



STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 61/5

CANADIAN EFFORTS IN THE WORLD OF TODAY

Excerpts from a Statement by Mr. Howard Green, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the House of Commons on April 26, 1961.

... These are very stirring days in the field of external affairs. As all Members will realize, the dull moments are few and far between. Sometimes the news is bad and at other times it is good. Today I am sure we are all very pleased that the troubles through which our old friend and ally, the Republic of France, has been going during the last week-end, are over. News of the collapse last night of the insurgents in Algeria was received by the Canadian Government with the greatest relief.

According to the latest reports the situation is returning to normal and the French Government is now resuming full civilian and military control in Algiers.

President de Gaulle, the French Government, and indeed the entire French people deserve high praise for their firmness and courage in the face of a challenge which could have had incalculable consequences, not only for the future of Algeria but for France itself, and which would have posed very serious problems for the North Atlantic alliance. France has emerged from this test stronger than before, and I hope it will now be possible to proceed to a peaceful solution of the Algerian issue.

In this debate on external affairs it is my hope that as many Hon. Members as possible will participate. There are a great number of Members of this House who have had considerable experience in the field of foreign affairs. I need only refer to the large number who, down through the years, have rendered excellent service for Canada at the United Nations, either as delegates or as parliamentary observers. Another large group have gone abroad to attend meetings of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Still others have made a practice of attending the meetings of the NATO Parliamentary Organization. Another group have taken part in the meetings of the Interparliamentary Group, which consists of 24 members of the Canadian Senate and House of Commons and a similar

number from the United States Senate and House of Representatives. A few months ago Canadian Members of Parliament also attended meetings of the Interparliamentary Union. ...

... My officials, as well as myself, are hoping for some useful suggestions from the Members taking part in this debate. It cannot be gainsaid that an informed Canadian public opinion on foreign affairs is vital to the future greatness of our nation. This is one aspect of the whole picture which worries me, namely whether or not Canadian Members of Parliament, and the Canadian people generally, are following international affairs with sufficient care to give whatever Government happens to be in charge of the affairs of this country the backing required for Canada to play the part she can play in the world of today. Make no mistake, no country in April of 1961 has a greater opportunity to take a part and play a worthy role in world affairs than Canada...

Let me put it this way. No country has a greater responsibility. Let us stress the feature of responsibility in world affairs rather than opportunity.

United Nations

I go on, ... to give the House a picture of the world situation as I see it today. In the first place -- I think this is the most important factor -- we have a great world organization actually functioning today, and I refer to the United Nations. Some people scoff at the United Nations, but when you go to New York and see the representatives of 99 nations meeting in that great world body, and when you realize the speed of communications and the fact that world opinion is quickly focused on any vital issue that comes up anywhere in the world, you cannot help feeling that in the United Nations we have the greatest world organization there has ever been. It makes mistakes. The amazing thing is that it does not make a great many more, because of necessity the transactions must be of such a complicated nature. It would repay members to watch events there and to consider that while the United Nations seems to arrive at the edge of the precipice every so often, and while it might appear that in a few days' time the whole organization would blow up, that day never comes.

Just within the last week there was a serious crisis over the financing of the United Nations effort in the Congo. For a few hours that situation looked very serious; in fact one key resolution failed to carry during the last night of the sitting. If things had rested there the result might have been that the United Nations would have been forced to recall its troops from the Congo. But good judgment prevailed; consideration of the subject was adjourned for an hour or so and delegates went out into the lounge...

We cannot do that in the House of Commons; our rules and procedures are not quite so flexible. I do point out that this organization has gone through crisis after crisis, and I believe that it will continue to do so and that it will continue to grow, because without the United Nations our civilization would probably revert to savagery.

Another feature of the world situation today is the large number of new nations emerging on the scene. You know, I think it is a good thing for Canadians to see some of the bright sides of the world picture and not be concentrating only on the scare headlines. Today we have self-government spreading in the world at a rate which was never even imagined a few years ago. I was looking at a map of Africa this morning and counting up the sovereign states in that key continent. I think the number is 28. I may be out one or two because the maps are not always kept up to date, but a new nation is emerging at midnight tonight, namely Sierra Leone. It will not be very long until there are other new nations taking their place in the world from that continent of Africa.

These are some of the bright spots in the world picture.

Uneasy Coexistence

There are, of course, some which are not so bright. One of those is that we are living in days of an uneasy coexistence, with the Communist world on one side and the so-called Western world on the other. I hasten to add that I do not believe any honest person can question the fact that the Western grouping was formed as a defensive unit. It was not formed with the purpose of taking away anything from anybody, from the Communist world or from anyone else; it was formed as a defensive grouping, and we should always keep that fact in mind.

