

*External Affairs*

On the 8th of May the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) sent a strong message to the United States. Previously the tone of the messages that were sent, when agricultural products were interfered with, was, to say the least, lukewarm if not apathetic.

Today, the closing out of our oil products to the United States will not only have a serious consequence to the western oil industry but the restricting of imports to 250 million barrels a year to all countries of the world will weaken the defences of North America.

The United States must realize that it depends upon us as the safety deposit box of the minerals of North America from which they get all their asbestos and nickel; and, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) has often said, they depend on us for their manganese and in large measure their cobalt, 55 per cent of their lead, and 42 per cent of their copper, all of which commodities are necessary to the preservation of freedom through the instrumentality of strong armaments.

Doubtless the minister will have read the United States' newspaper reports of his address; scant attention was paid to that speech. Canada gave it widespread publicity; but apart from the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, the *New York Herald* and the *Chicago Tribune* there was very little reference to that speech which set out in clear terms a viewpoint with regard to our national survival that ought to have been expressed long ago. If it had been expressed three or four years ago it would have removed many of the criticisms that one hears today.

The GATT agreement with preservation of the restrictive rights now made legal cannot but result in artificial barriers being legalized in defence in a situation serious to the maintenance of unity and the preservation of our respective economic lives.

I feel that today Canada, with its resources, should be to a greater extent than ever before manufacturing these raw materials to provide the sinews of freedom and to ensure that these resources within Canada may be utilized for the benefit of freedom everywhere in the world among free nations.

In support of my view I take the 1952 Canada Year Book, which says in effect that we do not have today a balanced Canadian industrial economy.

It says:

Less dependence on export of primary raw materials and agricultural products and more processing of these resources in Canada—

Here I cease quoting—would bring about a balanced Canadian economy that is needed today.

That is certainly needed in the period in which we live. It is needed in order to make Canada strong and to provide those sinews for our joint defence with the United States in the event of war. On the other hand, should war not come, as we hope and pray it will not, at least Canada will be making its contribution to the building of power and strength so that negotiations based on strength may be the result.

I wish to discuss one other matter before I conclude. I was surprised that the minister, who was present in London at the prime ministers' conference, did not inform the house of some of the things that happened there. He bestowed upon the commonwealth just a passing glance. He said in effect that we must trust our friends, the United States and Britain, and one or two others. That is not enough. That kind of thing does not have any realization of the contribution that the British commonwealth makes in the world of today. I think one of the finest terse descriptions ever given of this commonwealth was given by one of the reporters from Canada, namely James McCook, who described the power of the commonwealth, lacking as it does any material organization. During the meeting in London it was possible, because of the vastness and the world-encircling nature of the commonwealth, to communicate with other peoples with ease. If a communication was to be made with the United States of America, that would be done by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) or by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson). If there was to be a communication with Chou En-lai to ascertain his views on any subject, Nehru was there to perform that task. If there was to be a communication with Molotov in the U.S.S.R., Sir Anthony Eden, by reason of his previous association, was in a position to make that communication.

There is one thing I should like to say here, and I digress for a moment. Today we have become so accustomed to the power and the authority of Sir Winston Churchill that we wonder how different things will be if he decides to resign at the apex of his power and his world authority. If he does resign let us remember that the British commonwealth has always had a leader available. That leader today, Sir Anthony Eden, was right in 1938; and in the Yalta revelations of the other day—the publication of which was as unjustifiable as it was unconscionable at this time—Eden stood out as the man at