

*External Affairs*

against our friends in the United Kingdom; that we were anxious to carry on in an unduly friendly way with the United States; that the integrity and unity of the commonwealth was injuriously involved, as a result of our interventions at the assembly of the United Nations.

I think the secretary of state indicated clearly this morning that what we had done, instead of in any way destroying the unity of the commonwealth, had greatly contributed to its strength, to its unity and to the opportunity afforded to be a continuing and useful instrument for the preservation of peace among the nations of the world. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs said, that attitude was shared by the Asian members, representing as they do a most important section of the commonwealth.

It is interesting to note that the quotations referred to this morning by the Secretary of State for External Affairs were not from people in Canada or Asia, but for the most part they were from journals or publications in the United Kingdom. The course we have taken has been the course of an independent sovereign nation within the commonwealth of nations, not one that was calculated to destroy our unity. It is a course which events have proved has made the commonwealth as unified and as strong as before.

Then again, does it contribute to peaceful relations to suggest that our understanding of the attitude of the United States is not to be pursued by Canada when we agree with certain policies of the United States? Because we have agreed on a number of occasions with the United States in some recent matters does not mean, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs said, that we have agreed with them on all matters. The strength of Canada's current contribution internationally is that most nations recognize that we are close to the United Kingdom and to other members of the commonwealth, and also that as a North American state we understand the meaning and implications of our relations with the United States. On account of this background and by these affiliations nations have come to know that we are capable of asserting our own judgment honestly, as we in this country, in this government and in this parliament do in an objective and unselfish manner. That is the strength of foreign policy in Canada today, at the United Nations and elsewhere.

To sit in my seat and have the Leader of the Opposition give the impression that the Secretary of State for External Affairs had to rise and record his own achievements is something that I cannot let pass by. I want

[Mr. Martin.]

to say that as one who has followed international affairs for some years long before I came into this house; as one who has had something to do with recent events as a member of the government, I would have thought that because of the role my colleague has played this would have been an occasion for the Leader of the Opposition to join with the hon. member for Peace River, the hon. member for Winnipeg North and other hon. members and to have said that this was the kind of question on which we could be united, thus giving expression to the common denominator that prevails in Canadian thinking at this time.

If my hon. friend, who now understandably smiles, will really reflect on what I have said, he will find that the kind of speech he made this morning is so out of touch with Canadian public opinion at the present time that at the earliest moment he will want to revamp his thinking and his ideas.

**Mr. McIvor:** May I ask the minister a question. The mail we get from the United States at this time is marked "Pray for Peace".

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Applewhaite):** Order. The hon. member for Fort William indicated that he wished to ask a question. I think he should ask his question.

**Mr. McIvor:** Is the government of Canada considering doing anything like that in connection with our mail?

**Mr. Martin:** I will see that it is brought to the attention of my colleague the Postmaster General.

**Mr. Howard C. Green (Vancouver-Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a speech which shows more clearly than anything we have ever heard before in this chamber the God complex which has settled upon the minds of the supermen in the Canadian cabinet. The attitude of the government toward the questions which have arisen in the Near East has been expressed by the two ministers to the United Nations. Of course they have had great experience in making long speeches designed to make the people of one nation think one thing and those of another nation think another, speeches which along with many others made in the United Nations sometimes result in resolutions which nobody can understand. These resolutions have been interpreted in different ways by the different countries involved. One good example is the resolution of February 2 which is now being interpreted in one way by the Israelis, in another way by the Egyptians, in another way by the Americans, and possibly in another way by the Canadians and so on.