

said I, "I will swop, and give you a guinea to boot." "Done," said he. We swopped, and Gladiateur won.

I need hardly say that, apart from that one incident, Sir Alexander Galt made a great reputation as Finance Minister.

Turning now to some other matters in the Speech from the Throne, I was glad to see assurances, which I thought were needed, that Canada is maintaining its support and its ties in NATO. These are very difficult times for NATO. They have their troubles and they stem largely, I think, from the fact that France, and perhaps some other countries, are having serious doubts about the efficacy of the United States nuclear deterrent power, and even more serious doubts as to whether the retaliatory power of the United States would be brought to bear in their defence in the case of an unprovoked attack.

The Speech from the Throne assures us that Canada will continue to carry on a high degree of collaboration on both sides of the Atlantic. I for one wonder if we really mean that, if we really intend to collaborate in NATO on both sides. Hitherto we have had the concept in NATO of one land front in which all the nations were collaborating. That, of course, is the European land front stretching from western Turkey to Kirkenes in the north of Norway.

But what about that other and larger land front stretching across North America, the Canadian front? Our allies over there would, I am sure, welcome a suggestion from Canada that we share the responsibility with them for the defence of that front. If we are not prepared to do that, I for one do not see how we are going to reassure them that we have this total front concept of the defence of the NATO countries. This is something we hear more and more about in the protests of some of the NATO countries about the apparent one-sidedness of our support for NATO. It is true, of course, that on the European front, totally committed, there are United Kingdom troops, American troops and Canadian troops, but that is not giving them, as I think it was hoped to do, the reassurance and evidence of total commitment. I would suggest that it might be worth consideration as to whether we might not extend that concept to our own Canadian front, and I very much doubt if our American friends would have very strong objections to seeing us invite here some of the troops of our allies to learn with us and to work with us on the

problems of the defence of this large sector of the NATO land front.

In the Speech from the Throne we read similar assurances respecting our commitments in and to the Commonwealth. As Senator Roebuck has said, and it cannot be repeated too often, when we speak of the Commonwealth we are speaking of a quarter of the population of the globe, a great union of over 750 million people.

The Commonwealth and its importance in the peace structure of the world is very much to the front today for a number of reasons. Our Prime Minister will be attending next month the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London, and I am sure we all wish him success there as he carries on some of the work for and in the Commonwealth with which he has been so long associated. It is almost certain that at this Prime Ministers' Conference the final arrangements for the establishment of a Commonwealth secretariat will be made, and there seems to be a possibility that a Canadian may become its first secretary-general. It will be a very great day for Canada if this happens. I think there is also a possibility that the secretariat may be established in Canada.

Furthermore, as we have heard here on several occasions, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association will meet in Canada in 1966. It seems to me that this offers an area of extreme usefulness for the Senate Committee on External Relations, to which Senator Roebuck referred, because I think this committee might well fill in one of the rather serious gaps which we have found at Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conferences in the past. I refer to the lack of adequate briefing in facts, figures and statistics which would help to make some of the discussions more meaningful than they sometimes are.

This matter was brought up at the last general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and I would hope that the work of this committee would be tied in very closely with the agenda of the conference to be held in Canada in 1966. In my view it will not be sufficient merely to set up a Commonwealth Secretariat; I think the next step will be a Commonwealth meeting. It is rather surprising that in this vast organization there is no such thing as a meeting of the nations of the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association is a meeting of parliamentarians of the Commonwealth nations. The Prime Ministers' Conference is a meeting only of heads