

Supply—External Affairs

his masterly review of world affairs. I must admit, however, I should have liked to hear something a little more definite about Canada's role and Canada's views on concrete international questions. I suspect other members would have liked to hear a little more definite information, too. I was reminded, Mr. Chairman, by his speech of what was once described as the two worst lines of English poetry ever written. They were written by Dr. Samuel Johnson, and he opened the poem with these words:

Let observation with extensive view
Survey mankind from China to Peru.

This seemed to me to be a fairly good description of the minister's speech. He spoke eloquently, for example, of the dangers of the isolation of a great country such as China. He told us, if I correctly heard his words, that it was not too soon for the west to rethink its relationship with China. I wish that he and his government had had the courage to announce official recognition of the existing regime in China, which is a fact of life whether or not we like it. If he had done so, Mr. Chairman, he would have given some substance to the generalities which he gave us in his speech.

The minister's observations—I see he is here now—about O.A.S. were, I thought, a beautiful example of his own inimitable style. He told us that the question of Canada's relationship with O.A.S. was under active review but that no conclusion whatever must be drawn as to whether he and his government favoured Canada's joining the organization, and that his answer to that question would be, maybe yes and maybe no. I think that is a rather typical example of the style of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In a remarkable speech made at American University in Washington on June 10 of this year, the late President Kennedy called upon his nation to reassess their position towards the cold war. I should like to refer briefly, Mr. Chairman, to some of the things that were said by the president on that occasion because I believe that they are extremely relevant to this particular debate. On that occasion, he said he had chosen a topic on which ignorance too often abounds and truth is too rarely appreciated. He said this was the most important topic on earth, peace. He spoke of peace, he said, because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense, he said, where great powers can maintain large and relatively invulnerable nuclear forces and when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all the allied air forces in the last war. He referred to peace as the necessary rational end of rational men. He spoke of the dangerous belief that peace is impossible; the belief

[Mr. Brewin.]

that we are gripped by forces we cannot control. He did not refer, he said, to absolute concepts of universal peace and good will.

I ask the house to note these words, and I quote:

Let us focus instead on a more practical, a more attainable peace, based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace—no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

I make no apology, Mr. Chairman, for quoting at length the words of the late president. It seems to me that it is within the framework of this approach that we in this house can most usefully discuss in this debate on the estimates on external affairs the part which Canada can play in the supremely important task of our generation, which is the building of a world community. That part will not consist of magic formulas or withdrawals from the harsh facts of life, but in steady support for concrete actions and effective agreements looking towards the evolution of an effective international order.

The members of all parties in this house agree about the importance of this objective, and will agree about many of the means required to achieve it. I, on behalf of my party, will emphasize those aspects of our international policies in which we believe that a new approach is required and in which we believe Canada lags at the present time.

First of all, we believe, as other members in the house no doubt do, that Canada must give its fullest support to the United Nations and its agencies. We believe that we should do all we can to advance the interests of the United Nations, for example—and this was discussed by the minister—by placing a contingent of Canadian troops permanently at the disposal of the United Nations secretariat. We believe we can assist other like-minded countries to make available to the United Nations a force which would be at least a step towards the rule of law throughout the world. I welcome what the minister said in this regard, and I sincerely hope that his words will be followed by actions. I know there are difficulties, but I do not see that these difficulties should prevent us from genuinely making available a force of this sort to the United Nations.

We believe that the present easing of tension between the east and the west, which has been symbolized by the test ban treaty, should be used for further steps forward. I have just returned, as have other members of