

Supply—External Affairs

at some time before this debate is concluded as to whether he feels that a constitutional amendment of this kind is one which would permit him to undertake and to carry out his responsibilities as one charged with conducting the external affairs of this country.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I am encouraged to take part in this debate for a few minutes because of the remarks the minister made about me this afternoon. I want also to correct an impression which may be getting abroad, contributed to by some of my colleagues who are looking at the minister as if he had adopted an avuncular attitude now to the House of Commons and to life in general. I have known him of old and I do not see this kindly, paternal attitude of the minister. I think he must be very careful or very soon he will be called "Uncle Paul" and "the old gentleman". I would prefer to see a firmer hand on our foreign affairs than is now being shown by the minister of external affairs.

I am worried about the impression he is going to create among his distinguished colleagues in other foreign countries when he uses in this house such undiplomatic language as he used this afternoon when I put before him a serious question on the policy of this country. He talked about this being a shoddy and a parochial question. He imputed a motive to me by saying I was pursuing the question as a political hobby and indicated that I was inefficient and amateurish in the performance of my duty. That is undiplomatic language in any country. I thought I would admonish the minister tonight so that he will be a little more careful in the future.

Let me just say a few words about the situation in the Congo, and the Canadians who are there. There has been a bit of buffoonery with regard to the unexpected and generally unauthorized visit of the hon. member for Red Deer to the Congo as a government representative. Now that he has returned perhaps the minister will take the matter firmly in hand to see whether it can be straightened out. The people of concern are the Canadians there, and if they were relatives of any one of us we would be deeply disturbed about their fate.

What I should like to know, quite seriously, is what the minister is doing about appointing an official and competent representative of Canada to solve this situation. I think two things are essential. The first is an attempt, as has been made, to get in touch with the rebels who are endangering the lives of our

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Canadians there. The second thing is for someone of competence and knowledge to make contact with the government of the Congo, and be on hand if possible when the relieving force now approaching Stanleyville is successful. The minister has not told us about that. Has he any information as to whether Stanleyville is under attack at the present time, whether these hostages have been released or, if they need assistance, what assistance will be given by the Canadian government?

This is a serious matter, but all we have witnessed is the fiasco of sending, without public notice until we discovered it, the hon. member for Red Deer to conduct negotiations. What is going on now with regard to the Canadians who are endangered in the Congo? I should like to see a serious approach to these matters adopted by the minister.

The other thing I want to refer to is related to the question I posed to the minister this afternoon, and it irritated him a bit. He showed that irascible side of his nature of which I have been aware for 14 years. His mask fell off and the real member appeared, rather than the glorified minister who moves with the slow steady steps of a mandarin of the old school.

I should like to know about the commitment that this government has made to negotiate out of the nuclear weapons field. There is a tinge of hypocrisy to these bland statements which are made to other countries of the world, such as: Do not accept nuclear arms because it is a bad thing to do; do not do as we do, do as we say. Canada has nuclear weapons, but of course we do not produce them; therefore we are not a member of the nuclear club. This seems to me to be very close to hypocrisy.

I should like to refer again to the famous speech made by the minister on May 22. I have read it again, for the third time, but I hope I will not have to refer to it again. The minister places reliance on his speech of May 22, and when questions are asked of him he invariably suggests that we can find all the answers in that speech. The repetitious answer that one finds in that speech is: We are watching the situation closely. I have watched the situation very closely and I have again read this speech. I find that the minister has not answered the very important questions about Canada's position in relation to other nations of the world.

On May 22 the minister talked about the importance of disarmament and how someone should make a start in that direction, even if