



# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

60/11

## CURRENT INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS- A CANADIAN VIEW

Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Howard C. Green, to the House of Commons on February 10, 1960.

... I find that the Canadian people are very much interested in external affairs. Fortunately, or unfortunately, they are much more interested in what the Secretary of State for External Affairs says than they were in what he said as Minister of Public Works. Probably we underestimate the intense interest of the Canadian people in world affairs at the present time. After all, is it any wonder that such should be the case? Because it just may be that the whole of our civilization is at stake, depending upon what is done by the various nations.

In my remarks today I intend to deal with nine different subjects. They are disarmament, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Commonwealth, Canadian-United States relations, Latin America, Canada and the Pacific, the Middle East, the United Nations, and the Law of the Sea. If I find that time is going I may possibly delay my remarks on the Law of the Sea until we get into the Committee on External Affairs.

Before going on with these nine different subjects, I have two general comments to make.

The first is that in the world today Canada has only friends and no enemies. She is a comparatively young nation with an excellent record, for which credit is due to those Canadians who have been in positions of responsibility down through the years. Canada is a nation with no designs on anyone, a nation whose people approach world affairs with an unselfish attitude, and also a nation whose people have great capacity for friendship. I repeat that Canada today has only friends and no enemies.

For this situation, too, we owe a great deal to those distinguished representatives from abroad who have come here to man the embassies and the high commissioners' offices. They keep us informed of the views of their respective countries, and they go home at the end of their term, or to another post, friends of Canada. They have played through the years a very important

part in spreading good will for Canada throughout the world. I should like to pay that tribute to them today, and to thank the members of the present Diplomatic Corps who have been of great help to me in these last eight months.

The second thought I should like to place before the House is that the time has come to drop the idea that Canada's role in world affairs is to be an "honest broker" between the nations. We must decide instead that our role is to be to determine the right stand to take on problems, keeping in mind the Canadian background and, above all, using Canadian common sense. In effect, the time has come to take an independent approach.

I do not want to leave the impression for one minute that former governments have not taken an independent approach, but across the country one has heard time and time again, "Oh, Canada can do a great deal by being honest broker between the nations, particularly between the big nations, by running from one to the other and suggesting that one should modify its attitude because the other one does not like it", and so on. This has been so particularly as it concerned dealings between the United Kingdom and the United States. Every member of the House will have heard comments to the effect that Canada should be interpreting the British to the Americans and the Americans to the British.

That idea used to appeal to me, and it may have been a wise plan to adopt at one time. But today the British and the Americans are just as close together as any two nations could be. They do not need any interpreters from Canada, or from any other place. Sometimes I think, when we do not agree with their policies, that they "gang up on Canada". I am not using the phrase "gang up" in any offensive way; if they think we are in the wrong, then it is natural that they should get together and try to do what they can to persuade us to change. It is all done in a very friendly way with the attitude that "this hurts me more than it hurts you". So we are all good friends. It is not as if there is any lack of friendship and understanding. But I do ask the Honourable Members of this House to consider whether Canada would not gain more respect in the years that lie ahead and exercise more influence if she forgot about this role of being a middle man or an honest broker.

Then to come to my first subject, the subject of disarmament. In my judgment the field of disarmament is the most important field for Canada in world affairs in 1960, because our nation is a member of the 10-Nation Disarmament Committee, which literally carries with it the hopes of mankind.

May I just outline something of the background? For many years there have been attempts to work out some system of disarmament both in the United Nations and outside. Canada, I think, has participated in every committee or commission on disarmament since these efforts began and has made a splendid contribution. But this work has been discouraging, and to a

degree disillusioning. During the summer of 1959, the position was that in the United Nations there was a Disarmament Commission whose function was supposed to be to work out some method of disarmament. As I understand it, the attempt had been made earlier to have a fairly small committee deal with the subject but it had been unsuccessful, so this United Nations Disarmament Commission was set up, consisting of every one of the 82 member states. You can imagine how difficult it would be for a Commission of that size to get results, and of course there were no results obtained.

Then last summer the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Russia spent many long weeks negotiating at Geneva. One result of their deliberations was that at the conclusion of their Conference they announced their intention of inviting Canada, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Poland and Roumania to join them on a new 10-Member Disarmament Committee. They announced at the time that this Committee was expected to be, and I am now quoting from their announcement:

"a useful means of exploring, through mutual consultations, every avenue of possible progress toward such agreements and recommendations of the limitation and reduction of all types of armaments and armed forces under effective international control as may, in the first instance, be of particular relevance to the countries participating in these deliberations".

