

*Foreign Policy*

this house are agreed, and that is that we are very much concerned about the numerous threats to world peace that are appearing in various areas of the globe. I also think we are all agreed that we in this house would like to see these threats removed by peaceful negotiation and settlement. Where we differ perhaps in some degree is in the best means of attaining this end.

I think it is quite safe to say that Canadians generally are very disturbed about these threats to peace which are being made throughout the world—in Viet Nam, in the Middle East, in Hong Kong and other places. People are disturbed because there is uncertainty, and there is nothing that disturbs people more in this world than uncertainty. People in Canada are disturbed about the objectives in Viet Nam of our closest friend and ally, the United States. People are very worried indeed about this. There is also uncertainty about what is intended by the Chinese in Hong Kong. We are uncertain as to what is intended by President Nasser in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I think these uncertainties are to some degree caused by the position taken by the government. As suggested in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker), the government has not explained its position. It has not forcefully stated the reasons for its policy or, indeed, what the policy is.

• (8:10 p.m.)

The government's difficulties in this regard have been compounded by parliamentary agencies such as the C.B.C. The right hon. Leader of the Opposition has noted that that organization has been running a steady propaganda campaign against the United States for a good many years and has been distorting the views and objectives of that country. Why they do this I do not know, but that has been going on. The general impression created in this country is that the people in the United States are like demons, and that they can do nothing right under any circumstances. Never a word is mentioned when the North Vietnamese or the Viet Cong place bombs in restaurants where there are women and children; that is perfectly all right. The result has been that the public of Canada has been misled considerably by this parliamentary agency, and that has caused much trouble.

Again, had the government been more ready with information about the reasons for the position of the United States and the

positions of others in Viet Nam, and if to counter adverse propaganda it had been more forceful in expressing reasons for its policy, it would not have to sit on the fence, so to speak and pussyfoot about its position.

There is something else I wish to mention before getting to the meat of my remarks, and that has to do with information. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) was vehement in objecting to observations from opposition members that the government had not been forthcoming with information about Viet Nam and other aspects of our foreign policy. His position was that the government has given out all the information it could give out. Of course this is all a matter of opinion; the minister had to decide to what degree information must be classified, and how much can be given out. I know that perfectly well. Yet last week, when noted members of the United States Senate and Congress were here at the annual meeting of the Canada-United States parliamentary group—there were such distinguished men as Senator Mansfield, Senator Aiken, Representative Gallagher, and Doctor Morgan who is Chairman of the house committee on armed services—we obtained more information from them on Viet Nam and China in two or three hours than we had been able to obtain here in the last couple of years. Those, men of course, may be in a better position to assess the importance of information than is our minister. I understand the minister's position; nevertheless the information we obtained was readily forthcoming and was very helpful.

The first of the two major problems concerning people in this country, as was suggested this afternoon by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition, is the Middle East. Perhaps the present situation, where the President of the United Arab Republic is pressing his demands on Israel, has flared up, or been prompted, because the United States is somewhat tied up in Viet Nam. President Nasser may have thought that this was the appropriate moment to press his demands. Also I cannot help feeling that the president of the U.A.R. may have been influenced by the presence of a certain gentleman who is well known to some members of this house and who is now active in Middle East and Near East politics—Doctor Shukari. He was for a long time at the United Nations, and he is a very dangerous and influential man. Knowing something of his character I have a feeling that he may have had some hand in