

*Alleged Lack of Government Leadership*

While on the one hand the department of state issued its statement, on the other hand, on the day after, the secretary of defence said the very opposite. He said:

Our principle concern in the years ahead must be the dangers of an intercontinental ballistic missile and submarine-launched missile attack and the main thrust of our efforts should be redirected to meet these rising threats.

Mr. Speaker, there is the story. I do not often quote from the *Toronto Star* but this is what the *Toronto Star* said on that occasion:

Washington contradicts itself. Whatever else may be said about them, the arguments the American state department marshalled yesterday in its statement on nuclear arms for Canada are, at best, dubious.

In fact, they often run head-on into the views defence secretary Robert McNamara presented earlier yesterday to a congressional committee. It would almost seem as if the left hand in the state department did not really know what the right hand in the Pentagon was doing.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** That sounds like the government of Canada.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** There are three or four other points which can be analysed in the same way. On this occasion I am going to restrain myself from again referring to the document in question, but I do say this, without any reservation; that the subsequent statement made by the United States secretary of state added to the seriousness resulting from the earlier statement. He said in effect that what I said was incorrect. Then he wound up and said that Canada of course has the right to decide. Certainly it has the right to decide, but in that subsequent statement over and over again there is reiterated a viewpoint that is inconsistent with the relationship between allies.

There has been no criticism on our part of the United States on occasions when we might have done so. I can think of events which have taken place within the last year, but self-control is necessary and must be exercised as between nations. We might have spoken out. Mr. Speaker, I say no more about that statement issued by the state department.

What I said on the opening day I repeat, and to that I add that the further restatement by the secretary of state constituted a further intrusion into Canadian public debate and public consideration of this matter.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** So far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, he has a way of finding himself in a hole and then coming through the same hole he created for himself. He said this thing is wrong, but then he

proceeded to use all the arguments that were wrong in that statement to devastate us if he could.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** So did Mr. Harkness last night.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I realize the joy that has been given to the heart of the hon. gentleman by making that statement, but I am saying that the arguments that were used in the statement that should not have been issued, should not have been used. That is not the way for diplomatic relations between countries. It has become the cornerstone of the argument of the opposition, indeed even before the statement was issued. I refer of course to the Liberal opposition.

**Mr. Benidickson:** You cannot explain that to the Conservatives in Calgary North.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I am glad to see the hon. gentleman back. Now, there are some who say to me that if you take a stand like this it is anti-American. Mr. Speaker, it is nothing of the kind. I do not think it is other than pro-Canadian, or Canadian, to point out when something is wrong. That is unjust.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Somebody said to me that if I take this stand then we are going to suffer danger in Canada, damage to Canada, and that we are going to do harm to Canada's economic strength. I do not accept that argument. It is an unworthy one. Does anyone tell me that the United States, which has spread its beneficence all over the world, would retaliate because we failed to adopt a suggestion that they offered? Such an argument, and I hear it spoken today in various parts of our country, if carried to its logical conclusion means this, that our country has ceased to be a country wherein we have the right to make our own policies. I do not accept that.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I believe in co-operation because I believe in good relations. Franklin said we hang together or we will hang separately, and I believe in co-operation. Without it there is no survival. But I cannot accept the fears of those who believe we must be subservient in order to be a good ally of any country in the world. Macdonald fought this battle. The great merchants in the city of Montreal in those days—not the French Canadians—had their views on this subject, that after all Canada would be that much stronger if it were joined with the United States. That was not Macdonald's view. That idea comes in with almost every generation.

I say this, Mr. Speaker. We are influenced in this way every day in our country on