

*Supply—External Affairs*

and secession. We now see that the former secessionists are in control of the central government of the Congo and the mercenaries who were the core of Tshombe's army are fighting to establish the authority of Leopoldville. A wiser and less precipitous course in the Congo might have saved the United Nations from its present impasse.

In the Middle East the wise counsel of our present Prime Minister, who as secretary of state for external affairs urged the United Nations to use the impasse of 1956 between Israel and Egypt as an opportunity for establishing a peaceable relationship between these two countries, was not accepted and upon the insistence of the then United States secretary of state, Mr. Dulles, and with the blessing of the then secretary general of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjold, there was a return to the status quo ante. Had the wise counsel of our present Prime Minister been followed, the war situation could have been turned into a basis for an enduring peace. Canada will certainly continue to use its best influence to bring about a resolution of the unhappy state of affairs in the Middle East between Israel and her neighbours.

We now find a situation in the United Nations where it is facing bankruptcy and where one of the major powers refuses to participate in the peace keeping undertakings which have been ordered under the uniting for peace resolutions of the general assembly. To lose Russia would be a serious blow and our best efforts must be used to help resolve this very critical situation. The United Nations itself has been radically transformed with the addition of many members from the developing countries. It is becoming a wider forum, and we all hope that it will be a responsible one. The future of world peace is so intimately associated with international co-operation, which the United Nations symbolizes, that we cannot allow it to go by default.

NATO is also faced with a crisis. Formed to underpin the security of western Europe in the face of burgeoning Russian power, NATO in its early years gave confidence to nations of western Europe to defend themselves in association with North Atlantic countries. Canada has given commitments much beyond any in peacetime and the United States and Britain have also given automatic guarantees which are historic and unique. This is a situation on which to build, and the present re-examination of the NATO relationship must be used, not to dismantle

the machinery which has made such an important contribution to world peace, but to direct NATO activities in new directions which can meet more fully the situation where western Europe with new confidence and a welcome prosperity can play a fuller role in the fulfilment of NATO's objectives.

The statements of the new government in the United Kingdom are welcome since they recognize that the problem of nuclear initiative within NATO cannot be spread among a triumvirate of powers. The dispersal of control of nuclear weapons would set up new dangers. Canada is content to allow this initiative to remain in the hands of the greatest strategic power in the west. The demand for independent nuclear deterrents in the hands of British and French forces means that each would have a trigger on American nuclear power. Canada, which is committed to go to war in defence of its partners should they be attacked, can only look with trepidation upon the development of these independent initiatives. The statement of the British prime minister that his country is prepared to waive this position will certainly be welcome in Canada. The proposal to expand the number of countries with nuclear weapons by organizing multilateral nuclear forces is also viewed with some trepidation here. The further dispersal of nuclear weapons is a matter of great concern.

We must continue our unremitting efforts for disarmament. I am not one of those who feel that an agreement for disarmament would bring about a cataclysmic readjustment of our economic affairs. There is much for us to do, and the predictions which were made in 1945, 1946 and 1947 about the critical economic result of the end of the war certainly were not borne out. Even if we had to pay a large economic price it would certainly be worth the security and well-being resulting from a program of agreed disarmament. We will probably only go forward slowly, but we must be patient, we must be persistent, and we must be wise.

The United Nations itself cannot continue to deny membership to mainland China. Seven hundred million people must have a voice through their government, even though it may not be a democratic government, in the councils of the United Nations. We must bend our best efforts to gain the adherence of mainland China to international agreements, particularly in areas of disarmament. We must also offer economic association to mainland China so that it can become integrated in the world community. Certainly the claims of China