

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

commonwealth will be able to help one another and, in particular, the underdeveloped countries within the commonwealth. Unless action is taken in this regard, the gap between the have and have not nations will continue to grow as it is growing today, and world-wide difficulties will be the result.

Now, sir, in so far as the international situation is concerned, this is one matter upon which we can all be in agreement. Recently, as has been pointed out in the speech from the throne, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom was here. He said that war is unlikely since the deterrent of nuclear annihilation restrains both sides. I gathered from his remarks that in his view it was necessary to do everything we could to raise the economic standards among the nations as a primary purpose and objective of the western world. Today we see coalitions breaking up or in grave danger. CENTO and SEATO lack the strength that results from a clear understanding. NATO is subject to stresses and strains. I am hoping the Prime Minister, when he speaks, will deal with this particular matter in some detail.

The U.S.S.R. and communist China are engaged in a division that seems to be widening. The U.S.S.R. has removed most of its economic and technical aid from China. Strange things are happening. The U.S.S.R. is giving aid to India against China. Some of the NATO countries are trading with communist countries, while others are not. I was most surprised a few days ago when the United States decided to bar certain countries—I speak now of Britain and France—from aid because they dared to follow a policy that was not acceptable to the United States. We had the same experience when we were in office. Strong objection was taken to the fact that we dared to deal with communist China. We proceeded to carry out what we believed to be the right course, and that we were right in that regard is shown by the fact that today the United States is trading in wheat with the U.S.S.R. Canada today is following the policy that we followed of selling wheat to communist countries. Indeed, the wheat sales of the last year and a half or two years have been directly the result of the policies of the former government carried into effect by the present government.

The other day an announcement was made about the wheat payment for the 1962-63 crop year. There was some boasting about the fact there was a final payment of 40 cents a bushel or a little over. As a matter of fact, I should point out that this represented the results of a year in which the former government was in office for nine of the

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

twelve months. I know what we were subjected to when we decided to advance credit. The idea was ridiculed and condemned, but now it is being followed. The United States took a strong stand in this regard. In so far as Cuba is concerned, one of our major offences was that we said to the United States, in effect, you will determine your policies and we will co-operate at all times in the interests of freedom, but when we think a course is right, that course we shall follow as a sovereign state.

Then I should like the Prime Minister to tell us something about his trip to Paris and Washington, because we want to get an authentic report. We have had to depend upon the press. I must say the reports we received indicated that there was a different stand taken by the Prime Minister in Canada from the one which he took in Paris. Of course one understands that he was in the position of a suitor, and naturally intent on pleasing. Certainly he left the impression there that the recognition of communist China would take place; that was the diplomatic thing to do, because after all he said that General de Gaulle gave him an enigmatic smile, that in return deserved some suggestion that the course followed by France would be followed by Canada. It was so reported in the press, and there were enough newspaper reporters along. The United States press so reported, and the French press so reported. When the Prime Minister got back he said there was nothing to that.

Then he went to Washington, and he was asked what was going to be done. The answer given by one of his officials was that the Prime Minister had not given an undertaking not to recognize communist China. That was a double barrelled denial open to any interpretation one wished to place on it. Then we remember how the invitation was going to be extended for them to meet in Canada, and that the honest broker was bringing together General de Gaulle and President Johnson. That was until President Johnson heard of it, until General de Gaulle heard of it, and that was the end of that; and the Prime Minister on his return denied it. Naturally one asks what is the reason.

Then there was the strange thing in Paris which was reported in the *Ottawa Citizen* by its representative, who went along and who is not unfavourable to the Prime Minister, that Ambassador Bohlen bowled over the Prime Minister. We would like to have details on this, and we would like to know what happened in that conversation. What was the ambassador angry about, and what had been said by the Prime Minister that caused that anger? I am not going to quote