

*External Affairs*

I should now like to refer to the broader aspects of external affairs. I am sure that it was reassuring to all the members of this house to hear the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the opening part of this debate, in which he spoke in the warmest and most unreserved terms of our relationship with the United States. Those remarks, however, did not explain away the statements he had previously made outside the house.

It is not a case of anyone in this house seeking to find in his remarks some meaning that they did not contain. It would not be enough for the Secretary of State for External Affairs to say that what he has said in this debate represents his real sentiment with regard to our relationship with the United States and that any interpretation which has been placed on any other remarks he has made, and which would give a contrary impression, was obviously the result of taking a meaning which he did not intend to convey.

There is no hon. member in this house who does not recognize the strain imposed upon cabinet ministers who are called upon to assume the administrative responsibility for their departments in these difficult times while at the same time they are asked to accept invitations to speak at a great many meetings in other parts of the country. Certainly there would be no disposition to over-emphasize the importance of any single statement, separated from its context, where it appears that such a statement might have been made inadvertently, under the pressure of making many speeches, and without any opportunity to give full consideration to its possible effect. On the other hand, the members of this house have no right to disregard statements, made by ministers of the crown outside this house, which give every appearance of being the result of clear consideration and of being part of some established pattern.

If the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs before the Empire club in Toronto on April 10 stood by itself, there perhaps would be no reason to refer again to what he said at that time, particularly in view of what he has already said in this debate. But the speech does not stand by itself. The Secretary of State for External Affairs made other speeches at that time and since. They are speeches which must be regarded as carrying the importance of speeches made by the spokesman for the government of Canada with regard to international relations. For that reason one cannot disregard the apparent persistence of the

Secretary of State for External Affairs in trying to create the impression that the people of the United States are much too unaware of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that the twenty million people or thereabouts who in a single year cross the border, coming from the United States in to Canada, seem to demonstrate a fairly active consciousness of Canada in the United States, as does the fact that probably no other country in the whole world seems to be quite so well informed about its neighbour and about the attractiveness of the neighbouring nation which its people visit. The enormous number of border crossings by automobile, by aeroplane—and I am speaking of private aeroplanes in this case—and by other means of transportation indicate a vivid consciousness of Canada. Nearly every important publication in the United States is carrying frequent references to what is taking place in this country. I mention this matter because it seems hard to explain just why there is this recurring emphasis on the failure of the people of the United States to understand or to know about Canada.

That, however, is a detail relating more to general information. What is perhaps much more important, and certainly more important to the subject now being discussed, is the nature of the comments which have been made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs about the policies of the government of the United States and the manner in which they do business; and also the way in which some of that criticism is conveyed by those officials who remain anonymous but who are customarily described in press reports as "usually reliable sources". I noticed a rather startling choice of words in a speech made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in Renfrew on May 3. I am reading from a report in the *Ottawa Journal* of the following day. In that may I read one paragraph which appears under the subheading "Hoop-La Diplomacy", and is as follows:

The external affairs minister decried what he termed "hoop-la" diplomacy. By this he meant conducting negotiations in the presence of television cameras and banks of microphones. It was to be hoped, he said, that diplomacy would retain dignity and not descend to or counterpart the elements of the vaudeville stage.

Having regard to the particular time when that speech was made, and having regard to the things of which we were all fully aware, there could be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable reader what diplomacy the Secretary of State for External Affairs was referring to when he referred to "hoop-la" diplomacy, or what place he had in mind when