from the article that appeared in the *Citizen* but certainly it was made very clear that this hapened.

Then what about uranium? "If it is good for Rio Tinto it is good for Canada," is not an effective policy for Canada. Again I ask what about uranium? All I have before me are the reports that over there an indication was given that uranium would be sold because General de Gaulle needs uranium for his independent deterrent force, but when the Prime Minister returned he said there had been no discussions on the subject of uranium. It is strange how matters like this become so involved, and how it becomes necessary not only to deny what allegedly he said but even to deny the denial. Here are some of the reports in my hand; "Ready to sell to France, P.M. reveals; Canada sets policy pending aid pact."

I ask what took place. What is the position of affairs with regard to uranium? Did the Prime Minister change his view after he got to Washington? You remember that there the Prime Minister gave the President a saddle; I think Canada took the ride. All these things are very interesting, and I am sure the Prime Minister will tell us about them this afternoon.

What of our relations with the United States today? Do you recall how they used to say that we were anti-American? All one has to do is read the United States press today to note the cleavage between our countries, a cleavage never before equalled. What took place in Washington? So far as the communique was concerned it contained nothing and conveyed nothing. The secretary to the President of the United States was asked what happened, and he said Prime Minister Pearson called on President Johnson, period. What happened there? What discussions took place with regard to uranium?

What discussions took place between Canada and the United States in reference to the great lakes difficulties and the action taken in United States ports against Canadian ships? What representations did the Prime Minister make to the President of the United States? Early in January, at a meeting of representatives of the Canadian lake shipping industry in Montreal, a resolution was unanimously passed condemning interference with Canadian shipping in United States ports and calling on the Canadian government for prompt and effective action to bring such interference to an end.

What was done over there? I am told the only reason that we do not have difficulties on the great lakes at the moment is because of the icy peace of winter. What happens when navigation begins? Did the Prime Minister do anything to persuade the government of the United States to protect Canadian ships from waterfront violence in American ports and from the practice of boycott? Did he make clear to the President of the United States the fact that the government of Canada does not view with appreciation the situation in which certain unions in the United States can take punitive action against Canadian ships in United States ports because they do not approve of Canadian policy? Will he tell the house what was said in this connection, for we have had no report on this matter as yet?

Hal Banks was to go. Well, Mr. Speaker, he is still there. We are to get a report some time as to what the trustees are doing. They have been abroad finding out what they could do. We in Canada know what they should do, and that is remove Banks.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I cannot go into the cases that are being heard against him because they are sub judice. I would like to make some references to the last prosecution, but I cannot.

What is the nature of this questionnaire to the thousand seamen? I endeavoured to get an answer to that yesterday but was not successful. I know this, though; that after some of these people were visited by the questioners they were immediately approached by representatives of one of the unions within the C.L.C., endeavouring to secure the membership of these people in their union. Where did that information come from, and how was it made known? Was it given by the trustees? Was there not some reason for complaint in the appointment of the trustee board when Mr. Millard, a most estimable gentleman formerly connected with the C.L.C., was appointed thereto? Where do these names come from and how are they known? There are misgivings, and those misgivings have been repeated over and over again. Recently, on February 1, these words appeared in a special editorial in *Canadian Transport*:

> The relative restraint of the three maritime union trustees has begun to disturb us. We would be less than frank if we did not admit that we now have some doubts about the trustees' chances of discharging their assignment satisfactorily.

Then it said what should be done.

> ...this means "cleaning up" the S.I.U.—ousting its hoodlum leadership...and putting the democratic control of the union in the hands of its members.

Why has this action not been taken? Is the fact that this action has not been taken connected with what I shall deal with on some future occasion, the courtship between