

inclined to push OAS membership and felt that had Canada been at Punta del Este it might have been embarrassing.³⁵ The Canadian Government's determination to maintain links with Cuba received favourable support, but this did not mean that everyone who expressed an opinion was pro-Castro. Maclean's Magazine was certainly not.³⁶ Canada Month, on the other hand, was not anti-Castro, although it published Paul Kidd's article questioning whether Canada was wise to deal with Cuba if it meant loss of respect in the U.S.³⁷

The OAS debate continued, and Dr. Marcel Roussin's report to the Head of the Latin American Division, on his return from a visit to Washington D.C. and the Pan American Union, reflected his increasing pessimism about the OAS. He said it had lost its spirit and seemed more than ever to be dominated by the U.S. State Department. He still favoured joining, but he suggested that Canada should be more aware of what she would be getting into.

The Cuban missile crisis illustrated how vulnerable Canada was when the two great powers decided to test each other. Reaction in the French-language press, with reference to Latin America, was divided. La Presse printed a letter suggesting that Canada would do well not to become involved with U.S. policy; Le Droit's editorial said that the crisis showed that Canada ought to join the OAS "dont le général est la sécurité économique, social et militaire de notre hémisphère." Le Soleil urged Canadians to encourage their American allies against succumbing to the use of force because of anti-cuban hysteria.³⁸

The OAS question dominated Canadian interest in Latin America in 1963. This was in part because of the approaching election, and Charles