

External Affairs

scattered across the globe, and certainly everyone in the commonwealth at the present time is working for peace.

The Leader of the Opposition took that statement and twisted it out of all recognition and came up with the following conclusion, as reported on page 983 of *Hansard*:

Of course they are but the suggestion that if there were a war the commonwealth would be in a more vulnerable position because it is stretched out around the world, more vulnerable than the United States or the Soviet union, does not seem to me to be a very realistic one because it assumes that if there were a war every member of the commonwealth would be equally affected or that every member of the commonwealth would be participating in that war. As we know—especially the new commonwealth with the Asian and African states know—every single member of the commonwealth has its own independent foreign and defence policy and is not under any commitment to enter into any conflict merely because other countries of the commonwealth are involved. This hangover, if I may call it that, of the old concept of a centralized commonwealth is not a very realistic one.

The words used by the Leader of the Opposition were certainly not very realistic. Picture a nuclear war, and picture the fall-out; not where the bombs are actually dropping, but the fall-out everywhere. No one escapes in any part of the world. You cannot now have half the commonwealth at war and the other half not at war. They may not be actually bombed, but they will be suffering from fall-out just the same. The whole world will be suffering, and no part of the commonwealth will be suffering more than Canada, because here we are between the two main contenders, the United States and the U.S.S.R. and if there is any place in the world where bombs will be falling other than on those two nations it will be in Canada. Further, we are in a temperate zone where fall-out is far more serious than it is in other zones of the world. Canada is the nation in the commonwealth which will have the most to lose if there should be a nuclear war.

Worse than those statements made by the Leader of the Opposition which I have just read were two other amazing statements he made about the commonwealth. At page 982, we find this:

I suggest to him that if we think about the commonwealth in the old sense as some kind of association of states under the umbrella of Westminster—

This is the same old line as we heard for so many years from Liberal cabinet ministers when I was sitting in the opposition, and I thought it had died out long ago. Then, on the next page:

—if we think of the commonwealth in old terms as a commonwealth based on London with white supremacy we may find ourselves faced with some insoluble problems in the years ahead.

Here we have the Leader of the Opposition reverting to the old Liberal tactics of baiting the British. It reminded me of the Right Hon. Mackenzie King in the thirties taking the position that he could be informed by the British of what was happening but he could not be consulted because that might involve Canada in some obligation. Within a few months of the time the Germans declared war he took the position in this house that the British would not be allowed to come to Canada to set up an air training scheme because that would be the equivalent of establishing a foreign military base in Canada.

That action, if carried to its conclusion, might very well have cost us the war. Now we are getting back to the same sort of thing from the present leader of the Liberal party. He mentioned white supremacy. I did not mention white supremacy. It was farthest from my thoughts, and the policy of the government is just the opposite. Here we are sending out representatives to Nigeria; increasing our help under the Colombo plan from \$35 million to \$50 million; providing additional aid for the commonwealth countries in Africa and for the West Indies; taking the lead in establishing a commonwealth scholarship plan; having visits all the time from representatives of African nations—I have had leading men from Uganda and Nigeria here within the last few weeks, and we are to have representatives from Tanganyika within the next few weeks—and it is a strange attitude for the Leader of the Opposition to take, referring as he did to white supremacy.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to explain how worried he was because there are new African nations gaining membership of the United Nations. Turning to page 986, I find he said this:

There are some terrific problems faced by that world organization. As I said the other day outside the house, it will not be long before we shall have something approaching 100 states as members of the United Nations. A great many of them will be Asian and African countries, weak economically, without experience politically but each with one vote in the United Nations assembly which will equal the vote of the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. To maintain the effectiveness of this organization in the face of that kind of situation is going to be extremely difficult indeed and it is a problem that we shall be obliged to face very shortly.

The hon. gentleman did not stop at that; he went on:

I have suggested that perhaps one way of doing this—something that may be required in the years ahead—is to convert the United Nations somewhat from the concept of its founders and to make the assembly, the unwieldy assembly—the majority perhaps of which would be composed of these Asian and African members, because certainly no longer does the west dominate the assembly—to