In these two groups there are a comparatively small number of nations. The vast number of nations in the world today are in between. For example, practically all those nations on the Continent of Africa are not committed to one side or the other. In fact one of their main purposes is to refuse to be committed either way. They want no part whatever of the cold war. They have too many problems of their own, building up their own nations, training the necessary leaders and all that sort of thing, to have any time for getting mixed up in the cold war; this is a fact which Canadians should remember.

Overwhelming Destructive Power

Another dark spot in the world picture is that at the present time, the age in which we live, there is overwhelming destructive power. When you recall that the Soviet can hurl a missile with an atomic warhead 7,000 or 8,000 miles and land that missile within a mile of the target, and when you recall at the same time

that there are now at sea Polaris submarines of the United States, each with many times the destructive power-contained in all the bombs dropped in the second world war -- when you realize these facts you understand that mankind today is in a position to destroy our whole civilization. Here again is another fact which Canadians in particular would do well not to forget, because we just happen to lie between the two great nuclear powers of the world, each of which has the capacity to destroy the other in a matter of hours; it does not need a very fertile imagination for a Canadian to realize what would happen to his country if there should be a catastrophe of that kind.

What is Canada's role in this world? I suggest ... that there must be no escapism in Canada. As a people we have traditions of courage, of common sense and of religious faith. Our nation was not founded by people who were in the habit of wringing their hands, giving up and refusing to face facts no matter how unpleasant they might be.

This is not the character of the Canadian people. We must take our full part in world affairs and do it with a spirit of optimism. This is no day for a pessimist in world affairs. Anyone trying to deal with world problems today who is a pessimist is very likely to end up in a mental asylum, I feel that Canadians should face the world with optimism and also idealism, and this our people have been doing. Canadians from coast to coast look on world affairs from an idealistic point of view. How else can you explain the fact that there has been practically unanimous endorsement of the large programmes of aid to the less-fortunate peoples of the world?

No Covetousness

Our people do not look at the world with envy. We envy no one his or her country. Canadians have had an unselfish approach, perhaps because we have so much land that we do not know what to do with it. If we had not had enough, we might have been just as greedy about taking over other people's land as some other countries have been; I do not suggest for a minute that we are any better fundamentally than any other people.

In addition ... in the world of today Canada must honour her commitments. We must stand by our allies. There are a great many Canadians gone before us who would be ashamed if they ever found that Canadians in 1961 were running out on their allies. This is not the Canadian character. When a nation fails to stand by its friends then it is not worthy of having friends, and none of us wants to put Canada in that position.

This is a day when Canada in world affairs can urge cool-headed action. It is so easy to become excited about some of these questions and start condemning some other nation, start saying things that will hurt the people of another nation, saying things which may have a far-reaching effect that is not for the good of

Canada or of mankind. I suggest that we must always urge cool-headed action in dealing with world problems. We have a far wider influence in the world than most Canadians realize. I do not take any credit for that myself or on behalf of the Government of which I am a member. I do not say that we are doing more than previous Governments did but Canada has a very wide influence in world affairs.

Today I propose to review briefly and sketchily some of the ways in which Canadian efforts are being directed in dealing with various world problems. Before proceeding to do so, I feel that I must pay a tribute to the men and women serving Canada in the Department of External Affairs. They number about 2,000 and I believe it would be impossible to find a more devoted group than these officers and members of our department. Canada now has diplomatic relations with some 63 other countries, 19 in the western hemisphere, 22 in Europe, 7 in Africa and 15 in Asia including the Middle East, Far East and Australasia. This does not mean that we have 63 embassies because in some cases an ambassador will be representing Canada in two or in one case in four different countries; there are 16 countries to which our ambassadors from another country are accredited. I do not believe that any nation in the world has a finer group of foreign service officers today. These men have been carefully selected and trained. Our senior foreign service officers have vast experience, and in my time as Foreign Minister I have not found representatives of any other country who were any better.

We have been helped a great deal also by the type of ambassadors sent here by other countries. We have a large number of embassies in Ottawa staffed by distinguished citizens and through their work here Canada has made a large number of friends. All over the world you run into ambassadors who have served in Ottawa and who have left as friends of Canada. It is very important that we appreciate this work being done here and also that we learn from them because each and everyone of them has a great deal to offer.

Disarmament

Canadian efforts in the world of today have been directed in various fields. Perhaps the most important has been the field of disarmament. When I mention disarmament I mean not only the attempt to reach agreement on the reduction of arms but also the effort to bring about a cessation in the development of more fearsome weapons. There are two sides to the picture: cutting down existing weapons and preventing the invention and development of weapons which are becoming steadily more destructive.

From the start Canada has participated in disarmament negotiations commencing as far back as 1946 or 1947. Our most recent efforts in the negotiating field, were as a member of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee which was set up by the Foreign Ministers of the United Kingdom, the United States, France and the Soviet Union at Geneva in the summer of 1959.

