

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 59/23

CANADA'S FOREIGN POLICY

A speech by Mr. Howard Green, Secretary of State for External Affairs, on July 9, 1959, in the House of Commons.

The first subject I plan to discuss is the Geneva Conference. I am aware that Canadians have been following with close attention the course of the Foreign Ministers' discussions in Geneva. As hon. members know, the Foreign Ministers' Conference adjourned on June 20 and will resume its sittings next Monday, July 13. It is disappointing that no agreement was reached during the six weeks of negotiations, but at the same time one should not underrate the benefits of the discussions which took place. The attitudes of both sides have been clarified, and there are some common elements in the proposals advanced on the Berlin issue which might possibly lead to progress.

This has been a period of re-examination for the West, both with respect to the attitude to be adopted in further discussions and with respect to the question as to whether the present discussions might usefully lead to a summit meeting. The United Kingdom, the United States and France, and the Western negotiating powers, together with the Federal Republic of Germany, are examining the records of the discussion and are consulting to determine how best to proceed in the hope of making some progress. In addition--and this is important to Canada--to participation in consultations with the negotiating powers which are taking place in the NATO Council, in which consultations, of course, Canada is at all times represented, the Canadian Government will shortly have the opportunity of discussing these matters with the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Christian Herter. As I announced in the House yesterday, Mr. Herter will be here on Saturday.

It is to be hoped that during the period of recess of the Foreign Ministers' Conference the Soviet leaders will come to realize that nothing is to be gained by an attitude of challenge and impatience. If progress is to be made it will be necessary for the East-West talks to be conducted in an atmosphere free of implied threats or peremptory demands.

As hon. members are aware, the Canadian Government has consistently supported proposals for negotiation with the Soviet Union on the question of Berlin, and on other issues. Since, in this thermonuclear age, war is unthinkable, there is no alternative to negotiation for the solution of these problems. In our view negotiation implies a preparedness on both sides to do more than exchange views across the conference table. Each side must go some way to meet the basic interests of the other. If it is possible to arrive at some settlement on the Berlin question, the way should be opened for the solution of broader problems.

For these reasons we have watched with satisfaction the patient and determined efforts of the three Western negotiating powers at Geneva to find some basis for reaching agreement. We commend the willingness shown by the Western powers to make modifications concerning the terms of their presence in Berlin, which take account of expressed Soviet concerns. At the same time we support the principle, on which the Western powers have been united, that no agreement would be acceptable which placed in jeopardy the security of Berlin or the freedom of its citizens, or which could have the effect of foreclosing the prospect of the reunification of Germany. Unfortunately, circumstances do not seem propitious for great or sudden progress on the basic problem of reunification. This should not, however, preclude us from attempting to create an atmosphere in which reunification can more easily be brought about.

Where the resumed Foreign Ministers' Conference will lead us cannot now be predicted. The Canadian Government has held to the view that progress toward settlement of some international issues might be achieved by discussions amongst heads of government, in other words at a summit conference. It is the hope of the Canadian Government that such a meeting can be arranged. Then there may prove to be subjects other than those relating to Germany and Berlin--I mention the suspension of nuclear tests and the peaceful use of outer space as examples--on which progress could be made by high level discussions. At this stage, I think as few pre-conditions and prior stipulations as possible should be placed in the way of a summit meeting. For example, there have been signs of some difference of opinion on the question of who should participate in a summit conference, and there are indications of a trend to increase participation. In the judgment of the Canadian Government this is not likely to be a helpful development.

The suicidal prospect of global war must be apparent to all nations, and the need of finding some alternative for the settlement of differences must recommend itself to all statesmen. For a middle power such as Canada, with brilliant prospects of development, the international tensions which keep alive the threat of a nuclear holocaust are in themselves

especially significant. The speed with which our hopes and prospects can be realized, however, will depend to an important degree upon the international atmosphere. We must work, within the Western alliance of which we are a member, toward a reduction of tension if we are to be free to devote a greater part of our national talents and energies to constructive Canadian development.

NATO

Through NATO Canada is able to work intimately with the United Kingdom, the United States and the 12 European member states in the formulation of policies and attitudes which are designed to facilitate progress toward a settlement of some of the highly complicated issues dividing East and West.

Today NATO takes stock of the past decade and the plans for the years ahead. Nothing that can be seen on the horizon suggests or permits the luxury of a slackening in the preparedness of free nations. The need for vigilance and unity is as imperative now as at any time during the past decade. It is imperative not only for reasons of our security but also in the context of our never ending search through diplomacy for peaceful solutions to the problems dividing the world today.

