Canada has been drawn, partly by the accident of membership in the Commonwealth, into assisting in the struggle for economic viability of, first, India, Pakistan and Ceylon and, later, other Commonwealth nations in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean. We have found ourselves grappling at the United Nations with the complexities of such issues as the Korean War, the Congo rebellion, Cyprus and the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East. We were called to play a part in the International Control Commissions set up so hopefully in 1954 to supervise the settlement in Vietnam after France's withdrawal. We now have to decide whether we are to continue all or some of these involvements, to broaden out our interests abroad, or to concentrate on certain international functions and certain areas of the world.

Canada's contribution to international development assistance now amounts to more than $300 million annually and we are pledged to increase it to 1 per cent of national income. Our programme is a respectable one in size and effectiveness. But we have a lot of urgent questions to answer about our aid. Should we concentrate more of it in certain countries or in certain sectors of development? What should be the relative emphasis on grants and loans of various kinds and on trade concessions? As a middle power, are there special things Canada can do better than other countries? To what extent should we pool our efforts with those of other contributors? As development assistance becomes an increasingly important part of our international activities, questions like these become much more critical.

One new dimension that has been added to Canadian activities in the world in recent years is that of the active projection abroad of the bilingual and bicultural aspects of our nationhood. French-speaking Canadians now urgently seek to play a role in national and international affairs more in keeping with their weight in the Canadian population. The signing of the France-Canada Cultural Agreement in 1965 marked a major step in a conscious effort to represent the "French fact" in Canada more adequately in our external relations. As I have mentioned, for historical reasons we found ourselves fairly closely associated with the newly-independent members of the Commonwealth in Africa and Asia. We were slower to develop comparable ties with the newly-independent francophone countries, but we are now rapidly expanding these relations. A proper reflection in foreign policy of our bicultural character is vitally important in strengthening the unity of our Canadian nation. It is also an opportunity for Canada to play a greater role in the world.

An area in which our foreign policy has been unbalanced in the past is in the American hemisphere. Beyond the United States, we have been somewhat tardy in developing an active collaboration with the countries of the Caribbean, and even slower to seek out closer relations with the nations of Latin America. We should frankly admit that there has been a neglect of that part of the world in the thinking of most Canadians and seek to rectify that omission.

So, too, in our relations with the nations that border the Pacific Ocean. The imbalance in that respect, however, is not exactly a case of neglect. On the contrary, the western part of Canada, and especially British Columbia, has long had active trading and other relations with Eastern Asia and the South