As Hon. Members know, these negotiations began in the spring of 1960, but in June they were broken off when the five Eastern members walked out. In August, following that walkout, Canada and the United States succeeded in bringing about a meeting of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations which is composed of all the member nations.

At that meeting we got through a unanimous resolution calling for a resumption of the disarmament negotiations at the earliest possible date. Nothing had been done when the General Assembly met in September and Canada then introduced a disarmament resolution, co-sponsored by Sweden and Norway, which in essence called for a prompt resumption of negotiations for the selection of a neutral as chairman and for co-operation of the United Nations with the negotiators through the Disarmament Commission. For example, we had in mind that the Disarmament Commission should set up ad hoc committees to assist the negotiators and also to check the work that they were doing. Eventually, we were able to get a total of 18 co-sponsors for that resolution.

However, the atmosphere at the United Nations last fall was very tense and that ... is putting it in mild language. It really was worse than that. It was very difficult to have agreement reached on any question, let alone on the subject of disarmament. We were not able to gain our objective before the adjournment in December. Fortunately, during the session which ended last Saturday morning, there was far less tension. I cannot say whether or not this was because there had been a change of administration in the United States or because everyone was tired of that quarrelsome attitude just as we in this House get tired of such an atmosphere after a few hours and decide it might be better to be less pugnacious. There is a good deal of the element of human nature in the deliberations of the United Nations, just as there is in those of the Canadian House of Commons.

Whatever the cause, there has been far less tension in the United Nations during these recent weeks.

Eventually, the United States and the Soviet Union, with a good deal of assistance and a good deal of prompting from other nations -- I am not being immodest when I say Canada took a prominent part in this prompting and in these negotiations -- decided that they would get together and try to arrange for the resumption of disarmament negotiations at about the end of July of this year. After all, these two nations are the key nations in any disarmament negotiations. They brought in a joint resolution before the General Assembly which was passed unanimously. They were unable to agree on the composition of the negotiating group. One side had suggested that there should be an impartial chairman and vice chairman. The other side wanted five uncommitted countries added to the five Eastern and the five Western countries. Agreement was not finally reached, but I believe that in these intervening weeks that question can be worked out.

One fact which was of great help was that at the Prime Ministers' Conference in London in March there was a statement issued on disarmament which was published as an annex to the final communiqué. Here was a statement agreed to by all the Commonwealth Prime Ministers on this question of disarmament. It contained the following very significant and very helpful paragraph:

The principal military powers should resume direct negotiations without delay in close contact with the United Nations, which is responsible for disarmament under the Charter. Since peace is the concern of the whole world, other nations should also be associated with the disarmament negotiations, either directly or through some special machinery to be set up by the United Nations or by both means.

Canada is working now in preparation for the resumption of disarmament negotiations. As Hon. Members know Lieutenant General E.L.M. Burns is our adviser on this subject and he would be heading any Canadian delegation participating in disarmament talks. I believe there is good reason to expect real progress in the field of disarmament during the present year.

Nuclear Tests

Hon. Members will recall that Canada has taken a firm position on the question of nuclear tests. Time and again we have said we are against any further nuclear weapons tests. We continue to follow with the greatest attention the developments in the three-power negotiations which are taking place now in Geneva on this parallel question of finding a way to end further nuclear weapons tests. This conference is one which has never been broken up. It has been going on now for nearly three years, but has been adjourned from time to time. Agreement has been reached on many aspects of the problem but there has been no final agreement and yet, during the whole of that time, not one of those three participating nations has undertaken a nuclear test. There has been a voluntary moratorium during this intervening period. This moratorium has continued until today, in spite of the demands from people, for instance in the United States, that further tests are essential and that testing should be resumed.

Before the Christmas break in the recent session of the General Assembly, the Canadian position on nuclear tests was once again reaffirmed by our votes in support of two resolutions asking to reinforce the present moratorium on nuclear weapons tests. Canadian opposition to testing is based not only on concern for the radiation hazard but also on its belief that the prevention of testing will inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons.

With this consideration in mind Canada also voted in the General Assembly for an Irish proposal aimed at limiting the spread of nuclear weapons at the independent disposal of national governments. Consistent with the Canadian view that temporary measures are no substitute for disarmament -- and this Irish resolution, of course, was a temporary measure -- under effective international control, the Canadian vote on this resolution was explained as follows, and I am now quoting from the statement made by my Parliamentary Secretary the Hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt):

"Here again, however, I must emphasize the importance of the time factor. We have stressed over and over again the necessity of resuming negotiations on disarmament and we think that the threat of the further spread of nuclear weapons is one of the most important reasons for getting on with these negotiations. If no steps are taken toward disarmament -- if, indeed, we do not have even a beginning to serious negotiations on this subject -- no country will be content to sit by in the hope that goodwill alone will prevent the widespread dissemination of these weapons. For our part I must say quite clearly that Canada would not be able to accept this state of affairs for very long. We have worked and we will continue to work with every resource at our command to achieve an agreement on disarmament which would include provisions to deal with the frightening problem of nuclear weapons. If, however, there is no significant progress in this field in the immediate future, we will consider our position on the temporary measures which are proposed in this resolution."

