

determine the right stand to take on problems, keeping in mind the Canadian background and, above all, using Canadian common sense. In effect, the time has come to take an independent approach.

I do not want to leave the impression for one minute that former governments have not taken an independent approach, but across the country one has heard time and time again, "Oh, Canada can do a great deal by being honest broker between the nations, particularly between the big nations, by running from one to the other and suggesting that one should modify its attitude because the other one does not like it", and so on. This has been so particularly as it concerned dealings between the United Kingdom and the United States. Every member of the House will have heard comments to the effect that Canada should be interpreting the British to the Americans and the Americans to the British.

That idea used to appeal to me, and it may have been a wise plan to adopt at one time. But today the British and the Americans are just as close together as any two nations could be. They do not need any interpreters from Canada, or from any other place. Sometimes I think, when we do not agree with their policies, that they "gang up on Canada". I am not using the phrase "gang up" in any offensive way; if they think we are in the wrong, then it is natural that they should get together and try to do what they can to persuade us to change. It is all done in a very friendly way with the attitude that "this hurts me more than it hurts you". So we are all good friends. It is not as if there is any lack of friendship and understanding. But I do ask the Honourable Members of this House to consider whether Canada would not gain more respect in the years that lie ahead and exercise more influence if she forgot about this role of being a middleman or an honest broker.

Then to come to my first subject, the subject of disarmament. In my judgment the field of disarmament is the most important field for Canada in world affairs in 1960, because our nation is a member of the 10-nation Disarmament Committee, which literally carries with it the hopes of mankind.

May I just outline something of the background? For many years there have been attempts to work out some system of disarmament both in the United Nations and outside. Canada, I think, has participated in every committee or commission on disarmament since these efforts began and has made a splendid contribution. But this work has been discouraging, and to a degree disillusioning. During the summer of 1959, the position was that in the United Nations there was a Disarmament Commission whose function was supposed to be to work out some method of disarmament. As I understand it, the attempt had been made earlier to have a fairly small committee deal with the subject but it had been unsuccessful, so this United Nations Disarmament Commission was set up, consisting of every one of the 82 member states. You can imagine how difficult it would be for a Commission of that size to get results, and of course there were no results obtained.