The presence of Canadian forces alongside their friends from the United Kingdom, the United States and Europe is both an earnest of Canadian intentions and an important cause of the respect accorded Canada in the daily conduct of international affairs. I might mention, in connection with the stationing of Canadian forces in Germany, that the negotiations concerning supplementary arrangements governing their status in that country have recently been concluded, and that signature is expected to take place next month. I regret that as the House will, I hope, have risen by that time, it will not be possible to table the documents, but this will be done early in the next session of Parliament.

Even though the initial emphasis in NATO was on military requirements, the members of the Alliance have recognized the fundamental community of interests and aspirations shared by all parties to the treaty, and have fostered through the years the development of an Atlantic Community of like-minded nations and peoples. Today, when the threat to the free world is not only military but economic, political and psychological, Canada is playing its part in stressing the need for consultations between member governments in the development of both the military and non-military aspects of the Alliance. Support for NATO remains an essential cornerstone of Canada's foreign policy.

The Commonwealth

It is natural enough that with Her Majesty, by happy circumstance, in Canada when this debate takes place, the Commonwealth and Canada's place in it should be foremost in our minds at this time. I recall with satisfaction the useful exchanges of views which have taken place here in Ottawa in recent months with a number of Commonwealth leaders. In March we had the pleasure of welcoming the United Kingdom Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, and Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd, and I would like to take this opportunity of paying tribute to the important part they have since played in preserving the unity of approach of the Western powers in the difficult negotiations that have been carried on at Geneva. We have, in addition, had the privilege of welcoming here the Prime Minister of Australia and Cabinet Ministers or other distinguished representatives of India, The West Indies Federation, Pakistan and, only last month, Nigeria.

One has only to recite the far-flung territories from which these visitors came to be reminded of the vast compass of this friendly association of nations which continues to exercise a beneficent influence on the affairs of all mankind. It is an association, moreover, which is never static but constantly expanding and evolving as former dependent territories take their place in orderly progress as free and independent members of the Commonwealth. As a member of the Commonwealth we are justly proud of its record in facilitating the constitutional development of its members. For example, very recently we had the opportunity of welcoming a further step in this direction and yet another member, Singapore.

Similar developments are taking place today in another most important area of the world, Africa. In the welter of news reports about problems and stresses in various parts of that continent I am afraid there has been a tendency to overlook a significant and happy Commonwealth event in Africa. I am referring, of course, to the fact that recently powers of self-government passed to the populous northern region of the Federation of Nigeria, thus completing the international political evolution which is to culminate on October 1, 1960, when the large and important nation of Nigeria is scheduled to obtain independence.

I am happy to say that both the Prime Minister of the Federation and the premiers of the regions have expressed the intention to remain in the Commonwealth. I am sure all hon. members will wish to join with me in expressing to the Nigerian leaders and to the United Kingdom Government congratulations for their respective parts in this welcome event. The Canadian Government hopes to be in a position to establish suitable diplomatic representation in Nigeria and to take similar action with respect to the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland as soon as circumstances permit.

Colombo Plan

It will be appropriate, I think, if I say a word or two here about the assistance which Canada has been giving in recent months to the less-developed countries under the various programmes which have been established for this purpose, especially since most of Canada's assistance has gone to our partners in the Commonwealth family. I refer, of course, to the Colombo Plan. If the Commonwealth association is to continue to have the meaning it now has, it is important that the less-developed countries of the Commonwealth should continue to be able to count on the active sympathy and support to those of us who are in a more fortunate position.

Since my predecessor last reviewed the position, we have been able to carry to a successful conclusion our discussions with Pakistan and Ceylon with respect to their share of the Colombo Plan appropriation voted by Parliament for the fiscal year 1958-59. As a result of these discussions we have now agreed that \$13 million in the form of Canadian commodities and equipment will be made available to Pakistan and \$2 million to Ceylon.

Under the Pakistan programme we have agreed to provide a further \$2 million worth of wheat in addition to the \$2 million of which the House was informed last November. The amount of \$2,800,000 will be devoted to the provision of industrial metals which are urgently required for the industrial sector of the economy to help maintain reasonable levels of industrial activity and employment. Some \$650,000 will be made available in the form of wood pulp which is required for a new newsprint mill being constructed by a Canadian engineering firm. Then \$120,000 will be provided for the purchase of pesticide spraying equipment and \$200,000 for the purchase of three Beaver aircraft to help with the eradication of crop pests. The sum of \$500,000 has been set aside to provide spare parts and to finance the cost of overhauling the equipment which has been used in the construction of the Warsak Dam, and which will be turned over to the Government of Pakistan as and when it ceases to be required on the project. An amount of \$1,100,000 has been allocated to the construction of a transmission line from Karnaphuli to the port of Chittagong in East Pakistan. The balance of \$3,630,000 available from the \$13 million set aside for Pakistan is being allocated tentatively to two new projects, one in the construction field and the other aimed at creating additional electrical generating capacity in Pakistan.