It should be pointed out that five of those countries are Western countries and five are Eastern. All of the five Western countries belong to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and all of the five Eastern to the Warsaw Pact. Canada, of course, was perfectly willing to fall in with this idea and to serve on such a Committee.

The four big nations which had decided to set up the Committee so reported to the United Nations in September because, after all, here was the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations supposedly dealing with this question of disarmament, and it was essential that there should be some arrangement worked out between the 10-Member Committee and the large United Nations Disarmament Commission. The four big powers asked that the United Nations Disarmament Commission be convened to hear formally of the creation of the new Committee of Ten. These four powers, moreover, made it clear that the United Nations would be kept informed of progress in the deliberations of the Committee, because it was essential to keep the United Nations in the picture. After all, the only way in which a world-wide disarmament plan will be worked out will be under the aegis of the United Nations.

Canada was particularly concerned that the United Nations should be kept fully informed, and when I spoke in New York on September 24 I pointed out that the middle-sized and smaller powers must have an opportunity of being heard, since disarmament is of the deepest concern to all mankind. I said, further, that in Canada's work on the 10-Nation Committee we would at all times keep these considerations very much in mind.

At the United Nations last fall it was very clear that the delegates from every nation were far more interested in the question of disarmament than in any other question. They had witnessed a lessening of tension across the world. There had been a visit by Prime Minister Macmillan and Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd to the Soviet Union, and while we were in New York, Premier Khrushchov came to the United States. The two leading speeches in the opening debate at the United Nations were made by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and by Premier Khrushchov, and both dealt with disarmament; each speaker put forward a plan for disarmament. Thus, I repeat that at the United Nations there was tremendous interest in this question of disarmament, and I suggest that right around the world today there is a realization in the minds of millions of people that a nuclear war would be a catastrophe and that it would probably end civilization as we know it.

In these circumstances it was to be expected that the United Nations would fall in with the proposal of the four big powers that this Disarmament Committee should carry on the work on the question of disarmament. Something happened which had never happened at the United Nations before, I believe, when all 82 nations co-sponsored the resolution which provided United Nations facilities for the meetings of the 10-Power Committee. That resolution contained these words:

"The question of general and complete disarmament is the most important one facing the world today."

The Canadian Government realized from the start the vital role Canada could play in these disarmament deliberations, hence the appointment of Lieutenant-General E.L.M. Burns as Canada's representative at these discussions. I do not need to tell anyone in this House of the wonderful record of General Burns in two wars, as Deputy Minister of Veterans Affairs, then as Chairman of the Truce Supervision Body in Palestine and finally, as Commander of the United Nations Emergency Force. He is a man respected not only from coast to coast in Canada but by delegates from every member state in the United Nations. We were able to persuade Mr. Hammarskjold, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to release General Burns from his important command in the Middle East because the Secretary-General felt--and so did General Burns--that he could make an even greater contribution as a member of this Disarmament Committee.

In addition, Canada has opposed from the beginning any delay in the actual commencement of the work of the Disarmament Committee. We did this for several reasons, but principally because we were afraid that if there were not an early start there might be an increase in tension, and around the world people might become discouraged again and decide they would have to pay more attention to arming, with the result that the impetus gained by the friendly actions taken in 1959 might be lost. There was some inclination in some other countries to postpone the calling together of the Disarmament Committee until after the East-West summit meeting had been held. This is not to be held until the middle of May.

That would have meant that the Disarmament Committee would not have begun to function until June, or later. The next session of the United Nations would commence about the middle of September, and the 10 Nations would then be in the position of having nothing to report to the other 72 member nations who are depending on us to get some results on this question of disarmament.

As I said, Canada insisted from the start that there should be no delay in getting busy on this disarmament question. In Paris last December, when we were attending the NATO meetings, the Foreign Ministers of the five Western members on the Disarmament Committee were called together at the Quai d'Orsay and there we decided to invite the five Eastern members to commence the sittings of the Disarmament Committee on March 15. That invitation was accepted and the 10-Member Committee is to start its work on or about March 15, I believe, in Geneva. In addition we set January 18 as the date for the first meeting of representatives of the five Western members of this 10-Nation Committee. These meetings commenced in Washington on January 18 and have been continuing ever since.

At the same time, in Paris, the North Atlantic Treaty Council, which of course contains representatives from the 15 nations belonging to NATO, decided that the five Western nations on the Disarmament Committee would do all the preparatory work on disarmament for the East-West summit meeting and, further, that NATO would give all the help it could to the Disarmament Committee. You see, NATO is very much involved in the question of disarmament, because NATO has most of the forces which, of course, would be involved in disarmament and would have to work out many of the problems.

