

External Affairs

In the United States, if press reports are correct, they have gone so far as to remove from the President the power and authority to make the declaration that this is indeed war. They have appointed General Chidlaw as air defence commander with headquarters near Denver. He has his fingers on all these radar warning screens in the north. He has the power to say "I declare a military emergency" and take immediate steps to defend the country.

I say again that no one wants to pierce the curtain of security. But that curtain of security should not be simply a means whereby the Canadian people are lulled into a sense of false security. Let the Prime Minister speak with that authority, as I said the other day, which his position gives in matters such as this and of such importance to the preservation of mankind.

When I hear people in this country casting slurs and sneers at the United States I wonder whether they have any realization of the world of today. Our relationships have not always been of the best. There have been disagreements; agreement in objective but disagreement in means, just as we sometimes find it difficult, separated by 18 feet of green carpet, to agree here.

With that same objective in mind it is interesting to go back to something which I came across the other day. Ordinarily I do not put quotations on *Hansard*, but this particular item does indicate the changes that have taken place in North America. In 1880 the New York *Herald* was conducting a campaign for the annexation of Canada to the United States for purely defensive reasons, and they said this:

The Canadian keeps 43,365 men armed to the teeth; he has much garrison and field artillery of the most destructive kind; his multitudinous cavalry horses say ha! ha! to the trumpets;—

They had cavalry horses then too.

—he calls up 14,000 new heroes every year for drill and is altogether a perilous enemy.

Those were the days when Canada had military service.

And at his back the British lion stands ready to roar most thunderously, supported by legions of regular troops, and capable of sending forth swarms of gunboats to shell the lake and river cities of the union, while his big men of war bombard New York, Boston and the cities of the Atlantic coast. The army of the union is small and scattered over the Indian territory—

Then it goes on to say:

Ogdensburg, Oswego, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago and a hundred smaller towns would endure bombardment, and perhaps be burned to the ground, before the Americans could make any defences worth talking about. . . . The United States should strongly fortify the St. Lawrence frontier of New York and be ready to lay down the ruinous torpedo at a moment's notice.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

That quotation from 1880, within the lifetime of many Canadians, represents an attitude of mind which time, common understanding, and a dedication to the principles of freedom have obliterated.

We have mutual devotion and trust. We are bound together in economic and military co-operation.

Those who speak loosely in what the minister described as unjust criticism, who always picture the United States as an aggressor, make no contribution today to the building of that unity without which there can be no survival. Here we are, side by side, common heirs of Westminster Hall and Independence Hall, with a common dedication to a liberty which Lincoln described as "Liberty not alone for the people of this country but hope to all the world for all future time".

If ever there was a time when we require a co-operative attitude it is now. I refer to a co-operative attitude wherein, while disagreeing, we can make clear, as the minister said Mr. Dulles made clear to him in personal conversation, our common objectives; wherein we can voice to friends our just criticism and in that way build a unity and develop a co-operative defence basis without which there can be no survival.

The nations in this partnership must retain absolutely their respective sovereignties over their own areas to join with the British commonwealth in singleness of purpose, strength and steadfastness. For without that dedication, freedom indeed may perish from the earth.

I sometimes think the major reason for the invidious attacks that are made on the United States by certain people is that the United States represents the greatest example of free enterprise which exists anywhere in the world.

Now I come to another part of the minister's speech. I should like to say a few words about it. That speech in Toronto should have been delivered in the House of Commons on the question of trade a long while ago. We on this side of the house have repeatedly pointed out that the attitude of the United States in raising quotas and limiting imports is not in keeping with our world responsibilities. On more than one occasion we indicated that interfering with our agricultural production machine in this country by the scheme of quota imposition was a denial of that spirit of co-operation which is necessary to the preservation of freedom.

The minister in that speech made blunt and unequivocal objections to the restrictions being imposed, but it is strange that strong terms were not used when agriculture was affected.