

International co-operation is, I think, today more important than it has ever been before. In this age of guided atoms and guided missiles, guided bacteria and, even worse, guided hatreds, it is important, on this or indeed any other day, for us to think hard about international affairs. No people have more cause for such thought than Canadians. We have long since lost the illusion of political security in remoteness. We have also long since lost the idea that we could have prosperity without international economic forces working in our favour. Today, particularly, when scientific developments have proceeded, either downwards or upwards, to the point where we know that forces which we don't control will blow our world to pieces, we should think deeply about where that world is going, and where the nations in the world are going with it. We hear a lot, and we read a lot, about one world. It is true that there is one world in a physical sense, but there is certainly not even an approach to one world in a moral or political or even an economic sense.

We are all together in the physical sense, but in hardly any other sense. Being together in a physical sense, alone, however, doesn't necessarily mean international friendship. Rubbing shoulders sometimes brings about soreness as well as sentiment, and propinquity doesn't always mean peace, as any family man knows. However, one world, physically, does mean that our international contacts are more urgent, more immediately urgent, and more complicated than they have ever been before.

The machinery for conducting these contacts, for carrying on international relations in this one physical world, is diplomacy. In the old days, and I don't mean so very far back when I say "old days", diplomacy was carried on sedately through foreign offices and diplomatic missions abroad. I would have liked to have been a diplomat in those days. It was a genteel, pleasant, rather glamorous profession. Foreign Ministers dipped their quill pens into inkwells, and wrote despatches, which they sanded and sent off by packet, and which reached their Ambassadors three months later, when the problem about which they dealt had disappeared. The Ambassadors then wrote back. Their reply reached headquarters in due course, and the world went on. That is not the way it's done now, I am afraid. A telegram reaches your desk two or three minutes after it was sent, and demands a reply two or three minutes after it has reached you. Diplomacy is now not only big business, but high pressure business.

However, in recent years, this machinery of international intercourse through diplomats has been supplemented by the conduct of international relations through international conferences; if you like to call it that, multilateral diplomacy. This has, I think, become the important characteristic in the conduct of international relations in the last twenty or twenty-five years; diplomacy through conference. Before I left Ottawa, I was looking up the possible requirements of the Department of External Affairs for delegates, advisers and experts for forthcoming international meetings. I was somewhat surprised, and a little discouraged, to discover that, from July the 1st until the present, there had been held 60 international conferences, in places so far removed as Lake Success, Liberia, Toronto (where there was an International Meteorological Conference), Geneva, Shanghai and Canberra. I also discovered that those international meetings were dealing with everything from the peace and future of the world in the Security Council and the Atomic Commission, to the revision of the list of the causes of death and morbidity.

It is one thing to have all this United Nations machinery. It is another thing to make it work. How is it doing? The machinery should, I think, be divided into two categories. We have those United Nations agencies which are dealing with specialist technical problems. And