Thus the Five-Nation group of which Canada is a member has a double function. It is, first of all, to participate in the discussions with the five Eastern nations and, second, to do the preparatory work on disarmament for the United States, the United Kingdom and France for use by them at the East-West summit meeting. Arrangements were made to keep the NATO Council in the picture and that there should be regular reports to the Council. That plan is being carried out. The Five-Member Disarmament Committee is reporting to the Council from time to time.

To date, while the Five Nations have been meeting only since January 18, there has been considerable progress made. General Burns has been in Washington and he comes back here from time to time. I had an interview with him last Friday. Canada is putting forward her proposals which I am not at liberty to disclose as yet. Also we are getting great help from our own Department of National Defence.

There is a series of studies being made under the direction of the Five-Nation group and the whole situation is really hopeful. We believe that the general objective on this

question of disarmament must be to achieve a maximum of disarmament and reduction of military forces which could be verified and controlled and which is compatible with the maintenance of adequate security against aggression. However, no one should underestimate the difficulties that lie ahead nor look for universal panaceas in the near future.

There is no intention on the part of the Canadian Government to let down the guard so far as Canada is concerned, but we do believe that a genuine effort should be made to work out some scheme of disarmament. If every nation on that 10-Member Committee feels the same way about it, then there will be results which will benefit mankind. This should not be taken as meaning that, if the five Eastern countries will only approach it sincerely, there will be worthwhile results. I mean all ten nations both on the Eastern side and the Western side. If they all genuinely want disarmament in the world today then there will be disarmament.

The second subject is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO is essentially a defensive alliance and it has fulfilled this function. After all it was set up to prevent aggression by the Eastern nations. Whether or not they would have committed aggression no one can say but there has been no aggression during these ten years. NATO continues fulfilling that same function today and must continue doing so until there is actual controlled disarmament.

Canada is doing her full share in the Alliance. We have a magnificent brigade of troops in Europe and we have a thoroughly efficient air division which next to the air forces of the United States is the most powerful and effective air force in the NATO organization today.

Sometimes when I hear of the criticism of the Department of National Defence I think it would be worth-while for Canadians to recognize the fact that in peacetime Canada has abroad a permanent-force army. How difficult it is for any old soldier from the First World War to realize that. I think back to those days when my one ambition was to fulfil the terms of the song "When I get my civvy clothes on, Oh how happy I will be". I remember how everybody wanted to get out of Europe by the first boat and what a job it was to get them sorted out because everybody thought he should be on the first boat. The same thing was true of the Second War. We now have a permanent-force army and a permanent air force stationed in Europe. I repeat that Canada can hold her head high because of the contribution that is being made by her young men to the strength of NATO. ....

There is in that organization a spirit of comradeship built up over the last ten years which is very strong. These fifteen nations understand each other's viewpoint. There have been friendships made which will last for a lifetime. The leaders of all these countries are on the very best of terms and fundamentally the foundations of NATO go very deep. I do not believe there is any chance of the NATO Alliance breaking up.

Most of the European members of that Alliance have made an outstanding economic recovery. They are in a very strong position; for example, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium. Some, of course, are not in such a good position. Naturally there are problems.

Here you have these 15 nations and, as I say, there are problems. One which has worried Canada considerably has been to ensure adequate consultation. Last fall the big powers were talking about a summit meeting and other subjects and they were not agreeing. One thought this should be done and another thought that should be done, and instead of going to the NATO Council and airing their troubles there they said nothing about them. All the press in all the NATO countries started to speculate, as the press will do quite naturally. The press made quite a lot of good guesses, and the whole story was on the front page of all the papers in Canada, in the United States, in France and in England. The whole story was there, and yet there were no adequate consultations in NATO.

When I went to Paris in October I had an opportunity to speak to the NATO Council and emphasized on behalf of Canada that we thought there would have to be a far better system of consultation. I made the same submissions to President de Gaulle, to Prime Minister Debré and to Mr. Couve de Murville the Foreign Minister of France, also to Prime Minister Macmillan and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, and they all agreed. The Americans agreed at Camp David a few weeks later. Everybody was perfectly willing to consult, but they still were not consulting.

The smaller nations, of course, agreed with us that there was great need to get a somewhat better system.

One direct result was that, when the Western summit meeting was held in Paris in December, there were consultations in the NATO Council before that was held, and there were also consultations after. The Foreign Ministers of The Four came together and reported to the NATO Council. The report was not treated in a perfunctory way. It had quite a going over at that meeting of the Council which followed the meeting of The Four.

