

Mr. KNOWLES (*Winnipeg North Centre*): We can take it that you are prepared to follow through the implications of what you said the other day; if there is anything Canada can do to get the east and west talking to each other?

Mr. SMITH (*Hastings-Frontenac*): I am just alarmed personally and officially about what could be the terrible, tragic alternative if we both retreat to our corners—I am thinking of the U.S.S.R. bloc and the western bloc—and stop talking to one another,—distrusting one another. The alternative might well be a global, exterminating, war.

Mr. KUCHEREPA: Do you not think, Dr. Smith, that one of the primary reasons for the United Nations' existence is because it provides ground for mutual meetings.

Mr. SMITH (*Hastings-Frontenac*): I am not detracting from or derogating from the importance of the fundamental role that the United Nations plays but it does seem to me that a smaller group would get much further than one with the whole world looking at them.

Mr. KUCHEREPA: Do you think that a country like Canada could, through its representatives, achieve more than say the United Nations, by way of this committee of 25 which has been proposed for the discussion of disarmament? Do you think a country like Canada could do more in that sphere than the United Nations exerting its influence?

Mr. SMITH (*Hastings-Frontenac*): I wonder if the major forces would be inclined to say, and this is just a speculation; this is a summit conference, what are you butting into this realm for? This is just speculation.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Mr. Chairman, is there not something that Canada could do? For example, at the forthcoming NATO conference opening December 16, I think it is? It seems to me that one of the basic questions of the world is in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli dispute has gone on for many years. Also the question of refugees. These are all questions that must be settled or at least must be attacked. It seems to me that a middle rank nation like Canada, without prejudice to either side, so to speak, could raise the subject for discussion at the NATO conference to see if we could bring the parties together to discuss a solution, and to tackle these subjects one by one; the refugees, the cost burden, the Arab-Israeli problem, which is very difficult. You will recall that the former Minister of External Affairs, at the time of Suez, in his formula, suggested there were two parts; the formulation of UNEF and the sending of troops to patrol the area, which was brought about and the second part, which has not been touched, so far as I know, which is the calling together of the interested parties in an endeavour to reach a solution. My words might sound idealistic, but what is the alternative?

It seems to me that Canada could put these subjects on the agenda for discussion at the NATO conference, because obviously anything which disturbs the peace in the Middle East affects Canada—our security both politically and economically. I do not see why you, as our minister, could not formulate some activity along that line and bring it to the attention of the other powers, and at least that would carry out your own ideas of cooperation. This is one avenue of approach. We could at least put it up to the Russians and say: come on, let us discuss this problem, because if you don't, and I ask the question again—what is the alternative?

Mr. SMITH (*Hastings-Frontenac*): Israel is not a member of NATO.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: Israel has applied for associate membership.

Mr. SMITH (*Hastings-Frontenac*): In my short diplomatic career I have been surprised, if not astonished, that in the whole area, when you consider stresses and strains, this Israeli-Arab question is at the root of it.