

Supply—External Affairs

taking a firm stand, even although the minister seems to be hedgehopping at times and according to reports in the newspapers, it would seem as though he was inclined over to this side. One writer even said the minister implied that the time was going to come when public opinion would force the government into that position. Whether that report is right I am not sure. But, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the minister himself should not assume, as I have said before, that the Canadian people are in favour of this, because I believe that the great mass of the Canadian people are still opposed to the recognition of Red China and its taking a seat in the United Nations until it has demonstrated the fact that it is a peace-loving nation, and apparently events in the last days have not indicated that in the least.

What is Canada's foreign policy? I wish the minister would make a clear-cut statement setting out the basic principles outlining our policies. Let me ask this question. Is the minister completely in favour of the national sovereignty of Canada or is he inclined to neutralism? I ask that question because certain statements that have been made recently cause me to wonder. Here is one from the *Ottawa Citizen* of July 11, 1956:

Pearson Decries Atlantic Union

The second paragraph reads:

"The 15 member countries of NATO are much impressed with the need for greater non-military co-operation," Mr. Pearson remarked, "but, as a matter of personal politics, establishment of an Atlantic union—a centralized sovereign federalized state is just not feasible at this time."

In the magazine *Freedom and Union* for July and August, 1956, there is an account of the minister's address to the English-speaking union in London on April 30, in which the minister said:

Security, peace and ordered progress call for action on a wider basis than that of the national community. This does not mean, however, that we should move at once into world government or some form of Atlantic union or broad political federation with a central legislature and executive, a common citizenship, currency, and budget, a single foreign policy and defence establishment under central control; in short, with all the institutions of a federal state.

Those who advocate such schemes of federation do so from the highest of motives. They perform, I think, a good and useful service in preparing public opinion for the political changes which will undoubtedly be called for in the future to promote international co-operation.

In the first statement, he said, we do not believe in moving immediately into world government. What do the world government people want? I am reading from the *Ottawa Citizen* of June 13, 1956:

World federalists of Canada urged external affairs department officials during the weekend to consider proposed amendments to the United Nations

[Mr. Patterson.]

charter that would make the United Nations a world government of limited power.

The federalists, who held their meeting here Saturday, suggested Canada should "at the appropriate time" support a conference to review the United Nations charter and then put forward amendments that would give the world organization power to control arms and prevent war.

Now, I ask the minister, Mr. Chairman, is he in favour of world government, or is he in favour of the sovereign rights of individual nations? We are reading a great deal about the self-determination, and so on, of peoples, and yet on the one hand we have been crying loudly for the self-determination of peoples, the right to make their choice, and on the other hand the same people want to have a world government that will dictate policies to the entire world. Where are we going?

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I should like to present some of the policies which I believe are essential and which should be adopted and followed by this government: First, industrial rivalry is one of the greatest single factors leading to international conflict; therefore, there must be the establishment of sound trade policies designed to accomplish the mutually satisfactory exchange of goods between nations. Second, self-determination of peoples; third, the maintenance and strengthening of Canada's place in the British commonwealth; fourth, the retention of Canada's sovereign authority to govern her affairs in accordance with the will of the Canadian people; fifth, active participation in plans of assistance designed to promote the welfare of all peoples of the world; sixth, co-operation in zonal pacts where such arrangements are considered desirable and necessary for the safety of the free world.

Mr. Boisvert: Mr. Chairman, my first words will be to thank very much the hon. member for Prince Albert for the reference he made today to my humble person in connection with the committee on external affairs. What he said was very pleasant, but I think his remarks should be directed to every member of the committee, because of the wonderful co-operation they granted me in carrying on the business of this very important committee.

Today, I do not intend to dwell on what I shall call the headaches of our world. Of course, everybody knows that the world has those headaches, and we have indications of it today in Algeria, in the Middle East and in Asia. I think the ground was well covered by the previous speaker in this debate. We, of course, should remember that in the past we have gone through some ordeals in Korea, in Morocco and in Tunisia and those problems were solved to the satisfaction of the whole world with the co-operation of the United Nations. Therefore,