

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

constitutional limitations of this country that discrimination of any kind will not be condoned.

I am one who believes that internationally today one of the great responsibilities of the free world is to assure that each of the nations within the free world shall so act that nations outside the free world will not be able to say that in any way is discrimination practised by those free nations. As soon as possible we hope to introduce this bill of rights within the constitutional powers of the federal government, thereby making the most material advance in our country in the maintenance and preservation of freedom which has been made for many years.

My hon. friend says that the international situation is such that there should have been reference to it at great length in the speech from the throne. I am in disagreement with him on that point. The speech from the throne is presumed to be the bill of fare or menu of parliament and mere fatuous declarations regarding idealistic things, unless coupled with actual legislative changes, are meaningless in that context and that is why there was no reference to the international situation in the speech from the throne.

I am acquainted with the views of my hon. friend in international affairs and I am going to refer to them a little later on. During the election campaign the hon. gentleman made a variety of statements on this subject which I think can be dealt with in a general discussion at a proper date to be determined at the convenience of the house when, in setting up a committee to which the estimates of the Department of External Affairs may be referred, an opportunity will be provided for a discussion of international affairs. I am eager to hear that discussion because it is by this means that we are able to secure a reasonable degree of unanimity in our international affairs.

I agree with my hon. friend that the responsibility of leaders everywhere in the free world is not to be inflexible but rather to show a spirit of flexibility but without appeasement to bring about those things that are necessary to preserve peace, for none of us is unaware of the fact that the grim alternative will be organized suicide.

While my hon. friend says there has not been any change within recent months my view is that the period of uncertainty which followed the launching of sputnik I and II and resulted in the December meeting of NATO in Paris has given way to a sense of greater assurance on the part of the west. The free world has reiterated its stand that NATO is not aggressive and I believe there

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

has been an improved situation in so far as the initiative is concerned in recent weeks. This is partly attributable to the recent behaviour of the soviet government whose attitude toward a summit conference has been considerably less accommodating than we might have expected of a few months ago, but I would need greater argument than the mere say so of the hon. Leader of the Opposition in order to agree with him that a summit conference should be constituted of only two powers. We believe that the United Kingdom and the commonwealth have the right to representation in any such discussion. We in Canada as a member of that commonwealth have a right to the expression of our views by our own selves rather than through a representative of the United States, and that is no criticism of the United States.

The diplomatic position of the west has been strengthened by the reluctance of the soviet authorities to join with other nations concerned in technical studies designed to eliminate the possibility of a surprise attack across the Arctic areas. There have also been signs in the last few days of the renewed difficulties that the U.S.S.R. is sustaining as a result of its external relations, particularly with Yugoslavia. I think the coalition of western powers as a result of the meeting in December and again in the last few days in the meeting in Copenhagen has emerged with a stronger sense of direction and purpose from what was admittedly a difficult time and that the examination of western policy that has taken place has brought about a unity that had been greatly weakened in the fall of 1957.

Ever since the birth of NATO it has been a Canadian objective to make this organization into more than just a military coalition. While it is reasonable prudence to prepare to meet a possible military threat, the economic and political dangers to western institutions and ways of life are just as urgent and much more difficult to combat. Because of our realization that the contest between the soviet and western systems has already been joined on political and economic grounds, all of us will be pleased with the increased willingness shown on the part of the NATO partners at these recent meetings to consider co-operation in the economic sphere.

My hon. friend says that is something we should effect. I would point out that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith) has stressed that over and over again and the Leader of the Opposition took a similar stand in the days when he occupied that position but in the past there has not existed that co-operative spirit that would