The same plan is to be followed this year. There is to be a meeting of the Heads of Government of the four Western Powers, I think in April but in any event there are to be consultations with the NATO Council at each stage.

France, of course, has a special problem in Algeria. After the events of the last 10 days or two weeks, I am sure the Canadian people will have a far clearer realization of the very difficult problems France has been facing and still faces in Algeria. She has an outstanding Foreign Minister in Mr. Couve de Murville. He speaks with great logic and great friendliness. He is very well liked in the NATO Council. I suggest that Canada must at all times have the deepest understanding for France and her problems. She, of course, is one of our mother countries,

and one feels that when he goes to her shores. I am of Anglo-Saxon descent, and yet when I went to Paris, in fact the minute I stepped off the plane, I felt that I was at home with members of the family. We were treated in just that way on both occasions that I had the privilege of visiting France. I repeat, so far as NATO is concerned, that in my judgement there certainly is no sign of any impending break-up. I hope there will be no more talk in Canada about possible break-up.

I should like to explain in a word or two the position of NATO in relation to European trade problems. This is not my field, of course; it comes under the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Finance. I had thought that NATO would be a forum for settling the difficulties about European trade, but when you remember that six of the NATO countries are in the Common Market--they are the Inner Six--and that only four of the European Free Trade Area known as the Outer Seven are in NATO, and that there are two from North America, Canada and the United States, and three, Greece, Turkey and Iceland, which are not in The Six or The Seven; and when you think that Sweden, Switzerland and Austria are not in NATO; when you look at this picture, you realize that NATO is not the place to work out the problems of trade in Europe. Hence the solution of these problems has been left to other organizations and including the possibility of a new organization being set up. Every one of the NATO countries is very anxious to do whatever it can to solve those difficult trading problems.

I should like to sum up what I have to say about NATO in these words. I believe it is remarkable that NATO has developed the way it has into a closely-knit and effective organization for collective defence and co-operation in many important non-military fields. Its strength derives in large measure from the freedom and independence which its members exercise and from the strong ties of history, culture and friendship, which the nations of Western Europe share with Canada and the United States. With this background, I believe we can be confident that any differences which arise out of the Alliance will be resolved, as they have in the past, in a spirit of friendship and mutual regard for each other's interests.

I go on to the Commonwealth. Canada's relations with each one of the other nine members of the Commonwealth are excellent. All 10 members value this membership very highly. Why should they not? As members of the Commonwealth, they have far more influence than any one of them could possibly have alone.

Another reason why they place great value on this membership is that today the Commonwealth is obviously the best bridge between the continents, playing a significant part in world affairs and of necessity working for peace. This Commonwealth of ours is so spread out around the world that it must work for peace. If there should be war the Commonwealth would be in far more trouble than the United States or the Soviet Union because, as I say, it is so scattered across the globe, and certainly everyone in the Commonwealth at the present time is working for peace.



Another reason why great value is placed on membership is that the Commonwealth is steadily growing and growing in a way that sets an example to all the rest of the world. On October 1 of this year Nigeria is to become a free nation and of its own free will a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. Nigeria is one of the leading countries in Africa with over 30 million people, the most populous country on that continent, and I believe it has the stability and the organization to make a splendid contribution, not only in the Commonwealth but also in the United Nations and in world affairs generally. This nation is one more that is being launched as an independent nation under the leadership of the United Kingdom and the other members of the Commonwealth.

We think of the launching of India, that great country which has been such a friend of Canada from the time it first got its independence, of Pakistan and Ceylon, both similarly great friends of Canada, of Ghana, Malaya and now Nigeria; and, shortly to come, the West Indies Federation, Uganda, Tanganyika and Kenya, and sooner or later the problems of the Central African Federation will be worked out. When we think of these developments going on in the Commonwealth at this time, we have every reason to be proud of our membership in that organization.

I know from my own discussions in London with Lord Home, Secretary for Commonwealth Relations, and Selwyn Lloyd that these British statesmen are deeply concerned about launching these new nations. They are putting much thought into working out the best plan to help these nations gain their independence. Here is statesmanship of the highest order.

In these short months the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth will be meeting and there further great steps forward will be taken. I think of the contribution our own Prime Minister made in 1957 when, within a few days of taking over his present position, he got on a plane and went to London to participate in a Commonwealth Conference and there gave splendid leadership which had a great deal to do with making the Conference the success that it was. He will be leaving us again for the meetings which commence early in May. Because of the contacts and friendships he made with leaders of all the other Commonwealth nations at the Conference in 1957 and during his tour in 1958, I believe that Canada can do a great deal at the Conference in May of 1960 to strengthen further the Commonwealth and to help to implement the plans for launching new members on the world scene.

