

Interim Supply

government have been using their good offices in private; I have no doubt at all that all the arguments I have presented have been presented in private to the representatives of these two other governments. But I suggest there is need for something more than merely the private presentation of these views. There is need for a similar, blunt and unequivocal statement on the part of the Canadian government with regard to this sort of folly as the one made a few days ago by the Secretary of State for External Affairs on the tragic case that has just been discussed.

I would urge that the Canadian government take this seriously into consideration and realize that there may indeed be further tragic results for us in it because, while there is no possible gain to be made militarily from these tests, if the United States government and the British government could be persuaded to stop them then the government of the U.S.S.R. is going to be left in a very embarrassing and unfortunate position with regard to those peoples in the world who, like ourselves, are viewing these tests with dismay and anxiety; the people of the uncommitted areas of the world.

I suggest that the Canadian government could perform no more valuable service for the people of the world than for one of its spokesmen to speak up as bluntly and firmly as did Mr. Adlai Stevenson during the election campaign in the United States.

Mr. Macdonnell: Mr. Chairman, it is very unusual for me to intervene in a debate on external affairs, but this situation which we have been discussing this afternoon seems to me to have become so extraordinary that I feel constrained to do it. When the Secretary of State for External Affairs spoke the other day about the Norman incident I went along with him the whole way; I approved of everything he said. I repeat, I really went along with him the whole way; there was no questioning in my mind whatever. The first thing that raised questions in my mind was later in the day when I heard it suggested that there were people who thought they knew a good deal about the background and who had not accepted the minister's full exoneration of Mr. Norman.

The next thing that bothered me—and it bothered me a lot—was when the Minister of National Health and Welfare this morning, when asked by the Leader of the Opposition whether he could give a virtually certified statement that Mr. Norman was trusted through and through by the department—I have not the exact words but I think that is a clear summary of what he was asked. It seemed perfectly obvious to me that the

minister was embarrassed; that he could not feel he could offhand say any such thing.

Mr. Martin: May I correct that at once? I know my hon. friend is the kind of man who does not want to create wrong impressions on matters such as this. My hon. friend, if he had been the acting minister in a matter of this importance, I am sure would have taken the position that before answering a question with which he was not in day-to-day association would have replied that that is the kind of question that he would want to carefully consider before replying.

Mr. Macdonnell: I think that is a fair answer. On the other hand, having regard to the feelings that I had when I heard the Secretary of State for External Affairs say the other day that there was no question about it, that the United States committee was wholly wrong, that there was no justification for them to—

Mr. Pearson: So it was wholly wrong.

Mr. Macdonnell: I need not labour that; I am giving my feeling of disquiet. And, of course, it is added to by the fact that the minister has rushed back this afternoon to make another statement, which I am glad he has done.

I am going to do what not everyone will approve of; I am going to read some extracts from an article in the *Globe and Mail* because they have disturbed me. They come from a man whom I respect, although he has criticized me pretty severely. He writes seriously, and what he writes I think is entitled to an answer. For that reason I am going to put part of it on the record. It is an article of Mr. George Bain in the *Globe and Mail* this morning. The thing that has puzzled me—and the minister's statement this afternoon did not wholly answer it—and disturbed me is that apparently this real feeling—and I know it is a real one—that we must not disclose a lot of details connected with the man. I believe, if I read this correctly, it has created difficulty because of the fact that we did not, as I read this story, put the whole story on the record years ago. I read:

The Canadian government's protest to the United States yesterday, which won it headlines in most newspapers in Canada, was 90 per cent a sham. As External Affairs Minister Pearson himself conceded, the sort of security information which Canada threatened to cut off from the United States, was not the sort of information the senate internal security subcommittee had used against Mr. Norman anyway. Yesterday's note, and Mr. Pearson's tough little speech that went with it, were aimed almost entirely at domestic consumption. The aim was to make a show, not in the reasonable expectation of anything tangible resulting from it, but to make Canadians feel their government was taking stern steps to protect their interests.