Another field to which Canadian efforts have been directed in the United Nations itself. Here, Mr. Speaker, may I say a word of praise for my Parliamentary Secretary, for the Members of Parliament, Senator Blois and other Canadians who have represented Canada during this last session. At the United Nations the work is hard. I would never admit that fact to the delegation when I am in New York but, now that they are all safely home, I must admit that they work very much harder there than we do here in Ottawa. The hours are long. Constantly coming up for consideration are resolutions and amendments. There are other delegations to canvass and there are receptions to attend, and they are also quite a hazard. This is a full-time job for anybody who represents Canada at the United Nations, not only as a delegate but also as an observer. There our people have worked as a team. There are no differences between the parties. We are all there as a Canadian team. This is the main reason why the Canadian delegation has been so successful during this last session.

For the first time we have had observers from the Senate. I must say that I have found them also to be extremely helpful. When there is a snap decision to be made in a complicated situation, it helps a great deal for a Foreign Affairs Minister to be able to talk to an old friend from the Senate who has been in the House of Commons for many years, even though in another party, and to get his view as to what Canada should do. I have appreciated more than I can say the advice and the assistance that I have received during this last session from those Senators who have been in attendance.

At the United Nations we are in contact with 98 other delegations. It is a wonderful place to make friends and to sell Canada. I use the word "sell" in the constructive sense. I think this is one of the main jobs of the Canadian delegation. That job has been done very well during this last session.

We were greatly helped by the results of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. It was amazing to see the reaction among the representatives from Africa and Asia after that Conference. They, of course, had been following very closely what went on in London. They were extremely pleased with the stand taken by the Canadian Prime Minister, and our work with those delegations was made a great deal easier and a great deal more successful by reason of Canada's position on the question of apartheid which was so important at the Prime Ministers' Conference.

The Congo

One of our main problems at the United Nations has been that of the Congo. We are one of the three European and North American countries with any considerable number of troops in the Congo. Because of those troops Canada has been a member of the 18-nation Congo Advisory Committee. There are differences of opinion on that Committee. The African nations do not always agree and neither do the nations of Asia. Our main purpose has been to keep this pot from boiling over, to try to reduce the friction in the Congo Committee and to help the Secretary-General take action which would be effective.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of the session last September he has been under terrific attacks, and very unfair attacks they have been. Sometimes I wonder why any human being would feel obliged to take all the abuse that has been handed out to Mr. Hammarskjold in these last six or seven months. However, he is a great world statesman who is there doing a job for humanity. I suppose the realization of this fact has been what has enabled him to withstand these attacks and to carry on in such a calm and efficient manner. Canada has felt that there should be no qualifications to our support for the Secretary-General while he was under attacks of this kind.

Another important feature of this last session has been the question of financing. Some countries will not pay their share. Communist Bloc countries, for example, will pay nothing towards the expenses of the Congo operation. They pay nothing towards the cost of the United Nations Emergency Force. Other nations claim they are not able to pay. This has been one of the most difficult questions faced by the United Nations.

As one of its final acts in the early hours of last Saturday morning, the General Assembly voted a resolution which approved the expenditure of \$100 million for the Congo operation for the period January 1, 1961, to October 31, 1961, that is, for ten months. The new session will convene in September, so this financial arrangement straddles the intervening period. It opened an ad hoc account for the 1961 expenditures as it had done for the 1960 expenditures. At the same time it decided to apportion the \$100 million as expenses of the organization in accordance with the scale of assessment for the regular budget. It provided for rebates of up to 80 per cent on some of the lowest assessments in an effort to assist some of the less-developed nations in meeting their financial obligations.

What this means is that the United States will be paying a very large part of the amount required. As Hon. Members will be aware from newspaper and radio reports, this resolution was finally adopted after a great deal of difficulty and after it had failed in its original form to secure the required two-thirds majority in the plenary body. As I explained earlier in my remarks, there was a second vote and it carried.

In addition, the Canadian Delegation tabled a draft resolution in the Fifth Committee which called for a thorough discussion at the sixteenth session, that is, the next one, of the administrative and budgetary procedures of the organization with a view to their improvement and to meeting the peace-keeping costs of the United Nations. Our draft resolution also provided for the appointment of a working group to study these procedures with particular reference to the establishment of a peace and security fund and a peace and security scale of assessments. It was put forward when it became evident that the sentiment at the resumed session was in favour of continuing to deal with the costs of the Congo operation on an ad hoc basis. Our object was to ensure that this approach would not be continued indefinitely and that serious consideration would be given to more permanent solutions to the organization's financial difficulties at the sixteenth session. We believe these expenses should be considered as part of the regular United Nations budget.