There is one other aspect of Commonwealth relations which is very important to us at the present time and that is the plan for Commonwealth scholarships. It was in 1958 at a Conference in Montreal that arrangements were made to set up a Commonwealth Scholarship Plan and that Plan is now about to function. Last summer a Commonwealth Conference on Education was held in England which took further steps toward implementing the Scholarship Plan. It approved a Canadian proposal for an exchange of high-level academic scholarships between different parts of the Commonwealth. It was agreed that a total of 1,000 scholarships

should be exchanged between the nations of the Commonwealth, and Canada undertook to place 250 students from other parts of the Commonwealth in Canadian universities and other educational institutions at a cost of about \$1 million per year.

To guide Canada's participation in the Scholarship Plan, the Government has appointed a Canadian Scholarship Committee. The Committee is working smoothly in receiving applications from students in other Commonwealth countries who wish to study in Canada and in processing the applications of Canadians who wish to study abroad under the Plan. I am hoping that this fall 100 to 125 students from other parts of the Commonwealth will come to Canada under the Plan. They will be here for a two-year term and at the start there will be about 125.

Also at the Conference in the United Kingdom the more advanced countries agreed to provide assistance in the general field of education to their less-developed partners. Canada undertook to provide assistance by sending teams of teachers abroad to assist in training teachers in other countries, and to receive trainees for the same purpose in this country. Work is under way to implement that portion of the policy.

The fourth subject is Canada-United States relations. One might make a very long speech on this subject but today I merely wish to say that relations with the United States also are excellent. They are on a personal basis between our own Prime Minister and the President of the United States, between the Secretary of State and myself and between various other Ministers of the two Governments. This is true also at the ambassadorial level. Canada is extremely well served in Washington by our Ambassador there, Arnold Heeney. He is very well liked in Washington and I think he is doing a splendid job. Similarly, the United States Ambassador in Ottawa, the Hon. Mr. Wigglesworth, is giving splendid representation here. The relationship between the two countries at every level could not be better.

There has been a very significant step taken within the last year or two in the setting up of a Joint Legislative Committee, composed of members of the Senate and the House of Commons and of the United States Senate and House of Representatives. This Committee will be meeting again, in Washington this time, within the next few weeks. This informal group has done a great deal to help create understanding in the respective legislative chambers. Of course, there are also the relationships between private citizens of the two countries, which are probably on a more intimate and friendly basis than those between private citizens of any two other countries in the world.

We had a very successful visit at Camp David early in November when the Joint Ministerial Committee on Defence met. We were able to sit around in the lounge of the main building and discuss views frankly on a man to man basis, with both sides feeling free to make any complaints or any suggestions. I feel the results were very beneficial. I am sure this means a lot to Canadians and, of course, it does also to the people of the United States.

In the world today this is a very important relationship. One good example of the result is that tomorrow there will be negotiations taking place in Ottawa between the representatives of the United States and Canada concerning the development of the Columbia River. Here we have another great scheme which can be developed only if there is co-operation between the two nations. If this development does take place it will mean a great deal to the citizens of both countries. The representatives of the two nations have been able to get together in a way which I am sure will bring about a solution of this problem.

We are having a similar experience with regard to the Passamaquoddy Project in the Maritimes. The International Joint Commission has been making studies of that Project, and I hope eventually it will be possible for some workable scheme to be devised which will be of benefit to the citizens of both the New England States and our own Maritime Provinces.

We have the same type of relationship with regard to another body of water. I refer to the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. This is a joint asset which probably no other two countries in the world can equal. Its use for the purposes of power production, recreation, navigation and the protection of commerce really startles the imagination. It has been necessary, in order to maintain this great resource, for Canada to deny requests, which otherwise we might have been able to entertain, from some United States interests who have wished to remove some of the water from this basin for other uses. It has been possible to sit down and talk the whole matter over with United States representatives. I believe there is a thorough understanding between the two nations as to just what is involved.

Sometimes I wonder whether it is realized in all parts of the United States, or even for that matter in all parts of Canada, just how vital the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes have been from the dawn of Canadian history. They have been the main geographic features in the development of Canada. Two-thirds of the people of our nation live in this area, and for us it is possibly of a great deal more significance than it is in the over-all United States picture. If that fact alone is realized, I believe that our difficulties with the United States on this question will eventually be solved.

