

Supply—External Affairs

Mr. Smallwood: They still don't know why he was sent. Further on the article says:

Thompson, in common with every other western emissary, came away with little more from Kenyatta than a promise to issue a bland appeal to the rebels "to do nothing that would be inhuman towards civilians in their custody".

But the first part of the article is the most interesting bit and gives the real reason why the hon. member for Red Deer went to Africa:

Inside his starkly modern palace overlooking Addis Ababa, the Lion of Judah greeted the member for Red Deer like one of the family. Then Haile Selassie escorted guest of honour Robert Thompson to a glittering state banquet attended by just about everybody who is anybody in Addis. That, as it happens, includes just about the whole original graduating class ('46) of the secondary school—Ethiopia's first—that the present day leader of the Social Credit party helped to establish during his 15 years as the emperor's top education adviser.

Now we are getting down to the facts of why he went to Africa. It was to attend a reunion. When we get reports like this we can only ask who is right?

The *Toronto Daily Star* of November 14 carried the following story:

Robert Thompson, leader of the Canadian Social Credit party, said last night that he has information three Belgians have been executed by Congolese rebels in Stanleyville and three more are under sentence of death.

But in Brussels, a Belgian official said Thompson's statement "contradicts" information received there.

I ask that the minister be good enough to get up and admit this is a worked up scheme, and admit this junket was planned three months ago. It was definitely a political plum in return for the hon. member's support. Will the minister say when the hon. member was briefed by his department? Will he tell us how much he is going to be paid and how he is going to be paid? Will he tell us why the hon. member was chosen and why all the great names in the back benches of the Liberal party were ignored?

If the minister will tell me why the officers in the external affairs department, who could have carried out this mission successfully, were ignored, then I shall not delay passage of his estimates any further. I believe this is a junket to be paid by the Canadian taxpayers. It is a trip that was planned some three months ago.

Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Chairman, I am prompted to enter this debate, not so much by what was contained in the minister's statement but by what I feel was a rather obvious omission, an omis-

sion to which emphasis was given by some of the things contained in the statement.

I had hoped that at this stage, particularly in view of the fact that earlier this year the minister visited Japan and after his visit made a comment on Pacific affairs, he would in his preliminary statement have given a clearly defined, comprehensive, well articulated statement on Canadian policy for the Pacific. I feel it is not just this minister who has omitted such a statement on occasions like this. Successive Canadian governments throughout history have never really bothered themselves to devote their full attention to Canada's Pacific role or to the question of whether in fact Canada has a Pacific role at all.

So much of our policy is built on an old tradition. Our orientation is toward Europe and toward the United States. Our perspectives tend to be the old perspectives and we do not have a fresh, new, Canadian perspective on the world as it is occupied by Canada. I have often wished that when we enter these debates on external affairs there could be a map of the world on the desk of every member, or else a very large map of the world hanging in a prominent place in the chamber, but not on the familiar Mercator's projection with which we have grown up and with which we are all familiar—that visual image of the world tends to shape so many of our ideas about the world. Rather it should have a projected centre, not on the prime meridian but on the 105th meridian west, that would show North and South America at the central point of focus, with the shores of Africa and Europe to the east and the shores of Asia, Australia and all the island countries in the South Pacific to our west, so that we would stop thinking in that European term of Asia as the Far East, but rather of Europe as our eastern area of interest and Asia as our western area of interest. For that is the Canadian perspective, or what ought to be the Canadian perspective.

We are a nation that looks out on two shores, to the east over the Atlantic and to west over the Pacific, but so much of our external affairs policy is influenced by the old perspective, the European perspective, rather than what ought to be the Canadian perspective, looking outward from both the east and west of the North American continent, and also looking south, which we must do as part of the necessity of our existence. And perhaps we do it to too great an extent.

In his statement today the minister emphasized our commitment to the trans-Atlan-