

*Lack of Debate on Foreign Affairs*

by Cuba, and certainly arms, have been coming to the revolutionaries.

It is all very well for people to sit around in armchairs and speculate about the benefits of selecting your own form of government, choosing a government by ballot, and all the rest of it that we take for granted in this country—perhaps a little bit too much so. But I think a great many of us make this mistake. Those who are ever willing to be armchair critics in these matters are accustomed to our form of democracy and we do not realize that our brand of democracy just does not work in other places, and cannot work. We have had ample evidence of that ever since World War II. I think the do-gooders of this country—and I mean genuine do-gooders—who would like to see our way of life spread throughout the world soon find out that it does not work in other countries where you have people with different backgrounds, and so on.

Then there is subversion, or war in its modern way, which comes by infiltration. When there is subversion in a country, it is no use sitting around and talking; you have to decide what you are going to do about it. This is the first thing the other people involved do—that is, the Communists. They have always followed the policy that a well organized minority could easily take over a highly disorganized majority, and they get in there and become entrenched.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that if the government of the United States had not moved in the Dominican crisis, we probably would have had another Cuban-type government there now. This would, of course, only encourage things in other places in the Caribbean and perhaps further to the south. There has been plenty of evidence presented in the press by reliable commentators to take up that position. I think that for this reason the Government should make clear whether it approves of the policies of the United States in the Dominican Republic, or whether it does not? We are entitled to know the answer.

The matter which I think is perhaps of the greatest concern to the people of Canada is the image of Canada in the United States at the present time. I can recall the elections of 1962 and 1963 when it was alleged by those who now occupy the seats to your right, Mr. Speaker, on the Government side of the House, that things were very bad between Canada and her neighbour when the Conservative Party formed the Government.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

I do not agree, and never have agreed, with those allegations; but certainly those who made them at that time are hardly in a very comfortable position just now, because the image of Canada in the United States is anything but very good. I say, first, that there have been a number of small incidents that have built up this image during the term of office of this Government. First of all, of course, there were the economic policies of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon); but that is not an appropriate subject for this particular moment. They have been dealt with extensively in this House, however, and in the press. They did not really help matters, to start with. Then there has been a series of other events. As I have mentioned, there was that very unfortunate event that took place in Philadelphia concerning the Prime Minister's statement of views with regard to South Viet Nam. I would not say I would disagree with the views that the right hon. Prime Minister did set out at Temple University. I am inclined to agree that the idea may well have been a very good one, but it was an unfortunate place, perhaps, to have made the remarks. I would suggest that had the President of the United States made a speech at the University of Toronto concerning how Canada should solve the difficulties between Quebec and some other Governments in Canada, this would not have been taken very kindly here, either. I am sure the subject of South Viet Nam is just as sensitive in the United States as is biculturalism in Canada. While we might welcome the views of our very close friends and neighbours, we would not welcome them publicly, and particularly in our own back yard. I am sure the Prime Minister's motivations were the best in this case, but I think the choice of location for making them was certainly unfortunate. In any event, the American press seems to think so and, as I say, this has created a very bad impression.

Whether or not there have been quarrels between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada seems to me to be a matter of dispute. As I understand it, the Prime Minister says there was an argument between himself and the President of the United States, but when they parted company they did so as good friends and the argument had been settled. That may be so, and I am quite prepared to accept the Prime Minister's word in that regard, as I think all of us are. But the fact of the matter remains, that regardless of what took place at the