

Canada has consistently sought to express to all nations its friendship and understanding. It has not received in return the kind of collaboration and appreciation that one would sometimes think it should receive from certain quarters. But as between Canada and India, for instance, there has been, during the past half decade at any rate, a close understanding and a disposition on our part to appreciate the significant and potential role and actual role which that country can play in Asia and international affairs generally.

In spite of that, and although I in a modest way at the United Nations have from time to time been part of this desire to understand India, I must frankly say that I did say in India on several occasions that some of the attitudes taken in Asia did cause me personally at any rate on occasion to express some wonderment. In the light of this, with existing foreshadowings in terms of geography that confront that great nation and other Asian nations, I can well understand how important it is that each of us, officially and privately, try to understand the problems immediately confronting some of these countries and at the same time urge that there be reciprocal action on their part as to the reasons we in the West on occasion take the courses which, in our interests and in the interests of the world at large, from our point of view we regard as essential.

I neglected to mention that among the countries I visited was Burma, which borders on China, close to Indochina and India. It is a country of 18 millions of people dedicated to the principles of a strong religious belief. It serves as a symbol, in one sense, of the kind of forces that are at play in that great land mass we call Asia.

Wherever I went I sought first of all to affirm our friendship for these nations, and to indicate to them that the Canadian Government, regardless of party, and the Canadian people disposed as they are toward building a peaceful world, had for them nothing but a desire of friendship and collaboration to the extent of their capacity. I also told them that, as a member of the Commonwealth, Canada felt that that instrument had in its very concept the opportunity of providing not only for the good of its constituents but for the welfare of all nations in the world, in Asia as well as elsewhere, who are prepared to understand its good intentions and purposes. I also sought to indicate that while there had been differences between Canada and others in the United Nations on recent actions on the part of one member of the Commonwealth, because of that difference, while it reflected the objective character of Canada's approach to international affairs as certainly the Government saw it, there could be no justification for any nation's believing that Canada did not have absolute faith in the character of and the purposes which, generally speaking, Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom seeks to establish. I also sought to indicate that because we were the closest neighbour of the United States, with whom we did not always have full accord in matters having to do with problems affecting our two countries, we had, side by side, over 140 years, lived in peace; and that whatever may be the misgivings of certain countries about that nation it was my judgment, as one Canadian representing my government in Asia, that the basic foreign policy of the United States could only be interpreted as one directed toward the easing of international tension and the preservation of peace in the world.

I will not say that these interpretations were always acceptable but I thought that was the place to say these things, and I said them, I hope, in proper terms and in proper context; and I believe they were accepted as coming from a nation that has gradually built up for itself a reputation for an objective approach to international affairs.