

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

any more than we should be dependant on United States magazines and T.V. for information and opinions.

When I speak about television, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the fact that United States television stations on the west coast and generally across western Canada on election night were broadcasting into Canada the results in the Atlantic provinces before the polls were closed in western Canada.

Then he mentioned the trading union involving only Canada and the United States, and said that the decision about easier tariffs in the beginning would be made in Washington and in the interests of the chief party, and added:

I find it difficult to believe there could be free trade between Canada and the United States in agricultural commodities... You will understand from these remarks, Mr. Chairman, why I said at the outset that we shall be able to preserve our separate identity as a nation if we believe strongly enough in ourselves and are prepared to pay the price of remaining separate and distinct from our great neighbour.

Who said that? The now Minister of Trade and Commerce and, sir, he went on:

By any standards Canada is a very fortunate country and if we lose our separate identity it will not be because we lack the means to sustain our Canadian way of life. It will be because we do not make the effort.

Sir, that was the stand we took. In order to have some control over our resources we brought in effective measures governing our mines, oils and gas located in territories under our control, and one of those regulations stipulated that 50 per cent of the equity stock in companies exploiting those areas should be made available in Canada. Now I ask the Prime Minister to tell us, when he replies, whether there is any foundation for the suggestion presently widespread that that regulation is going to be changed? I ask that because everywhere we hear it said that there are going to be changes in this.

I shall pass on to the international situation mainly for the purpose of asking a number of questions of the Prime Minister.

The NATO conference will be convened here this week. The former government invited the NATO nations here and the invitation was accepted. Union within this group of nations must be maintained. However, I must say I was somewhat astonished, when I asked the Prime Minister the question regarding Canada's ideas respecting the multilateral force, that he could not give me a reply. That was on Friday last, and in effect he said we have to wait until the meeting of the NATO nations. Is that not what I said all through the campaign?

I read press reports pretty carefully and just the other day I read where the Prime Minister spoke to a newsmen in the United

States. This is one story which he has not yet denied. I am just paraphrasing his words and if I misquote him I will be glad to make a correction, but what he said was that it is so much easier to say what you would do in international affairs when you read about them in newspapers than when you have available to you the information that comes from the various embassies maintained by the country.

This week's NATO meeting is an important one. At it there will be material discussions on the problems of defence; yet when I asked the Prime Minister what is Canada's view he said, "We cannot tell you that." They have not yet made up their minds and they will not be able to make them up until they sit down with these other nations. Did he not, when talking to Mr. Kennedy, discuss Canada's attitude in this regard? It said so in the papers. I do not know whether that has been denied but it is about the only thing the Prime Minister has not denied, except that he possesses the qualities that Jayne Mansfield ascribed to him.

If Canada is not going to fall in line with the views of the United States in this, should we not know? Is the course going to be determined by Canada as to the stand we will take? I ask should such a force be set up? The arguments generally have revolved around the fact that if it is acceptable it will deny Germany having atomic weapons for itself. It will assure a greater degree of unity in the western world by preventing France and Germany from having a joint deterrent force.

What of the mixed crews? Is Canada going to contribute to that idea? The Prime Minister said he thought he might be in a position to answer today and I hope he will be able to give us some idea as to what stand will be taken on the morrow regarding a question so important.

Today's press indicates that for now the United States has abandoned the multilateral nuclear force proposed for NATO. Is that correct? I ask these questions not for the purpose of dealing on this occasion with defence. That subject will be fully dealt with when action is being taken to set up the defence committee, but I ask them simply so that we will know in this country what attitude Canada will take at the NATO meeting.

I should also like to ask the Prime Minister what Canada's stand will be in connection with the maintenance of the United Nations. Today the United Nations faces the most serious fiscal worries of its time; \$106 million is owing in assessments. If action is taken to exclude members then, of course, you have the beginnings of the end of this institution.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]