

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

become "the cutting edge of the left—very active, outspoken and moral." The report adds:

Canada can be expected to take a similar, though not necessarily identical, approach to such problems in the future, he said.

And a little later:

Mr. Head said Mr. Trudeau met the Swedish prime minister in Austria last winter and was keenly interested in learning more about Sweden's activist foreign policy.

● (1500)

Mr. Head did say there was a leftist turn. Indeed, the day before he spoke to the Canadian Press reporter there was a dispatch from the United Nations under the heading "MacEachen to initiate shift in foreign policy". This is an article by Duart Farquharson in which we find the following:

External affairs minister Allan MacEachen believes a renewed era of tough U.S. bargaining with Canada may have already begun—

In the same article, the following is stated:

Canada's image abroad, so far as it is reflected in the personal characteristics of its new spokesman to the world, is also in for a change.

They infer that from his transfer from House leader to minister of foreign affairs, because apparently he cannot be pushed around by "Heads". The article continues:

Turning to Canada's relations with the rest of the world, the external affairs minister confirmed in broad terms a recent report out of the prime minister's office that the Trudeau-MacEachen foreign policy will be to seek a strong, new active role on the left wing of international affairs.

That is a report from New York of what the minister said. But the Prime Minister says that Mr. Head never said the same thing. When Mr. Head gets a full head of steam, one never knows what he will say when it comes to leftist ideas. I am not satisfied with the position in which this very reliable young reporter has been placed. He is in the position of having it look like he had written something that was fiction. What is the foreign policy of this country with reference to leftist turns? Why should we not know that? Is this a radical departure from current policy which has never received the support of public opinion, which has never been discussed nationally and which has never been dealt with in this place, where foreign policy views should be accepted?

Because there is so much approval of the committee system, I make the suggestion that the foreign affairs committee be called together—and I should like to be a member of it, if I might be chosen for this purpose—so that Mr. Head can be given the opportunity to state what he has said, rather than hearing these alibis for his statements. What did he say, and where are we going? Is Canada taking a turn to the left? Does all this result from what the Prime Minister of Canada said when in Russia speaking to Sacha Kosygin, that we in Canada fear the United States economically—and we do—that we fear the United States culturally—and we do—and that we even fear the United States militarily? Is it any wonder that our relations with the United States today are at their lowest ebb?

It has now been revealed that the CIA has been upsetting governments, undermining governments and giving bonuses to those it has been helping. This is something I

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

have said on other occasions since 1963 when the Liberal party was the beneficiary of the antagonism of the government of President Kennedy, when the president's chief lieutenant in relation to polls and the like, Mr. Harris, came to Toronto with a certain group, following which the Liberal Party found itself with endless funds during the last two weeks of the campaign. I could not understand that. There was also the interference which took place when General Norstad was sent here to say what Canada should do.

In addition, there were schools for pressmen, held by the United States Embassy, to give them the basis upon which to attack the government which I had the honour to lead. Why? Because we took the position that as the danger of air attack on America from the north no longer existed, there was no reason that we should extend the nuclear family. The United States itself had determined that in fact there was an end to the danger of attack from the north. We were reviled for that. The Liberal party turned a complete somersault following the visit of a former prime minister to New York. After his return in the month of January, he said in Scarborough that Canada should accept nuclear weapons. I would like this whole matter looked into.

We noticed the other day that the CIA revelations are not to cover the period 1959 to 1964. I should like to have some of these CIA individuals on the witness-stand before our foreign relations committee, so that they might have the opportunity of explaining whether Canada was one of the nations that received treatment similar to other nations in North America as a result of the unjustifiable and unnatural actions of the CIA. For this and other reasons I should like an opportunity to be provided for a discussion of foreign affairs in this House. Until we have had that opportunity of discussion, let Mr. Head keep his mouth shut, and those connected with external affairs not push Canada into a leftist position.

Where are we going? The minister was in New York the other day and he suggested that Mr. Moroz, a patriot who has committed no offence, like hundreds of thousands of others in the U.S.S.R. who have been put into mental hospitals and the like, is getting along fine and is enjoying good health. What manner of nonsense is it, that Canada does not speak out in the United Nations calling upon the U.S.S.R. to uphold the principles of the United Nations charter which provide for the right of self-determination and which deny those things contrary to every concept of democratic government? Why has Canada not spoken out? Why the silence, as well, regarding the three Baltic countries and the Ukraine? Why does Canada not speak out, instead of taking this attitude of saying nice things to the U.S.S.R.? Why does Canada not get down to asking that immortal question: How is Moroz getting along, and is his health good?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Mr. Speaker, I follow the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) with mixed feelings. He is certainly eloquent and humorous. He can fill the galleries, but I noticed that many did not stay for his entire speech. Nevertheless, he is always in the right place at the right time.