Then, I come to the fifth subject, and will deal with only four more. I refer to Latin America. In what is known as Latin America there are 20 republics all imbued with the love of freedom and all very responsible members of the United Nations. Many of them took part in the old League of Nations. At the United Nations today, these 20 Latin American nations are making a great contribution. The current President, Dr. Belaunde of Peru, has been outstanding in fulfilling the functions of that office. Latin America has given 5 Presidents to the United Nations since that organization was set up, a far larger number than from any other area in the world.

They have a deep friendship for Canada. They feel that we are all American nations together, that we are all in the Western Hemisphere and that we have very much in common. They are anxious to increase their trade with us, and we are anxious to increase ours with them. I think there is also a great deal more that could be done to extending our relations in the cultural field with these Latin American countries.

It is our intention to pay special attention to Latin America. I am hoping it will be possible to get away for a visit to the Argentine in May when they are celebrating 150 years of independence, and also that it will be possible to visit some other Latin American countries, as well as to hold consultations with our eleven Ambassadors in Latin America. This is an area in which I believe a good deal more can be done than has been done by Canada in the past.

The next subject is Canada and the Pacific. I realize that many Canadians are not clearly aware of the fact there is such a place as the Pacific Ocean. Today I plan to say a few words about Canada's relationships with the different countries around the rim of the Pacific.

First of all, there is Japan. We had a visit a few days ago from Prime Minister Kishi and Foreign Minister Fujiyama. It was possible to discuss all the problems between the two countries in a most amicable way.

Canada's relationship with Japan is excellent. At the United Nations Japan has been one of our firmest friends. She was the first to offer to co-sponsor our resolution on radiation, and we have had excellent co-operation from her representative. In the field of trade they have also been co-operative. There have been difficulties about Japanese goods coming into Canada and affecting the sale of Canadian products. The Japanese have throughout been very fair in the attitude they have taken in these discussions and, as I have said, the relationship between our two nations is excellent.

Then going a little further down on the far side of the Pacific we come to the old Indochina, South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. There Canada has been a member of the three International Commissions set up under the Geneva Agreements, and we have as a result had reason to follow very closely what goes on in that particular part of the world. We were worried last fall about the situation in Laos. It appeared as though there might be the beginning there of a full-scale war in the Far East. Canada took the position on the Security Council, and later in the General Assembly, that there should be a United Nations representation sent to and kept in Laos. This policy was followed; I believe there are still representatives of the United Nations in Laos. There has been no war and it looks as though the difficulties are gradually being settled.

We were also involved in this area because with several other countries we are participating in an aerial survey of the Mekong River. This is the key river through that part of Asia just as the St. Lawrence is the key river in this part of Canada. We have people out there now taking part in this survey which will be very beneficial to all of the nations in that particular area.

Then in Malaya, where an outstanding job is being done in carrying on the government of this new member of the Commonwealth of Nations, we have close contacts and there is the best of goodwill between our two countries.

In Indonesia a similar situation obtains. We have many Indonesian students studying in Canada. We have a mission in Djakarta, and the relationship is excellent.

With regard to Australia and New Zealand, here we have, of course, two of our oldest and best friends, the ties are so strong, and they go back over so many years. We work closely together in the United Nations, and under all conditions the relationships between Australia, New Zealand and Canada are excellent. I hope it will not be very long before we can announce the conclusion of trade negotiations with Australia, and from time to time the various problems which arise between these fellow members of the Commonwealth and ourselves will be ironed out.

This is a picture of our friends across the Pacific, and I know that everyone will be wondering just what our attitude is about the recognition of Red China. Most of the countries to which I have referred look on this question in exactly or practically the same light as Canada; for example, Japan, and I believe Malaya, Australia and New Zealand. The Canadian Government does not believe that Red China should be recognized under present conditions. I have made that clear in answer to questions in different parts of the country, and there is no need to repeat here our reasons at length.

Fundamentally, our reasons are that we believe it would be letting down our friends in that part of the world, particularly in Southeast Asia, were Canada to take the step of recognizing Red China at the present time. Also, she is in default under various resolutions passed by the United Nations. Certainly, her actions in Tibet and in India during the last few months have not made it easier for any of the countries which have not already done so to recognize her.