In committee this Canadian resolution was amended to take out the main feature. Our Delegation found itself obliged to vote against its own resolution as altered by these unacceptable amendments. However, when the resolution came before the plenary body the objectionable amendments failed to get the two-thirds vote

required, so they went out and our own resolution as it had been originally drawn, with minor changes, got the two-thirds vote necessary. Thus we finally succeeded in getting our way on this particular question.

There is much more that could be said about the session, but the Hon. Member for Oxford will be giving the House further details. Before I leave this subject I should like to make one plea on behalf of the United Nations. The Canadian Government attaches a great deal of importance to continued development in Canada of an informed public opinion on United Nations matters. It is very much aware of, and grateful for, the efforts which are being made in this direction by a wide variety of groups and associations of dedicated Canadians. Special mention might be made of the activities of the United Nations Association in Canada. That Association, through its national and branch offices, has taken the lead in stimulating public interest in the work of the United Nations. It has done this in a variety of ways, through the distribution of information material, the regular publication of a number of pamphlets and assistance in the organization of student United Nations groups. These groups, by the way, have been very successful. I have attended two or three of their meetings myself and have been much impressed. In addition, lectures have been organized, university and school seminars arranged, and so on. The success of these efforts so far has been reflected in the greater awareness in Canada of the value of the United Nations not only to less fortunate people in other parts of the world but to Canadians as well. Such efforts deserve the full support of the Canadian people, and I suggest they deserve the full support of the Members of this House of Commons.

Commonwealth Programme

I turn now to another field to which Canadian efforts have been directed. I have mentioned the Commonwealth. I have already said something about the Prime Ministers' Conference and about the effects of decisions made there on our daily contacts with Asian and African nations. The addition of new members to this community continues. Sierra Leone will become a full-fledged member tomorrow and Tanganyika is to get its independence on December 28 of this year. Next year it is hoped the West Indies Federation will join the Commonwealth family, and so the story unfolds. Various other countries will be coming into the Commonwealth in the years that lie ahead.

Canada now has a very important part to play in the Commonwealth. This has been one effect of the decision taken in London. We now have a closer working relationship with Asian and African members of the Commonwealth than we had before, and we are in a preferred position to work with them in connection with problems arising not only within the Commonwealth but in other parts of the world.

The Canadian Government has placed great stress on the Commonwealth Scholarship Plan. It was designed to enable 1,000 young graduates in various parts of the Commonwealth to undertake a two-year course in another Commonwealth nation. Canada is to provide for 250; our objective is 250 at all times studying here under this Commonwealth plan. Because this is a two-year course we had only some 101 during the past year but there will be an additional number coming in the fall, and we think that at the end of the present fiscal year there will be in Canada about 230 such students from other parts of the Commonwealth. I do not have the figure for the Canadians studying abroad under this scheme. It is not as large as the number coming here, but quite a significant number of young Canadians have benefited under the Commonwealth Scholarship Plan.

In addition we have initiated a special Commonwealth African Aid Programme which is to cost Canada \$10,500,000 spread over a period of three years. We have asked for a vote of \$3,500,000 for this particular work during the present fiscal year. The aid will go to independent members of the Commonwealth in Africa, and those who are approaching independence. Information on the needs of these countries is now being collected so that effective and useful programmes can be carried out. We believe that assistance in education will be one of the greatest needs, and already requests have been received for a number of teachers in various fields.

In this connection there has been a very interesting development in that the Province of Manitoba has decided to share in this work. In May of last year, Premier Roblin expressed a desire to co-operate with the Federal Government in providing teachers for under-developed Commonwealth countries. We welcomed his offer, and a project in Ceylon was suggested as a pilot scheme. Three instructors are required for an institute of technology in Ceylon and an arrangement has now been worked out with the Province of Manitoba under which it will recruit three teachers and pay their regular salaries amounting to \$30,000 and the Federal Government will provide transportation, overseas bonuses and living allowances, costing from \$20,000 to \$25,000 per year. This Federal Government share will be part of our regular Colombo Plan technical assistance programme. We believe this is a very helpful development and we will be interested in entering into similar schemes with any of the other provincial governments.

Another field is that of the French-speaking African states. At the United Nations most of these states became members last year. They are very much interested in Canada because we are a bilingual country. They feel they have a closer kinship with us than with countries where French is not one of the official languages. In this work the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin), who was one of our delegates, has been particularly helpful, as well as the parliamentary observers from the Province of Quebec. Their main task during this session has been to keep in touch with delegates

from these French-speaking African countries. I believe that as a result a friendship has been built up there which has been of great value to Canada; and we hope of great value to these African nations as well.