Turning to the Canadian aid programme in Ceylon, the Government has approved an allocation of \$710,000 to finance the continuation of the aerial photographic and resources survey which a Canadian firm has been carrying out in Ceylon under the Colombo Plan. A second project, which has been tentatively selected, covers the construction of transmission lines in an area in the development of which Canada has already had an opportunity to participate.

We have also completed discussions with a number of non-Commonwealth countries, notably Indonesia, Burma and Vietnam, out of which has emerged a programme that will absorb about \$2 million of the Colombo Plan appropriation voted by Parliament for 1958-59, the last fiscal year. This programme comprises the provision of Canadian foodstuffs, Canadian participation in a highway survey and a bridge building project in Burma and the supply of prospecting equipment to Burma and of three Otter aircraft to Indonesia to assist that country in the development of its widely scattered island economy.

We hope shortly to be able to commence discussions with our Colombo Plan partners about the programme to be financed out of our contribution for the present fiscal year, 1959-60, which as the House is aware will be increased from \$35 million to \$50 million. There are, however, two projects to which I might refer briefly today because they are projects of a regional nature which, because of their importance and the very substantial benefits that are likely to flow from them, have attracted wide interest and support from countries other than Canada.

The first of these is the Mekong River project, about which my colleague the Minister of Finance provided information to the House of March 12. I am glad to be able to say that the arrangements for Canadian participation in this project are moving ahead rapidly and that we expect the photographic surveying of the Mekong River basin, which as hon. members know affects several different nations, to get under way before the end of the year. In working out these arrangements we have had the benefit of the full and enthusiastic co-operation of the riparian states and the executive agent whom the United Nations has placed at their disposal to help with the administration of the project.

The second project about which I think the House would wish me to say something at this stage relates to the development of the Indus waters system. As the House is aware, the apportionment of the waters of the Indus system is one of the residual problems that has been left over from the partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947. This problem has been a source of continuing difficulty between India and Pakistan, and efforts to solve it had proved to no avail. Some years ago, therefore, India and Pakistan agreed to refer this problem to the International Bank to see whether the officials of the bank would devise a solution which would be at once economically feasible and politically acceptable to them.

As a result of the negotiations that have been conducted under the bank's auspices, the elements of a solution have now emerged in terms of an engineering programme that would safeguard the interests of both countries. The bank has asked the Governments of Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom and

the United States whether they would be prepared to co-operate in the implementation of this programme, which is expected to extend over a 10-year period. The Canadian Government agreed in principle to participate in the programme that has been drawn up by the bank, on the understanding that the funds required for this purpose would be provided as part of our increased Colombo Plan contribution. I am confident that the House will endorse the Government's view that it is in Canada's interest to help in the solution of a problem which has stood in the way of better relations between two of our Commonwealth partners in Asia.

Commonwealth Scholarship Scheme

One final Commonwealth development certainly deserves mention here. At the Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference held in Montreal last year a Commonwealth scholarship scheme was agreed to by the governments there represented. It was envisaged that in time there might be as many as 1,000 Commonwealth students studying under the auspices of the scheme in Commonwealth countries. At Montreal, Canada undertook to be responsible for one quarter of this total or about 250 places at any one time. The cost of this commitment to Canada is estimated at about \$1 million annually.

As I informed hon. members last week, detailed discussions about the implementation of the proposed scholarship scheme will take place at a Commonwealth Education Conference to be held from July 15 to July 29 at Oxford; in other words, it starts next Wednesday. The purpose of this conference is to work out the scope and detailed arrangements of a Commonwealth scholarship scheme. In addition, however, the conference will have a wider mandate;

--to review existing arrangements for Commonwealth co-operation in the field of education and to make recommendations for any improvement or expansion that may be possible, particularly in regard to the supply and training of teachers.