There is another very good reason which I think should be emphasized in this House. One of the main difficulties in any approach to the problem is the fact that given the attitude of Peking, recognition on the part of Canada, unless accompanied by explicit acceptance of Peking's claims to the exclusive right to represent China in the United Nations and to occupy Taiwan--Formosa--would, in all probability, serve to bring about only a

worsening of our relations with Communist China. Evidence of this is a matter of record. The Communist Prime Minister, Mr. Chou En-lai, at the last session of the National People's Congress, held in Peking last April, said unequivocally--and here I am quoting the Chinese Prime Minister:

"Taiwan is an inalienable part of Chinese territory. We are determined to liberate Taiwan, Penghu, Quemoy and Matsu. All U.S. armed forces in the Taiwan area must be withdrawn. The Chinese people absolutely will not tolerate any plot to carve up Chinese territory and create two Chinas. In accordance with this principle, any country that desires to establish diplomatic relations with our country must sever so-called diplomatic relations with the Chiang Kai-shek clique, and respect our country's legitimate rights in international affairs."

It is clear, that the Peking Government's quarrel is not solely with the Nationalist Government installed on the Island of Formosa. The Peking Government is opposed to any arrangement that will give a separate status to Formosa, whether under the Nationalist Government or any other. In fact, the official new China News Agency spoke a few weeks ago of the--I am quoting--"plot engineered by the United States to put Taiwan under United Nations trusteeship".

Now a word about the Middle East. Canada is not a member of SEATO and is not directly concerned with what is done in the SEATO organization. We are, of course, in close contact with most of the nations which belong to SEATO. Our dealings with them are as nations rather than with SEATO as an organization. The same thing might be said concerning the ANZUS Treaty.

The Middle East continues to be a very sensitive area. Canada has Embassies in the United Arab Republic, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, Iran and I hope before long will have some representation in Iraq. Our relations with all of these countries are good, even though they do not all agree among themselves. We are, of course, at all times doing what we can to help bring about a settlement of these very difficult problems in that area. We are also involved directly because of Canada's participation in the United Nations Emergency Force. We had there in that force 945 men as of December 31. That was the second largest of the seven national units in the Emergency Force.

We believe that this force is rendering a very efficient and worth-while service. Whereas there was some trouble on the Israeli-Syrian border a few days ago, no such trouble has flared up in the area where the United Nations Emergency Force is situated. Of course, it is not equipped for major fighting; it has only small arms and it is only, really, a police force. But we think it is rendering a great contribution, and regard it as a vital stabilizing force in the Middle East besides being a demonstration of the ability of the United Nations in similar conditions to place in the field a paramilitary force of substantial size as a means of separating combatant forces and preventing the renewal of hostilities between sovereign states.

We are also very much interested in the problem of the refugees in the Middle East. This subject was debated at some length in the United Nations, and Canada is continuing her contribution of \$500,000, subject to Parliamentary approval, to UNRWA for work in this field.

Finally, there is the United Nations itself. I do not take the United Nations last because of any considerations as to relative importance, for it certainly is as important in Canadian external policy as any other organization. It is a huge organization with several thousand employees and I believe most of them have a United Nations mentality; rather than feeling they are working for their own countries they feel that they are working for the United Nations. They are being given wonderful leadership by the Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjold, who is bringing order out of chaos in an amazing way. When I think of having 82 parties in the House of Commons here and trying to reach any result, and then see the representatives of 82 nations working together down in New York, I am forced to conclude that somebody, somewhere, has done a great deal of careful planning, and it is really a seven-day wonder the way results are obtained at that organization.

From the point of view of a Foreign Minister, the meetings of the General Assembly are extremely valuable. I had the opportunity to meet and talk with at least 35 Foreign Ministers, and I know no other way in which it would have been possible to get their views or to pass on Canadian views to them. These contacts alone have more than justified any time spent in New York during the sessions of the Assembly.

Canada was represented at the last Assembly by a splendid Delegation. I am very proud of the part they played and I include everybody--those who came from outside the service, the delegates, the alternates who came from the Department and the Parliamentarians from all parties. We were there as a team. Each and every one of the group made a great contribution and I think we were able to give Canada good representation throughout the Assembly.

One is also struck by the work done by the Permanent Mission to the United Nations. In effect, this is Canada's embassy at the United Nations, and so much is done there under pressure--resolutions and amendments and difficult problems come up so fast and so frequently--that decisions have to be made in a hurry, various people have to be consulted in a hurry.

We had as our main initiative this year a resolution to provide for more effective collection of information on radiation and fall-out, and also a more effective method of distributing such information. We had a great deal of difficulty in getting that resolution through. The Vice-Chairman of the Delegation, my Parliamentary Secretary, Mr. Nesbitt, did a wonderful job in carrying out these negotiations. He has become one of the outstanding representatives at the United Nations.

With any luck at all he will play a very significant part for Canada in foreign affairs.

