

*External Affairs*

many grounds and the problems and difficulties have been legion. They relate primarily to the concern with which a number of countries regard the implications of such a force for their national sovereignty. Others have been reluctant to contemplate the financial burden which the support of a permanent force would entail. Still others have been dubious of the feasibility of creating a permanent force capable of meeting the various and unpredictable situations that could possibly arise. These are legitimate apprehensions and practical problems which may prove difficult to dispel and resolve completely.

It is my impression that although there was apparent a new note of concern in the approach of a large number of nations toward the concept of an armed stand-by peace force, awareness continues to grow amongst the United Nations membership, despite the opposition of the Soviet bloc, of the overriding need for machinery of some sort to permit quick and effective United Nations action to prevent the development of conditions which could result in armed conflict and the needless sacrifice of human lives. As I said, there seems to be developing in the general assembly a growing general awareness that the United Nations must be provided with instrumentalities for quick and collective action that would prevent the outbreak or the extension of hostilities.

Just think of the great variety of agencies for the preservation of peace that the United Nations has had under its supervision, ranging from armed units, with respect to which I have spoken proudly as far as Canada is concerned, right down through observer groups to the mere token presence of the United Nations evidenced by only one person. It does seem to me that in this age, when we are likely to have indirect aggression, that the United Nations may be called upon to a greater degree to make provision for procedures of investigation. The secretary general is continuing his study and I can assure the house that Canada will be interested in his study and his further recommendations when we have some clear idea of what they may be.

I know that the thirteenth session of the general assembly has been dubbed an unspectacular one but in that regard I make the observation that dramatic quality is not a criterion of success. It is also not the sole test of the success of a session of the general assembly to ask the question, how many final agreements were reached on any particular set of subjects at a particular time? I was not able to attend the session of the general assembly for longer than seven weeks but I did sense a spirit of compromise,

[Mr. Smith (Hastings-Frontenac).]

a seeking for solutions, a climate of reconciliation of conflicting interests. True, as I have already stated, no final agreement was reached with respect to disarmament. No final agreement was reached with respect to Cyprus but this is an example of what I had in mind when I said that dramatic quality is not the criterion of success.

Undoubtedly the reasonable discussions that took place in the thirteenth session of the assembly provided a climate—to use the word I invoked a moment ago—of compromise, that outside of the United Nations came to fruition. I am sure we all join in congratulating the statesmen of the United Kingdom, Turkey and Greece on the solution of that problem which was of special concern to the NATO allies. I have sent, as I know the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) has, congratulatory messages to the prime ministers and foreign ministers of these three countries, and it is our wish and our hope that the spirit of reconciliation will continue in that island which has been so unhappy.

Perhaps the most significant discussions at the thirteenth session of the assembly had to do with matters in the economic and social fields. There was manifested to an encouraging degree a willingness on the part of the industrially developed countries to assist in the development of the economic and social potential of their less developed fellow members. I think it is opportune for me to mention at this stage what Canada is seeking to do in the way of helping underdeveloped countries, particularly our partners in the commonwealth, to solve their problems of economic development.

The problem, of course, can be stated in very simple terms. It is astonishing, it is distressing to realize that close to three-quarters of the human race live in conditions where poverty, hunger, disease and illiteracy are endemic. Many of these countries have emerged recently from colonial status. They now have their political independence and they are seeking, quite properly, not selfishly but in terms of the development of their own countries, to bring the standards of living of their people closer to those of the industrially and technologically advanced countries. Translated into economic terms this means that these underdeveloped countries must invest enough of their resources year by year to reach the point where economic growth can begin to sustain itself. It can be done in either of two ways. It can be done by their investing their own savings but when they are beset by impoverishment, illiteracy, disease and hunger how can they do that? They might do it under some leader who would adopt totalitarian processes and would