

Supply—External Affairs

launched aimlessly, but I still say that in the time in which we live, it might be a role better suited to our position and to our thinking. We could fulfill the duties of good samaritans to the world, thus winning the trust of the people who today are quite concerned about what is happening in the world and wonder whether it is not the beginning of the end of time. In fact, it is a natural and instinctive reaction to feel terrified at the thought of the destructive power of nuclear weapons which goes beyond the wildest imagination.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I am in favour of a revision of our policies and when I say that I have the impression, that the conscience of the Secretary of State for External Affairs is somewhat moved, because we know him, in this house and in the country, as a man of peace, who may not have in his hands at the present time everything which is necessary to revolutionize drastically and quickly the thinking of Canada but who, in the long run, might consider a re-examination of our habits in the sense which I mentioned earlier.

For the time being, Mr. Chairman, I think that any non-partisan and objective person who sincerely wishes a settlement of that unfortunate conflict, will recognize that the hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs in his statement this evening which in fact is only a repetition of at least two or three other statements made here or at the United Nations, has taken a stand which seems to me realistic, responsible, rational, frank and courageous, under the circumstances, and which in my opinion, will be perfect if, during the next five or ten years, we would not only rethink our military effort, but also redirect it, as a good samaritan would, so that our efforts for peace be really effective.

[English]

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the house, but just prior to six o'clock I made a few brief remarks on these estimates. At that time I referred to that senior official of the Seafarers International Union in the United States, that criminal, that gangster, that fugitive from justice, Harold Chamberlain Banks. In all kindness I should like to ask the minister if he can report to the house whether he has had any favourable response to his protest to the Secretary of State of the United States. I should also like to ask him whether he will look into the suggestion I made at the request

of some other people, with regard to this incident.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I will do that, Mr. Chairman. We have asked the United States to reconsider the ruling, as my hon. friend knows. We have been advised that they are now examining the note we delivered last Thursday. I have not had an official reply.

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Chairman, on this discussion of the estimates of the Department of External Affairs I feel it would be unfortunate if I should let go this opportunity to discuss the current Canadian position on Rhodesia. I know from recent statements that this government is prepared to support further restrictive sanctions against that *de facto* government, in spite of the very obvious failure of the existing policy to bring down the government of Mr. Ian Smith, to improve the conditions of the African majority of that land, to add at all to the peace, security and stability of that region of Africa, or to bring forth any thanks or commendation from the African nations in the rest of the continent. The policy is one guaranteed to fail and one that we can criticize on a variety of grounds. Mr. John Sparrow, writing in the *Sunday Times* of London referred to Jonathan Swift and gave an example of what he would say were he alive today and viewing the Rhodesian situation. John Sparrow says:

It is plain, too, on which side his feelings would lie in Rhodesia: the attacks he launched in "The Drapier's Letters" upon a government who, by oppressing the English ascendancy increased the miseries of the native Irish, would be deployed against a policy aimed at British settlers, only to intensify the hardships of the Africans—"Take care lest the severities you are so eager to inflict upon your kith and kin are not visited on the wretches whose well-being you profess to have at heart. No native in all the land will eat a crust of bread the more because you have taken away the cake from the table of his betters."

It seems to me that this is a very true comment on the situation in Rhodesia, and one which should give Canadians pause to think at a time when we make suggestions that this policy be intensified.

Then we could read from a statement by Elspeth Huxley when writing a letter from Africa entitled "Entering 1968". She is an author of considerable talent and ability, and one who knows the continent very thoroughly. She says this about the situation in Rhodesia:

● (9:30 p.m.)

The third major tragedy of 1967 has been a total failure to cut through the Rhodesian knot. If to