Earlier this week I announced a scholarship plan involving \$300,000 per year to provide for training in several French-speaking universities in Canada and for sending teachers abroad to these French-speaking nations in Africa. Some of these countries have put out feelers with regard to the establishment of diplomatic missions in Ottawa. We are very interested in establishing one or two missions in certain of these French-speaking countries in Africa. The Ambassador to France, Mr. Pierre Dupuy, visited all of these French-speaking African countries in November and December and brought back a most interesting report in which he pointed out that they need, primarily, help in education and in health matters. We believe this is a field in which Canada can render efficient service, and one in which we can gain a large number of new friends.

NATO

Then we have the NATO field. I had intended to go into this at some length but I think perhaps I had better not do that today. There will be greater opportunity in this regard in the Committee.

There is to be a NATO Ministerial Meeting in Oslo from May 8 to May 10, and I expect to head the Canadian Delegation to that meeting. It will not be dealing at length with defence matters because the defence ministers are not attending, but there will be consideration given to long range planning for NATO. For example, there will be questions having to do with consultation and ways in which consultation between members of the alliance can be improved. Canada has always been very much concerned about this particular aspect of NATO activities. It is not easy to have adequate consultation among the representatives of 15 nations, but down through the years there has been built up an understanding and friendship among the representatives, and in my opinion, the methods of consultation are steadily improving.

There are different approaches by different nations and, as a matter of fact, some members of the alliance think that we should adopt a uniform policy on all questions regardless of whether or not they have to do directly with the NATO areas. Canada has never gone that far, our opinion being that there should be consultation on all questions which affect the members of the alliance but that it is not essential that they should adopt a bloc policy. This is particularly true with regard to the United Nations. We believe it would be unwise for the NATO nations to act as a bloc in the United Nations because there are many issues which do not directly affect the NATO alliance as a whole, and on which the views of different members of NATO vary. We believe it would be unwise to attempt to put NATO in a strait jacket in that way.

In Oslo we shall also discuss the international situation generally. There are many problems arising in all parts of the world which will be considered, and our general approach is that Canada should do everything possible to strengthen NATO. In this connection we attach considerable importance to the efforts which are being made in the context of long-term planning to define the main problems and objectives of the alliance with a view to charting a guide line for the future. At the same time we believe that in preparing for the future years we should not minimize or under-rate NATO's accomplishments, and in particular, the essential contribution it has made and continues to make to the preservation of world peace and security.

As a going concern NATO's future viability will depend largely on its ability to adapt itself to a changing world; a world of emerging new nations and revitalized old ones. It has to face complex new challenges, political, economic, psychological, as well as military, which are continuing to develop.

One of the striking features of the world today is that the situations which pose a serious potential threat to world peace often arise in the peripheral areas of the globe, as for example, in the Congo and Laos.

Canada believes that to deal with such situations we must often rely on the activities of agency or peace-keeping machinery sponsored by or under the auspices of broadly-based organizations such as the United Nations. We consider that these peace-keeping activities are complementary to the efforts of the alliance to maintain world peace and security. Canada believes that the long-term aims of the alliance can be furthered if all members are prepared to recognize the important role of those peace-keeping activities in the preservation of world peace and are willing to lend their full support.

During the debate there may be some discussion with regard to trade and economic matters and the role of NATO in that particular field. I believe that the objectives of the new Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development known as the O.E.C.D. are fully consistent with those embodied in Article II of the North Atlantic Treaty alliance. Indeed, the new organization reflects the continuing desire of NATO countries to develop closer and more intimate relations in the economic field and provides an opportunity to translate into concrete measures and achievement the aims of Article II. NATO, however, continues to have a most important role to play in assessing the implications for the alliance of the economic developments and policies of the Sino-Soviet Bloc and, through consultations, in developing the political will among NATO countries to find solutions for economic problems which threaten to weaken the alliance or which threaten to provide opportunities for the extension of Communist influence. In the words of Mr. Spaak, NATO can and must serve as the "political conscience" of the Atlantic community of Nations. We shall be doing our best to build

up and promote activities of NATO in this field, although quite a large part of the field will be covered by this O.E.C.D.

With regard to NATO, I realize that my hon. friend from Assiniboia and his fellow members of the C.C.F. party are of the opinion that Canada should withdraw from this alliance. As he knows, the Government does not agree with that suggestion. We feel it would be a great mistake for Canada to take a step of that kind. ...

Representatives of the Canadian Labour Congress presented their brief to the Government on February 2 of this year and on page 30, under the heading "Neutrality No Solution", we find the following:

"While looking toward world disarmament, the Congress does not believe that Canada can make a contribution in this direction by unilateral disarmament or by pursuing a policy of armed or disarmed neutrality."

