would like to have answered by this newspaper correspondent.

Honourable senators, generally I do my best to keep my temper, but such things as these offend me deeply. I am sure this gentleman will see fit to correct his statements in accordance with the facts and that in future he will be more careful.

PENITENTIARY BILL

SECOND READING

Hon Léon Méthot moved the second reading of Bill C-21, to amend the Penitentiary Act.

He said: Honourable senators, the purpose of this bill is to remove the statutory provision which makes it automatic for the Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioners of penitentiaries to retire at the age of 65 years. The effect of the amendment would make it possible to extend the terms of office of these officers, if it is desired to do so.

According to the Act respecting Penitentiaries, Chapter 206, R.S.C. 1952, the Governor in Council may, by section 4, subsections 1 and 2, appoint a Commissioner and two Deputy Commissioners of penitentiaries.

Section 1 of the bill proposes that subsection (3) of section 4 of the Act be repealed. The subsection contains two conditions, namely, that these officers shall hold office during pleasure only, and that they must retire at the age of 65 years. At first