

*External Affairs*

he referred to television cameras and banks of microphones.

Then there is another paragraph in the same report which I think indicates a point of view which bears consideration. It reads as follows:

When exposed to the full glare of radio, television and headlines, he told the gathering, diplomats became actors and acted out their parts sometimes to the detriment of their real objective.

Mr. Speaker, already this afternoon there has been a wholly unwarranted attempt to attribute to the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green) and to the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Browne) participation in a particular point of view in the United States which was not justified by anything they said in their speeches. May I say that it would be equally justified to suggest that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is taking a rather direct interest in what is going on in an important and friendly country, something which is out of keeping with our desire to maintain the friendliest possible relationship with them. I shall not enlarge on that because I should prefer to believe that we shall have come to an end of these attempts to hold up to ridicule the procedure which I am afraid is not going to be changed by what the Secretary of State for External Affairs may have said at Renfrew or elsewhere.

I suggest that when we are referring to the conduct of the business of that government which today is carrying the greatest load of any of the free governments of the world, we should not describe their activities as hoop-la diplomacy, and it would be much more desirable that their own particular methods be recognized as their own particular methods, and that we be more concerned with the extension of our own discussion in our own country, down to the last detail of our own affairs in that wider field.

The statement, however, did not even stand alone as there have been a number of statements related to those of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On April 19 the deputy under-secretary of state for external affairs, speaking at the university of Maine, reflected some of these same ideas and some of our apparently increasing sensitiveness to things which are being said or not said about us in the United States. In a more carefully guarded speech, as was to be expected from his official office, the Canadian ambassador to the United States, speaking in the United States on April 23, made some reference to the same aspect of our relationship.

[Mr. Drew.]

This is a time, Mr. Speaker, for us to make sure that we do all within our power in this country to keep our differences behind closed doors in friendly discussion, where they will serve a useful purpose. On the other hand, if there are positive problems in the dealings between ourselves and the United States, then let them be stated in this chamber in clear and specific terms. Why be so critical of the people of the United States? Do the members of this house know with complete clarity what Canada's foreign policy is? If all Canadians know what Canada's foreign policy is, then that would be the time for us to be critical, if any people in the United States are not aware what it is. Do the members of this house, let alone the rank and file of Canadians from coast to coast, yet know exactly what we have undertaken to do under the North Atlantic pact? Do members of this house know what undertaking we gave in regard to the defence of Europe? True, it was announced just over a week ago that we were going to recruit for Europe a brigade which may possibly be ready by the end of this year. Was that what we undertook to do? Was there anything else? Was that the time within which we undertook to do it? Have we any other undertakings not yet disclosed to this house?

These are not merely details of foreign policy. They are details which directly affect the major consideration now before the house, namely, the voting of supply; and certainly before we raise any question as to the adequacy of the knowledge of the people of the United States about our affairs, we should be perfectly sure that the people of Canada have full knowledge in regard to these very important matters, which have such a profound bearing upon the immediate future of this country.

What does the Secretary of State for External Affairs mean when he raises objections about being told by the United States that we are not bearing our proportionate share? Has the government of the United States directed such an objection to the Canadian government? If it has, let us know what the main features of that objection were. If it has not, then what was the Secretary of State for External Affairs talking about? Surely he was not referring to casual and uninformed criticisms by individuals in the United States. We would not expect the Secretary of State for the United States to deal so formally with similarly casual and uninformed criticism of the United States by individual Canadians, or by individuals of other countries. Either there is something