

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

other day struck in me the reaction that injudicious annoyance with the questions of the moment—at a time when judicious and judicial calm should have been expected from him—had led him to utter these words, as found at page 20 of *Hansard* on November 26:

I have been scandalized more than once by the attitude of the larger powers, the big powers as we call them, who have all too frequently treated the charter of the United Nations as an instrument with which to regiment smaller nations and as an instrument which did not have to be considered when their own so-called vital interests were at stake.

The only reference in the preceding paragraph is to Britain and to France. I am scandalized, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister saw fit to condemn Britain and France to the same bag in which the U.S.S.R. was placed. I shall say no more about that because I do not wish to use words which later on I would have to repent, as I feel the Prime Minister will have to repent in the days ahead. No matter how one may judge, placing those three in a common position is, to say the least, not in keeping with the fact that two of them represent the motherlands of Canada, that those two have for generations preserved freedom and within our generation have done that very thing. I do not think this government has had any realization of events internationally in their proper perspective; or if it has, it has kept that information from parliament. We in the opposition have not been consulted. That is one of the complaints in Britain. After all, when our future is at stake and freedom stands challenged, surely these eighteen feet that separate us do not demand that we be kept in the dark.

I go back to January 11 of this year when the question arose as to whether aircraft were being shipped to Egypt and the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that he was unable to say whether any had been shipped. While he spoke the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of National Defence, who must have known, sat silent. On January 16 the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich asked whether any military equipment for the Middle East was being shipped by a designated transport and the minister said in effect that he was unable to say. On January 17 the Secretary of State for External Affairs admitted that aircraft had been shipped but he said that the reason that he did not give a proper answer the other day was the use of the word "recently". From now on, three months is not recently in an international calendar. Later on, the Prime Minister said that the decision to permit the shipment of arms had been made

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

by the cabinet in June, 1955. On January 20 the Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the export was authorized by an order in council of July 7. The next day he said that there was no such order in council. Mr. Speaker, here was a serious situation. This was parliament, entitled to receive information and receiving selective information. A few days later the Prime Minister completed the picture by saying that the matter was never before the cabinet in June, July or at any other time.

Something is wrong, Mr. Speaker, when on a matter affecting freedom in the world a cabinet furnishes information of that kind: misinformation, no information. I sometimes wonder why it is that things like that should exist. If the proposal for a United Nations emergency force had been advanced before the U.N. not on November 2 but earlier when hon. members in this house who have travelled in the Middle East knew it should be, how different things might have been.

I am not going to quarrel with the Prime Minister over his refusal to produce the telegram with respect to which the press reported that scorching words had been used. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister's words the other day, when he threw Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. into a common bag, represented judicial calm, I should like to see that telegram. In order to be able to answer the question whether that telegram should be produced, the right hon. gentleman did not ask the British government or Sir Anthony Eden whether that telegram could be produced. Oh, no. I want to read this message—which is found at page 23 of *Hansard*—because it is obvious that the wording of the request for consideration of the possible demand by myself and others is couched in the phraseology of one who realizes that the demand could not be accepted. Just listen to this:

A leading member of the official opposition has stated publicly that, when our parliament meets in the near future, he proposes to ask for the tabling of one of the communications I addressed to you recently in reply to one of yours.

It is obvious that this correspondence between us could not be published piecemeal and that, if one of these confidential communications were published, they would all have to be published.

All, Mr. Speaker? Not all; one. The No. 1 communication when danger challenged, is the one asked for; the request was not for the day to day confidential communications but for the one of advice, if you will; the one of challenge, if you will; the one of condemnation, if you will. For, Mr. Speaker, that is the telegram that was sent on behalf of Canada. That is the one that was