

## Interim Supply

securing information from any official Canadian source and we might have to cut off all their sources of security information. Perhaps that will not accomplish what we have in mind because the United States executive, as we all know, has some difficulty in controlling the United States congress. But that is something we can do and I hope my hon. friend will agree it is something we should do in these circumstances.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** My hon. friend said that we did not give him any assistance. We demanded for several days that a protest be made—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** —but the government was silent. The Prime Minister said that there was no intention to make a protest.

**An hon. Member:** Oh, no.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** We took a strong stand in that regard to ensure that Canadian rights would be preserved and maintained. But let me say this: The minister's explanation is one of the quaintest I have ever heard. The minister says that there has been no leakage of confidential information passed to the security corps of the United States.

**Mr. Pearson:** In this matter.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Does the minister say that in other matters there has been?

**Mr. Pearson:** We are not talking about other matters.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The minister now retreats from his previous stand.

**An hon. Member:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The suggestion he has just made is a dangerous and serious one. He has either spoken too much or too little. He cannot hide in that way from his responsibility. When the minister spoke on April 10 he endeavoured to leave the impression that what evidence had been taken by the United States committee had been obtained as the result of information passed by Canada and then subject to leakage.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Chairman, that is quite contrary to my statement. If my hon. friend will read it—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I will read it. I ask my friend to look at page 3358 of *Hansard* and read what he said. At that time he said:

Nevertheless, this experience has emphasized that we should now take steps to ensure that information received from us on these matters could not possibly be used for wrong purposes against Canadians in the future.

**Mr. Martin:** What is wrong with that?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The only meaning of that is that it was done.

**Mr. McCann:** No.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Otherwise it is just one of those smoke-screens raised in order to explain an untenable position.

**Mr. Stick:** Smokescreen yourself.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The minister asks what suggestions we made. We pressed over and over again for a protest, but we say what justification is there to penalize a favourable government, a friendly government, a great government like that of the United States—

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** —for something that they or none of them have done unless the minister in his last answer revealed something? I challenge him to say now, in order to clear up what he meant a few moments ago, that the United States government or any branch of that government, congressional committee or otherwise, at no time in the past used Canadian confidential information to the detriment of Canadians. A moment ago the minister took refuge behind a statement which I give him an opportunity to clear up. I say to him again he has either said too much or he has said too little.

**Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo):** Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to deal with an international question, but one which I think is perhaps of more importance than the one that has been generating so much heat for the last few minutes, both on the government benches and in the official opposition. I am basing my remarks on one of the estimates we are considering, item No. 52, a grant for research and investigation on atomic energy. I am interested to note, in fact I am very pleased to note, that this is one of the items that has been selected for particular treatment in that we are being asked to vote now what will finally be eleven-twelfths of the total annual vote. I think it is a very necessary thing.

I would however, point out that all our care, all our research may fall to the ground unless the government of Canada is prepared to assume a rather more responsible attitude than it has in the past with regard to the situation which is causing very great concern to those who should know. I wish to quote from a report from London which appeared on April 5 in the *Ottawa Journal*.