

In a sense I suppose that makes him my opposite number. I know that he will not spare the government or me when he thinks we have done the wrong thing, or left undone the right thing. But I know also that he will find his work the more satisfying, as I do, because on the fundamental objectives of our foreign policy, as opposed to details and methods, there is a great and fortunate degree of unity on all sides of the house.

I propose today--and I am afraid even though I shall take probably longer than I should, I shall leave many subjects untouched--to make a general and, I fear, a somewhat discursive survey of international affairs. Some subjects I shall not attempt even to touch, because they will be dealt with, at least some of them, at a later time by my friend and colleague whom I am so happy to have as my Parliamentary Assistant, the hon. member for Chambly-Rouville (Mr. Pinard).

For instance, he will refer to the recent Assembly of the United Nations at which, for most of the time, if I may say so, the Canadian Delegation was led with such distinction and efficiency by the Postmaster General (Mr. Cote).

The reduction of tension in Europe--and I am going to talk about European affairs first--which began a year ago, and which was mentioned in this House about that time, has been maintained. Nevertheless, the menace of Soviet imperialism remains and foreign and defence policies of our country and other countries of the free world must continue to be based on this fact. And I suppose we should also not forget that if there has been improvement--and I think there has been--it is largely due to the increased strength and unity of the free world, especially within the Atlantic alliance.

In Europe two developments have occurred since I spoke last in the House on international affairs, which I think deserve special attention. In the first place there has been a change, whatever it may portend, in the attitude and in the tactics, if not in the foreign policy, of the Soviet Union since the death of Joseph Stalin. There has been some indication in the past year of a trend away from the sterile rigidity of Stalinist policies both in domestic and in foreign affairs.

Among the more interesting Soviet internal developments have been the new emphasis on collective leadership in Moscow as opposed to personal dictatorship, and the modification of Stalin's denationalizing policy as applied to the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union. And there has been a greater stressing, I think, in their governments of practical considerations, of technical efficiency, rather than of Marxist orthodoxy. However, the outstanding domestic development in the Soviet Union during this period has been in economic policy, where a programme of increased production of consumer goods has been given such wide publicity that the failure of the regime to carry out its promises in this respect would, I think, cause very great disappointment among the people, and possibly even some unrest.

Agriculture in Russia has received particular attention, with an apparent reliance on greater money