The brief goes on:

"For reasons geographic, economic and historical, Canada must work in concert with those nations which share her outlook and interests, while at all times preserving her own integrity and striving for a world in which blocs and alliances will be obsolete."

The Western Hemisphere

... Let me leave the Old World and come back to the Western Hemisphere where we really belong. I should like to say a word or two about our relations with the United States and with the Latin American countries. Canada continues to be on a basis with the United States under which it is possible for us to consult on all problems of mutual interest and to do so in a most effective way. We have had the utmost co-operation from President Kennedy and from his Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and from Mr. Adlai Stevenson, the Permanent Representative of the United States at the United Nations. I am confident that it will be possible to continue in this friendly effective way with the representatives of our great neighbour nation.

As Hon. Members know, we were successful in negotiating a treaty with the United States concerning the Columbia River. This was done after a great deal of time and effort had been expended. Now, of course, we are in a position where questions are being raised by the Province of British Columbia which, of necessity, is involved in this whole transaction. This is not the place to go into that in any great detail.

I should like to say a word about Latin America. As Hon. Members know, we have been very anxious to build up our relationship with the 20 republics of Latin America and we have met with considerable success in this regard. We now have diplomatic relations

with all but two of the Latin American countries. Of course, in some cases there is double accreditation. For example, we are establishing a new embassy in Costa Rica and the ambassador to that country will also represent Canada in Nicaragua, Honduras and Panama. As I have said, we have diplomatic relations with all but two of the Latin American countries and in one of those two we have a trade mission.

There have been serious problems in connection with Cuba. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Canada has continued to maintain normal diplomatic and commercial relations with Cuba through these recent troubled months. In doing so, Canada has acted in a manner consistent with common international practice. No country except the United States has placed a comprehensive ban on trade with Cuba and Canada has not had the same grounds as the United States for taking such action.

While Canadian businessmen have remained free to carry on peaceful trade with Cuba, the Canadian Government has used existing regulations to prevent the export of strategic goods to that country. This is in keeping with Canada's general policy of prohibiting the export of military material to areas of tension anywhere in the world. The Canadian Government has also seen to it that the United States embargo should not be evaded by transshipment through Canada. It has permitted the export to Cuba of only such United States goods as might be exported directly from the United States to Cuba.

These policies remain in force. As the Prime Minister recently pointed out, Canada's practice over the years has been to carry on normal relations with countries of a different philosophy.

I am sure members would be interested to know that Canada's exports to Cuba in November of last year amounted to \$1.4 million compared with \$1.7 million in November of 1959 while in December of last year our exports were \$2.4 million compared with \$1.4 million in the same month the year before. In each of these months last year the United States sold more than twice as much to Cuba as Canada did in spite of all the restrictions the Americans have imposed. For the whole of the year 1960 our exports to Cuba amounted to \$13 million whereas in 1959 they were \$15.1 million or \$2.1 million higher than in 1960.

I might add with regard to Cuba that the Government is sincerely hopeful that a peaceful solution will soon be found for the conflicts troubling Cuba. I am sure Hon. Members will join me in looking forward to the day when an independent Cuba, free of all outside pressure, will choose to resume its traditionally close relations with the nations of this hemisphere. ...

I should like also to say a word about Chile. About a year ago, when the brave people of that country were suffering so terribly as a result of earthquakes, we had the opportunity to give them some help by supplying foodstuffs and air transportation, and

in other ways, I think that these actions on our part have resulted in the building up of a very fine relationship between our two countries. Canada, of course, was doing only what any humane country would do. We were delighted to be able to help them. But they have shown great gratitude. Recently our Ambassador to Chile had the opportunity to travel throughout the stricken area of Southern Chile and there he was shown records of the distribution of Canadian flour to hundreds of needy persons. He found the most kindly feeling toward our country.

As another sequel to the airlift assistance we were able to give, the Ambassador of Chile on April 20, on behalf of the Chilean Air Force, presented the Prime Minister with a plaque to commemorate the R.C.A.F.'s part in flying relief supplies to Chile. In the United Nations we found that Chile gave us help time and again. They were one of the first to co-sponsor our resolution on disarmament and we believe there has been a very fine friendship established between our two countries.

Hon. Members may wonder what is the present position with regard to Canada joining the Organization of American States. I have mentioned this question in many speeches during the last year. It has aroused a good deal of interest. Some branches of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs have undertaken to study the question and to let me know the results of their study. The policy of finding out from the Canadian people just what they think about this aspect of foreign policy is progressing very well. We are not yet in a position to make a decision as to whether or not Canada should join this Organization. We took steps to send observers to the meeting of the Organization of American States which was to have been held in Quito, Ecuador, next month. However, we received word today that the Conference will be going ahead. It is gratifying to see in Canada the increasing interest in this question. I am wondering whether Canada is wise in adopting an isolationist policy with regard to the western hemisphere. However, that is part of the argument on one side.

