

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

exception of the fact that today representatives of the U.S.S.R., the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries in the free world are at least talking things over together, there has been no act in recent weeks which would indicate any major amelioration of the attitude of the cold war which has prevailed. Indeed, as I came back to Canada I began to realize the great danger today to the Asian countries and finally to us in this economic offensive launched against Canada and the United States. Because the defences of the free world have been maintained the only way in which freedom can be undermined is through the economic influences, detrimental as they may be, that may be launched on the part not only of the U.S.S.R. but also of communist China. Indeed, it is very striking in this regard that in connection with cottons—and I digress merely for a moment in this—which the British, and the United States, can supply at \$1, in the various parts of Asia they are being supplied at 60 cents by Japan and at approximately 33 cents or 34 cents by communist China. In other words, there is an offensive in trade that is bound to be one of the most challenging dangers of the days ahead.

It is because of that, if we in Canada are to meet it, dependent as we are so greatly on trade, that every consideration must be given to the end that the expanding trade of the past shall be continued. One of my prides in the administration springs from the fact that in spite of the tremendous competition in 1957, particularly in wheat and the like, Canada exported more wheat than in the previous year and greater than the average at any time in the preceding five years.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, at the time of adjournment I had just commenced to refer to one or two general matters and I intend to continue on that course for a few moments. Then, at the end of that time, I shall meet certain phases of the arguments advanced this afternoon by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

I was somewhat surprised at the jocular manner in which he dealt with Canadian-United States relations, an attitude of jocularity which I did not regard as in keeping with the responsibilities which he had discharged for so long as Secretary of State for External Affairs and also as ambassador to the United States. He indicated that there

was little change in the relationship between Canada and the United States. I would point out that when he referred to some of the economic acts of the United States during the last year and a half, he might have referred also to a series of acts throughout the years on the part of the United States in respect of which it was quite clear, and I have the evidence here, that the then government of this country raised little or no objection. Indeed, on two occasions protests were made, and while this afternoon he exhibited shocked surprise that there had not been any reply to one or two of these casual objections raised by the United States, I might say that I well remember the Right Hon. C. D. Howe saying on occasion, we sent them a couple of notes but we did not get any reply; we did not expect any.

So far as our relations with the United States are concerned, there has been something in the nature of a change in that regard. As a matter of fact, the visit of the members of the Canadian parliament to the United States congress was one of the most successful pilgrimages on behalf of our common dedication between these countries that has ever taken place. In that connection, I should like to refer to the *Financial Post* of January 17, the heading on which is, "Canada gains Congress Ear". I quote:

A major improvement in Canada-U.S. economic relations may have occurred with the agreement on a Canada-U.S. interparliamentary group.

This was the solid accomplishment of the Washington conference of nine Canadian senators and m.p.'s and congressional members of the new house and senate Canada subcommittees.

Then, there is another article in the same issue which reads:

A "Massive Demonstration" of U.S. Attention to Canada.

History was made in Washington with the visit of the nine Canadian parliamentarians to the U.S. capital.

Washington rolled out the reddest red carpet it has ever displayed for a visiting group of fellow legislators.

More fuss was made over the Canadians than over any group of visiting firemen in decades.

They got almost as much attention as did Queen Elizabeth or Anastas Mikoyan on their Washington stopovers.

Rather than being met by words of ridicule, I would have thought we would be met with words of appreciation of the fact that, while we have our differences, those differences are not insoluble; that each of us owes it to our respective countries to ensure that the stand of our respective countries be made known.

As a matter of fact, my hon. friend made a speech in the United States in November, and when he speaks of harsh words I must say that some of the words he used on that