

Inquiries of the Ministry

form of a white paper will have been debated in this house.

Mr. Lewis: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Considering the Prime Minister's statement, can the house expect that a white paper on foreign policy will be presented to parliament before the summer recess in sufficient time for parliament to discuss it? Further, would the Prime Minister give a little consideration to the protest I made earlier, and rise tomorrow and table the statement which he made on April 3?

Mr. Trudeau: Regarding the final part, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member of the New Democratic Party raised a point of privilege which he knew perfectly well to be out of order in its form—

An hon. Member: Oh, come on!

Mr. Trudeau: —and he was accusing me of disregard for parliament when he himself was raising a point of privilege which he knew was out of order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for York South rising on a point of order or a question of privilege?

Mr. Lewis: I rise on a point of order. I do not think it is up to the Prime Minister any more than it is up to any other member of the house to impute motives to another hon. member. I was astonished at the failure of the Prime Minister to table the statement, and I was perfectly in order to raise the point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Abitibi wish to put a supplementary question?

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): No, Mr. Speaker; it is really a related question.

[*English*]

Hon. J. A. Maclean (Malpeque): I wish to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Arising from the Prime Minister's statement on defence policy, in which he said that the highest priority was the defence of Canadian sovereignty would he explain the difference, if any, between this and the policy stated in the 1964 paper, except that he used the phrase "protection of our sovereignty" rather than "protection of our territory"? Is there any special significance to this slight change in terminology?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I understand this is the kind of question we will be debating in the house when the days are allotted for debate.

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a further quick supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Was the chairman of the committee on External Affairs and Defence revealing the outcome of phase II of the government study when he predicted that Canadian defence forces might be cut by 50 per cent?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that the question as asked is not in order.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to get any answers with respect to this Janus faced policy, if it be a policy, but I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the ministers representing the Canadian government in Washington had authority to suggest that in the phasing out only a token force of Canadian infantry would be left in Europe, and in so far as the air corps is concerned it would be restricted to reconnaissance and would have no nuclear attributes?

Mr. Trudeau: I do not believe any such statement was made by the ministers in Washington, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is not the question I asked. The Prime Minister seems to have a lot of difficulty understanding a simple question. Did the ministers, or any minister, have the authority to make that statement? That is how simple it is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver East.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the right hon. gentleman rising on a point of order?

Mr. Diefenbaker: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, are we in this house to be treated like children by the government on a matter that concerns the survival of the country, with the government playing with the people of Canada, and no answers forthcoming from it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver East.