

*Correspondence on Union Trusteeship*

documents should be produced. That and nothing else is the issue. What my hon. friend is now doing is to quote from statements made by the Prime Minister and others on the main question itself, this delicate and important question which faces the Canadian people. This part of the problem is not before the house, and any discussion of it is outside the provisions provided for in the procedure now open to us.

**Mr. Martineau:** On the point of order, and with due deference to the minister, I have not been quoting during the last few minutes from anything that was said. I was simply summarizing my own views as to why these documents should be produced, and one of the objections to their production was that public policy demanded they be not produced.

I have simply stated—and this is not a quotation from anyone; it is my own prose such as it may be—that in this case public policy, far from precluding production calls for production, because of the fact that statements made in the house have indicated there has been an exchange of views, correspondence and the rest, between the two governments, and also because it has been declared to be a strictly Canadian matter. If it is a strictly Canadian matter, we want to know why there has been interference, and the extent of the interference.

That is why we want the production of these papers. In summary, as I said before, we have had interference. We have had parts of these documents referred to publicly by those who made them in the United States. They issued statements to the press concerning their views on this matter, and we have had the Prime Minister and other ministers of the crown bring them into open debate in this house. Finally we have the claim of the Prime Minister that this is strictly a Canadian affair.

In view of this situation surely parliament is entitled to a full disclosure, and so far as diplomatic usage is concerned in all these documents or discussions of state between the state department and the Department of External Affairs, some of them have been exchanged through normal diplomatic channels, but others did not take that route and were exchanged directly between the labour officials of both governments, with a follow-up in the press when parts of the documents were sent for publication.

With regard to those parts of the documents that may be privileged or secret communications, naturally I do not want to rob them of their confidentiality; but even in this case the government should give the house an assurance that, because of the fact this is an exclusively Canadian affair, it will ask

permission from the United States government to file any part of the documents.

Concerning precedents, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of precedents where documents involving two countries have been tabled in the house. The government is continually tabling international air agreements between various countries. The latest I believe was in November, 1962, when an agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom concerning air traffic was tabled. Last session the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) submitted a motion to the house, which was accepted, for the tabling of correspondence with other countries concerning the drug thalidomide.

We had the precedent which took place this very afternoon when the Secretary of State for External Affairs requested the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) to table a copy of a letter from the officer in charge of Canadian affairs in the United States state department to a chamber of commerce, I believe in Montana.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** You will have to get a better precedent than that.

**Mr. Martineau:** I think that is a precedent which goes far beyond normal diplomatic usage, and certainly there was less justification for tabling such a letter than in seeking the tabling of documents which are required for a serious purpose on a vital matter.

**Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat):** Mr. Speaker, before the Secretary of State for External Affairs attempts to call me to order I would like to draw his attention to the fact that the quotations given by the hon. member for Pontiac-Temiscamingue (Mr. Martineau) are completely relevant to the debate. I say that for the reason that when there are press releases issued by officials of another government usually there has been privileged communication between that government and the country referred to.

Further there has been what the Prime Minister may have referred to as embarrassing statements. I am not too sure if he used that expression, but he certainly used some rather strong language about statements issued by secretary of labour Wirtz and other people in the United States respecting their attitude to the Canadian trusteeship bill and various other problems connected with the S.I.U. Therefore if the normal course has been followed, there has been communication between the United States government and the Canadian government prior to the press releases that were issued by officials of the United States government, and surely this is relevant to the argument that there must exist some related documents that could be produced.