I do suggest to Hon. Members that they give this whole question deep thought, and that they discuss it with their constituents. It would be a big step in Canadian foreign policy if we were to join this western hemisphere organization. I think the decision should be taken only when it is fairly clear that the majority of the Canadian people are in favour of this being done.

The Pacific Area

The final field of activity toward which we are directing our attention is in the Pacific. Yesterday I announced that a call for a cease fire had been issued by the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. as Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference of 1954. They had invited India, as Chairman of the Truce Supervisory Commission, to call the Commission together in New Delhi. In addition, they called for a conference of 14 nations to be held in Geneva on May 12. If Hon. Members read these letters, they will observe that the first job of

the Commission, which is Canada's main concern, will be to discuss the question of the tasks and functions which should be allotted to the Commission if there is a cease-fire in Laos.

The Commission is to hold these discussions in New Delhi, not in Laos, and then present an appropriate report to the Co-Chairmen, Russia and Great Britain, who will consider the Commission's report and give the Commission directions on going to Laos to carry out the work of controlling the cease-fire. This is not a perfect scheme because, at the first, we are going to be working in New Delhi, a thousand miles or so away from Laos.

In addition, it is not clear just what the tasks of the Commission will be if the cease-fire should take place. We are hoping that there will be a cease-fire promptly and that the Commission can be sent into Laos promptly and can be sent in before the Conference meets in Geneva on May 12. This is the intention, as explained by the United Kingdom, and I am hoping that things will work out in that way. Canada will do her full part. It is important that there should be peace in that part of Southeast Asia if for no other reason than that a war there might lead to war all over the world. We are in a position to make a contribution in the area, and we will be glad to do so. ...

Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, who is the key man in the picture today, requested in 1958 that the Commission get out of Laos. The majority of the members, India and Canada, voted accordingly and the Commission did get out of that country. The belief at the time was, of course, that a stable government had been established and that there would be no further need for that Commission. ...

We are also in a very influential position across the Pacific by virtue of our participation in the Colombo Plan. This has made us various friends in that area and Canada has an important voice in bringing about decisions across the Pacific which will be of general benefit to our nation as well as to the rest of the world.

I should like to say a final word about China. I feel quite sure that the Hon. Member for Assiniboia and his associates will be dealing with that subject in their remarks. I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition or the Hon. Member for Essex East will be very vocal about this particular question. During the Liberal convention last January a resolution was passed with regard to the entry of Red China into the United Nations which advocated that Canada should no longer vote for a moratorium on the discussion of this question in the United Nations. This resolution, of course, did not go very far. While that particular procedure has been followed for some years, the introduction of the moratorium resolution has not prevented an effective debate on the real issue of the admission of Red China. The step taken by the opposition in their convention does not go more than three or four inches ahead of the position which was adopted by the former Government and which has been followed by the present Government with regard to the discussion of the subject in the United Nations.

May I say, too, that the world does not stand still. Changes keep occurring everywhere, and certainly the question of Red China is one of the most interesting and important questions now under consideration by the External Affairs Department. Everyone knows the policy we have adopted, and if and when there is a change in that policy it will be announced in the ordinary manner. One fact Canadians should remember is that there are a great many people living on Formosa who are native Formosans. No one is anxious to have them turned over to Red China. I think this would be a disastrous move to make, yet Red China is not interested in recognition or entry into the United Nations unless her right to take over Formosa is accepted. This, of course, has been one of the very big obstacles in the way of taking steps to change the present situation. Eventually, the wishes of the people of Formosa will have to be an important factor. In considering this whole question I suggest that it would be wise for Canadians not to forger the important factor of Formosa in the whole picture.

- - - - -

I think I have never made such a long speech ... in my Parliamentary career and I hope never to do it again. However, in conclusion may I say this. As Hon. Members know and as they will have found from this sketchy review of problems arising in all parts of the world, Canada is involved everywhere. In practically every part of the world Canada is involved in one way or another, to an extent and in such a manner that she can do something about every one of these problems. I suggest that this is a great challenge to the Canadian people. Whether we accept that challenge, whether we play our full part in world affairs -- the part which is there to be played by Canada -- will, of course, depend on the will of the Canadian people to participate, the idealism and optimism of the Canadian people and the sacrifices they are prepared to make.

I believe that Canada can render a service to mankind as a whole in the field of foreign affairs and, as the Minister responsible for Canada's activities abroad, it will be my objective to do just that. I ask for the support of the Members of the House, regardless of party, in bringing these facts to the attention of the Canadian people, thus helping to make it possible for the Canadian people to realize the challenge which faces them and to realize the opportunity for Canada to do something worth while in the world. If we make that attempt we shall be going a long way toward making our nation the type of nation we all think it should be.