

CANADA AT THE UNITED NATIONS

MR. ST. LAURENT'S MONTREAL ADDRESS: The following is partial text of an address delivered by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. St. Laurent, at a luncheon of the Rotary Tri-District Conference in Montreal, April 26:-

"What are the reasons for this close collaboration with the United States, and what are the long term implications?

"The reasons are obvious. We occupy with the United States the northern half of the Western Hemisphere. Our security, if threatened at all, is threatened only by Russia and her satellites. No longer are the Atlantic Ocean and the Arctic effective barriers. Any hopes we may have had about creating an effective system of collective security under the United Nations have not been realized. One world has become two worlds. I do not want to exaggerate the dangers inherent in the world situation today, but they are grave enough to compel us to look to our national security. By the facts of geography our security is linked to that of the United States and it would be criminal folly on our part if we did not cooperate with the United States in self-defence.

COOPERATION WITH U.S.

"Now, while recognizing that cooperation with the United States in defence is essential we must at the same time be alive to the dangers of close defence relationships with a country much more populous and powerful than we are. You have heard statements to the effect that the United States is taking over the Canadian North, that we have become a mere satellite of the United States and have lost or are in danger of losing our freedom of action in the International field. Statements such as these are obvious exaggerations.

"We have taken other steps to ensure control over all military activities in our territory. It has been made clear to our United States friends that any United States activities whether by land, sea or air, on or over Canadian territory, must be within the limits of a programme previously approved by the Canadian Government. And of course, before approval is given, we ask that there be substantial participation by Canadians and that all information obtained, whether of a scientific nature or otherwise, be made available to us. The same principles apply conversely to the U.S.

"Now if we proceed in our defence collaboration with the United States along the lines I have indicated, is there any real threat to our independence or freedom of action? I do not think so. If the United States wanted to take over Canada there is probably little we could do to prevent it. What they could do directly, they are not likely to try to do by infiltration. Fortunately for us there are no indications that the United States have any such intentions; and fortunately for the United States we are not apt to be the kind of people they would ever feel it was necessary to coerce.

"If we then can welcome close defence collaboration with the United States, can we equally welcome closer economic ties? This is a big question which I cannot answer today. Because of our dwindling United States dollar resources the Government in November last prohibited or restricted the importation of a large number of United States goods. These steps, though accepted as a necessary evil on both sides of the border, have spurred resourceful persons to suggest less painful solutions. The most far reaching was the proposal for customs union made in "Life" magazine a few weeks ago. You may have read the editorial entitled - 'Customs Union with Canada: Canada needs us and we need Canada in a violently contracting world'. This article has set off a debate in our press and periodicals but so far it has not reached the floor of the House and I can assure you that no proposals of that kind are under consideration by the Government. An adventure of that kind is one which would not be embarked on lightly.

TRADE BARRIERS

"There are obviously very serious political objections to a customs union between Canada and the United States. But no such objections apply to renewed efforts by both countries to lower the barriers to trade between them. . . .

"We all know how the international scene has greatly deteriorated since the joint statement was made over a year ago. We also know that the main reason for this deterioration has been the inability of the Western democracies and the Eastern totalitarian states under the U.S.S.R. to establish any basis for cooperation or even mutual toleration. We feel that the responsibility for this failure rests on the U.S.S.R. in its aggressive imperialistic policies and in its sponsorship and support for subversive communist fifth columns in all countries but more particularly in those countries of Eastern Europe which are most closely under the influence of its power and its propaganda.

"But wherever the responsibility may lie, there is no doubt that we have not got the one world contemplated by the San Francisco Charter with all its 57 members co-operating wholeheartedly and confidently with each other.

"Power politics are still a regrettable factor in general international relations. That does not necessarily mean a break-up of the United Nations or the secession from it of the Soviet group.

"We believe that so long as Communism remains a menace to the Free World, that World must create and maintain a preponderance of force over any possible adversary or combination of adversaries. The Free World must also create and maintain a sufficient degree of unity to ensure that that preponderance of force is available to prevent the free nations from being destroyed or defeated one by one. . . ."

