

system as a United States-Latin American historical tradition. He also came away convinced that an impression already established by his experience at UN assemblies had been reinforced: "...Canadians--a pragmatic and inarticulate people--are intolerant of the incurably rhetorical Latins: the more committees we sit in together the less well we get along together." He felt that the Pan American idea might, in fact, be a barrier to Latin American development and suggested that "Canadians...should probe deeply into the future of Pan Americanism before reaching a decision on their own place in our other Hemisphere."¹³

In 1963, there were two articles on the OAS question. Ian Sclanders was strongly opposed to membership as his Maclean's article clearly showed. He outlined the usual arguments, and included his own assessment gained from a seven month tour. He concluded with the unusual argument, "But if there's one reason more compelling than others for not joining, it's the utter mess Latin America is in ..."¹⁴

Relation's December, 1963, editorial in support of membership presents an interesting reason for Canada's reluctance to do so. The reason is even more striking at this moment in 1967, when it is apparent France is still uncertain as to whether Canada is truly independent of Great Britain, for the editor of the Quebec French-language Catholic monthly was obviously not sure: "On objecte nos attachés avec le reste du Commonwealth, la priorité du plan Colombo, la Vocation médiatrice du Canada dans les querelles qui pourraient surgir. Mais au fond on craint l'humeur britannique." (my italics).¹⁵