

join, and most of the reasons expressed by commentators for and against membership have remained the same:

For

- a. Canada is part of the hemisphere and ought to assume her hemispheric responsibilities.
- b. Membership would increase trade opportunities.
- c. Membership would expose Canadians to a new societies and vice-versa, as well as enhance Canadian prestige in that area.
- d. Canada ought to contribute to the social evolution in Latin America.

Against

- a. Canada is already committed to the UN, the Commonwealth, and to NATO and would not be able to undertake increased responsibilities at this time.
- b. Canada would find itself being damned if it did or damned if it didn't support one side or the other in disputes arising between Latin American countries and the U.S.
- c. Canada already has ties with Latin America and has established its image there as a responsible nation.
- d. Canadians know little about the area.

There have been consistent advocates for and against membership during the decade. Time was noted for its advocacy during the period 1957-62. Since that year there has been a notable decrease in mention of Latin America in the Canadian section, which reflected, perhaps, the repatriation of the editorial staff from New York to Montreal. Charles Lynch has been an ardent advocate of membership and this seems to reflect his early exposure to the area in the late '40s. André Laurendeau was an advocate of membership, but had second thoughts as a result for the Dominican crisis. W. Arthur Irwin, on his retirement as Canada's ambassador to Mexico, became an ardent spokesman too. Dr. Marcel Roussin, author of