

*External Affairs*

a general town meeting of the world which will represent the conscience of mankind, where every country big and small will have a chance to express itself.

These nations are now being welcomed in as equals. The Leader of the Opposition may not have meant his statements in just the way they read, but it is not a very good welcome that he holds out to the new Asian and African nations, that they should be coming in to participate in a type of town meeting.

**Mr. Pearson:** I am sure the minister would wish to be fair and that he would like to add the paragraph following the one he quoted, to the effect that the security council should be enlarged to give the Asian and African nations adequate representation on this smaller organization.

**Mr. Green:** Yes, but the idea is there.

**Mr. Pearson:** The idea is to give them more representation.

**Mr. Green:** The Leader of the Opposition was wrong in stating the situation in that way, because the one thing these nations prize above all else is their equality in the United Nations.

**Mr. Pearson:** We want to give them a more effective voice, as I said.

**Mr. Green:** Then, at page 983, the minister chided me—

**Mr. Pearson:** Not the minister.

**Mr. Green:**—the Leader of the Opposition chided me about not being worried about continentalism. I would be a lot more worried about continentalism under a Liberal government, because this has been their record from the time of confederation—always looking south. The hon. gentleman said this as recorded on page 983:

In that part of his statement he certainly gave no indication that he was worried about the growth of continentalism as an aspect of Canadian policy.

He was referring, of course, to our relations with the United States. And he mentioned trade dependence. He said, as reported on page 984:

Let me mention one that has not been settled, and that is the problem of our growing trade dependence on the United States.

What are the figures? Our adverse balance of trade with the United States in 1956, the last year the Liberal government was in power, amounted to \$1,282 million; over \$100 million a month. In 1959—these are the figures for merchandise trade in millions of dollars—it was less than half of that, \$625.3 million.

**Mr. Pearson:** Those are not comparable figures.

[Mr. Green.]

**Mr. Green:** The hon. gentleman mentioned uranium. He blamed us for the present situation with regard to uranium. The Prime Minister dealt with that question very effectively the other evening. I would just like to point out to the house what the Leader of the Opposition himself said, because that indicates where this trouble originated. Referring to the time when the Liberal government made the deal with the United States, the Leader of the Opposition as reported at page 984 of *Hansard* of February 11, 1960, said:

We were also assured that when the contract ended we would not need to worry about renewal, at least for some part of the amount. There was a gentleman's agreement.

Why on earth did the Liberal government not get that in writing?

**Mr. Pearson:** Would the hon. member like an answer to that question? I do not know if the minister would care to have an answer but I am prepared to give one.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Howe gave the answer.

**Mr. Pearson:** The minister will be aware of the fact that when this agreement was before the house there was not a word from the opposition of that day as to the five-year period or the option and the minister knows that the criticism advanced by the opposition was to the effect that the government of that day was tying up Canadian uranium commitments for too long a period.

**Mr. Green:** That is a very poor excuse. The Leader of the Opposition has no right to attack this government now on this question when his own government failed to provide for the renewal of this contract. Our policy with the United States has been to hold frank discussions with them.

**Mr. Pearson:** On this question?

**Mr. Green:** On all questions, including uranium. The result has been that today relations between Canada and the United States are just as good or better than they ever have been before.

Now a word about NATO. I will not go into that in any detail this evening but I do plead with the Leader of the Opposition to stop attacking NATO. The hon. gentleman is always pointing out the weaknesses in NATO and the other day he said it might come to an end.

**Mr. Pearson:** I am trying to make it stronger. I was quoting Mr. Spaak.

**Mr. Green:** I admit there are problems in NATO and we all know that, but why not stress the accomplishments instead of always harping on the problems? You would think that with his experience in NATO the Leader of the Opposition would make suggestions for