These negotiations on this resolution took a long time, in fact they took many weeks. We had to convince the big powers that the resolution should go through, and we had to convince the Eastern powers that we were not trying to deceive them. Finally we got ten co-sponsors--Argentina, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Ireland, Japan, Ghana, Norway, New Zealand and Mexico. None of these were big powers; we got the middle powers and received unanimous support from the General Assembly. I hope that resolution will be of considerable help in meeting the problems of radiation.

We also had some complications in connection with the election to one of the non-permanent seats on the Security Council. Canada was supporting Poland because we thought that under the gentleman's agreement reached in 1946 the seat should go to Eastern Europe. We also thought this election should not be made a cold war issue. Poland had been in the field for some time, before the United Nations sat, whereas Turkey was not put forward until after we had met in New York; taking all these things into consideration we reached the conclusion that we should support Poland. Many of our friends thought the same thing; many of the Latin American nations, for example, reached the same conclusion. There was a series of votes, about 50 votes altogether, but nobody would give in. Both contenders were evenly balanced. Finally, our Delegation was able to play a considerable part in bringing about a compromise under which Poland took the seat for the first year, and Turkey will take it for the second.

We also had difficult questions to face in connection with atomic tests. There was a resolution condemning the proposed tests in the Sahara and Canada, having made her decision clear from the start that she was against atomic tests, voted for that resolution. It was very difficult for some of our friends to understand why we would not be voting on their side but we believed that our policy was the right one and we voted for the resolution throughout.

We were able to support France later on in the resolution about Algeria. President de Gaulle, we thought, had offered very good terms for the settlement of that problem and we felt free to support France throughout on that question.

We have been criticized in some places in Canada for our vote on the resolution on apartheid. Here again was another very difficult question. The previous Government, just as the present Government, had been against the policy of apartheid. No one in Canada believes in an apartheid policy. Yet the previous Government had seen fit throughout to abstain in so far as paragraphs in resolutions directly condemning South Africa were concerned and in certain cases saw fit to abstain on the whole question. I think in no case did they vote against South Africa.



Last year the present Government did vote against South Africa on a resolution which was a good deal milder than the one which was brought forward in this last session of the United Nations; after careful consideration we voted for those paragraphs in that resolution condemning apartheid in general but abstained on the paragraphs which named South Africa; abstained on the vote on the whole resolution.

Last fall South Africa was elected one of the Vice-Presidents of the United Nations and her Foreign Minister, Mr. Loewe, made an excellent contribution to the work of the Assembly. In addition to this South Africa has had a long record of worth-while accomplishments which it would not do any harm for the Canadian people to recall.

Just about 60 years ago the Boers in South Africa were fighting a valiant battle against the British empire with Canadian troops participating against them. After that war they were offered self-government and the great Boer leaders General Botha and General Smuts took the lead in accepting that offer and in setting up a government in that country. Within a few short years World War I broke out and they actually put down rebellion in their own country by one of their fellow generals in the Boer War of a decade earlier and their troops fought beside us throughout the World War.

In the intervening years General Smuts as Field Marshal Smuts became one of the outstanding world statesmen of my time. Other than Sir Winston Churchill there were probably no more outstanding world statesmen contemporary with Field Marshall Smuts. He made a great contribution toward world peace.

In World War II South Africa was with us again. Before we talk of voting against South Africa and of taking the course advocated by a delegation here not so long ago, a course that would lead to South Africa being thrown out of the Commonwealth, I suggest that all Canadians should just stop and think for a few minutes. If we adopt the sort of policy that would lead to throwing countries out of the Commonwealth there would be no Commonwealth left before very long.

Canada believes that the Commonwealth is of such great value in world affairs that a course of the type I have mentioned would be doing a disservice to the Canadian people and to the world at large. We have been able to use our influence for the modification of policies we do not like, but to come out and condemn a fellow member of the Commonwealth as has been suggested would be very unwise in our opinion.

So much for the nine subjects which have now been reduced to eight.

In conclusion may I say this. Canada is a strong young nation, steadily growing stronger. It is a nation, as I have pointed out, with a good record in world affairs, with

many friends and one that is actively participating in various associations such as the Commonwealth, NATO and so on. Above all it is a nation with an idealistic, unselfish approach. I suggest that Canada can play a vital part in world affairs today, perhaps just as vital a part as any other nation in the world. These next ten years could be Canada's years in world affairs. This is the great challenge to Canadians, the challenge I should like to place before them this afternoon, and I offer this challenge particularly to those Canadians who from time to time represent the Canadian people in this Parliament.

S/C