

of any of the commonwealth countries under-estimating the views of other commonwealth countries in this regard. United Kingdom delegates are reporting back, of course, to their own colleagues just as the Minister of Trade and Commerce and I are reporting to this house.

Let it not be thought, as has been erroneously asserted in some United Kingdom newspapers, that the views of Canada were different from those of Australia or India or the other countries. There was a complete identity of views among these leading countries of the commonwealth. Indeed, I would say there was an extraordinary unanimity of view among all countries of the commonwealth. On this question we see eye to eye with the countries I have mentioned.

I close on the note on which I opened. Everyone recognized that this is a decision for the government of the United Kingdom. It is a decision to which a very great responsibility attaches because of the far-reaching consequences which would follow. As Mr. Menzies pointed out in the statement from which I have read, all commonwealth countries must sympathize with the government and the parliament of the United Kingdom in the responsibility which faces them in this regard. It is a very difficult decision for any government to make. The views expressed by commonwealth countries at Accra were not unsympathetic. They were not unmindful of the problem which faces the United Kingdom government. They fully recognized it.

Perhaps I might close by using in this house the words with which I closed my remarks at that meeting when I reviewed what had been said by the other commonwealth delegates. I pointed out that in an uneasy world we had an existing reality which we believe to be vitally important for all the world. I said we did not want to see any of the commonwealth values in this world weakened. Before this institution is in any way modified, we must be sure that we were giving up substance for substance, not substance for shadow. Having regard to the fears, the forebodings and the apprehensions which were expressed at that meeting—expressed with restraint, expressed with responsibility, expressed candidly, expressed in the most friendly way by all countries, I said: "These are not the fears of the indifferent; these are not the forebodings of the unsympathetic; these are not the apprehensions of adversaries. These are, rather, the fears, the forebodings and the apprehensions of the best friends that Great Britain has in all the world."

**Mr. Chevrier:** I desire to raise a point of order, and the point of order is this. Accord-

ing to the minister himself, the hon. gentleman has read from a part of the speech, or the concluding remarks of the speech which he delivered. I think it is the usual practice in those circumstances for him to produce the rest of the speech—in other words, the whole of it.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I can assure the hon. member that nothing would give me greater pleasure than to repeat the speech I gave there.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I have listened to one, and that is enough.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** It occupied 50 minutes. I was shocked to be told that after it was completed. I have not the text of that speech, but I have my notes. As I say, it would give me great pleasure to reproduce that speech, to repeat it here if the hon. gentleman wishes.

**Mr. Chevrier:** That is not the point of order. The point of order was that the minister, having read part of his speech should now table the whole speech.

**Mr. Green:** Perhaps I might point out, on the point of order, how ridiculous that suggestion is, Mr. Chairman. For example, I understand the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate made a speech in Toronto yesterday. Suppose he were to get up today and quote one sentence from it. Would some Liberal be entitled to demand, on the strength of that, that he could table the whole speech?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I can assure the Secretary of State for External affairs that I should be very happy to reproduce it.

**Mr. Green:** Yes, but nobody would be very happy to have to listen to it. I suggest it is going from the sublime to the ridiculous to try to introduce in this house the practice of the wholesale tabling of speeches.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I like the way in which the Secretary of State for External Affairs waives aside any point of order as being ridiculous—as going from the sublime to the ridiculous. I submit to the committee that not only did the minister read a part of the speech he made at Accra but that he read lengthy portions of the speech made by Mr. Menzies. Having done that, surely he should have no objection to producing the speech he made.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** The speech Mr. Menzies made was made in the house of representatives at Canberra, Australia and presumably is reproduced in the records of the Australian parliament. It is one thing to reproduce the closing sentence of a speech, but for the hon. member to ask me to table the speech is to ask the impossible because there is no text. I can assure the hon. member that I made that closing statement and if on