PALESTINE STATEMENT: Following is the text of a statement made in Committee 1 of the General Assembly of the United Nations on April 23 by General A.G.L. McNaughton, Canadian Permanent Delegate:-

"In view of the gravity of the situation in Palestine I propose to limit my remarks to a very brief statement of the Canadian attitude to the three proposals submitted to this Committee and shall only take a couple of minutes. The Canadian position with respect to the situation in Palestine, as it has developed, has been stated by me from time to time in the Security Council and is on the record. I need not repeat it now.

"As regards the propositions before the Committee, I mention first the proposal of the distinguished representative of France in regard to the special question of the protection of the City of Jerusalem and its inhabitants. As the Trusteeship Council has been concerning itself with the problems of Jerusalem, it is appropriate that this body should consider this special aspect of the Palestine question. From the remarks made by the distinguished delegate of France, it is understood that such consideration will include provisions for the protection of the Holy Places.

TEMPORARY TRUSTEESHIP

"I turn next to the proposal of the distinguished representative of the United States, regarding the establishment of a Temporary Trusteeship. In the Security Council I have had the opportunity of stressing the importance of giving first consideration to all measures which might bring about a cessation of the mounting violence, destruction and death in the Holy Land. I consider that it is our responsibility to examine every possible means to this end. The United States representative has explained that his proposal is in the nature of an emergency measure designed to establish and maintain public order and to ensure a continuance of public services, when the mandatory withdraws on 15th May.

"He has further explained that the truce, called for by the Security Council, taken together with this proposal for a Temporary Trusteeship envisages a 'standstill' in an effort to preserve human life and that it is without prejudice to the rights, claims and position of the parties, or to the character of the eventual political settlement. While the Security Council proceeds with all possible despatch to deal with the problem of implementing the truce, it is the view of the Canadian delegation that the Assembly should consider the United States proposal for a Temporary Trusteeship as a related measure designed to meet the emergency. On the question of procedure, which has been raised, it seems to us less complicated to have the matter considered

at a joint meeting of Committees 1 and 4, but we will support any procedure which will result in the practicability of this proposal being examined expeditiously.

"Finally I come to the proposal of the distinguished representative of Australia whereby the Assembly would request the Palestine Commission to proceed with the implementation of the General Assembly's Resolution of 29th November, 1947. The adoption of such a proposal at this time would, in my opinion, be inconsistent with the examination of the emergency and interim measures to which I have made reference. I therefore believe that the consideration of the Australian proposal should be deferred until the examination of the United States proposal has been completed. If this proposal, therefore, were to be put to a vote at this time, I would have to abstain."

CANADA ON COMMITTEE: The Social Commission on April 23 completed its Third Session by adopting, with minor changes, the rapporteur's draft report by a vote of 16 to 1 (USSR) with no abstentions.

The Commission considered the latter part of the report covering the draft convention of 1937 for suppressing the exploitation of the prostitution of others, and family, youth and child welfare.

By a vote of 13 to 4 (USSR, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland) with no abstentions, the Commission decided that the rapporteur should prepare, on the basis of the annex contained in the Secretariat Document and the various suggestions of the members of the Commission, a document on the programme of work of the Commission for 1948 and 1949.

In connection with the adopted Canadian resolution which set up an agenda committee, the Chairman nominated the following countries to serve on this committee: Canada, Colombia, China, France, USSR, Iraq and Union of South Africa. As the term of membership on the Commission for France, Union of South Africa and the USSR will expire at the end of 1948, the Chairman will make other nominations in due time.

In explaining his negative vote on the rapporteur's report, A.P. Borisov (USSR), stated that he did so because some resolutions adopted by the Commission on immigration dealt more with recruitment of cheap manpower rather than with the protection of immigrants. The resolution on prevention of crime, in his opinion, deviated from social questions. He also said that the programme of work for the Commission was dealt with in such a way that the Commission could not go deeper into the problem.

CANADA SECONDS PROPOSAL: The first point on the agenda of the Security Council on April 23 was the selection of two members of the five-man Commission for Kashmir in accordance