On July 3 I announced to the House the composition of the Canadian Delegation to the Commonwealth Education Conference. I indicated at the time that members of the delegation would be required to leave for the United Kingdom over the week-end and that accordingly I foresaw some difficulty in adding representatives to the delegation at that stage. However, the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam suggested that there should be a representative from a teachers' federation, and I am glad to tell the House today, as I have already been able to tell the hon. member, that through the good offices of the Canadian Teachers' Federation it has been possible to add Mr. G.A. Mosher to the delegation as a teachers' representative from the province of Nova Scotia.

Relations with United States

Turning to our relations with our neighbour and good friend, the United States, I shall endeavour to confine my remarks to certain matters which are of current interest. Within the past two weeks a signal event occurred when the President of the United States joined with Her Majesty the Queen at the opening ceremonies of the St. Lawrence Seaway. It was a happy occasion, and the importance of good relations between the two countries was underlined by the realization of what could be done to the advantage of both in co-operation. The personal and friendly relations which existed among Her Majesty, the President, the Prime Minister and the Ministers of the two Governments-- and I might add the Leader of the Opposition and other very responsible citizens of Canada and the United States--were evident as together we took part in the opening ceremonies and other events of that day. It seemed to me that in many ways we were paralleling the experiences of numerous families, business firms, service clubs and other organizations in our friendly approach to matters of common concern.

A particular parallel is, of course, present in my mind. The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway was chosen as a convenient occasion for a meeting of the legislators of the two countries, to which I made some reference in my opening remarks. May I take this occasion to pay tribute to the members of the interparliamentary group who examined together many of the facets of the relations between the United States and Canada, and whose serious and constructive approach will, I am sure, be reflected in discussions of matters affecting the two countries as these are dealt with from time to time in our respective legislative bodies. A sound basis of understanding one another's points of view together with an objective attempt to determine what is the real national and international interest in each question will, I am sure, pay untold benefits.

The boundary water problems between the two nations are receiving urgent attention, especially that concerning the development of the waters of the Columbia River basin, a problem to which the International Joint Commission has been devoting active consideration for some years. In January of this year, 1959, the two Governments requested that the Commission should report specifically and quickly with respect to the principles which might be applied by governments to two matters; first, the calculation of the benefits accruing in the downstream country in consequences of the storage and regulated release of water in the upstream country; second, the allocation between the two countries of these benefits.

Although no formal report has so far been made to governments by the Commission, the chairmen are keeping their respective governments informed of the course of their deliberations. As hon. members are aware, the Commission does

not maintain an independent staff. Accordingly the facilities and the personnel of government departments and agencies of the United States, Canada and also of the Province of British Columbia have been placed at the disposal of the Commissioners. I am confident that it will be possible for the Commission to report soon recommending principles which will be acceptable to the governments concerned. Such principles, with respect to the determination and division of benefits, should reduce materially the period required for completion of an international agreement.

The immense volume and complexity of Canada-United States economic and commercial relations inevitably create many difficulties and problems. These receive a great deal of publicity which sometimes tends to obscure the fundamental fact that our mutual economic relations are on the whole extremely profitable and advantageous to both sides. This is the starting point from which we must examine the particular, and often very important, difficulties which turn up from time to time, such as questions arising from the operation of Canadian subsidiaries of United States companies and, related to this, the problems sometimes encountered in the attempted extraterritorial application of United States legislation and policy.

I have in mind such matters as United States anti-trust proceedings and the effect of United States commercial or strategic policy on Canadian subsidiary companies. We have also had problems in our various agricultural sales and disposal policies and in connection with restrictions or limitations by one country on imports from the other. Such problems are a continuing and natural consequence of our closely interlocked economies. They are not problems which are susceptible of any general or final solution, and genuine differences in our interests must be faced frankly; but I believe most of these problems can be met to the mutual satisfaction of the two countries if we continue to tackle them in a spirit of good will and friendly co-operation, always bearing in mind the great mutual gain arising from our commercial and economic dealings with each other.

I am particularly pleased to be able to say that in recent months there have been a number of very important developments or decisions in the United States which have favourably affected Canadian interests and have reflected a responsible and co-operative attitude in the United States toward relations with Canada and other friendly countries. I have in mind, for example, the modification of the United States oil import provisions, as they affected Canadian oil transported by land; the removal of obstacles to transit shipment of certain goods--including, I think, canned shrimp--and the favourable modification of "buy American" requirements on United States defence orders.

Another recent example which was of particular significance to Canada was a ruling of the Office of Civil and Defence Mobilization that imports of large hydro-electric turbines and other related electrical generating equipment would not endanger the national security. As a consequence of this ruling a Canadian company will share in a very substantial contract for turbines to be installed at the Big Bend Dam on the Missouri River in South Dakota. These are all matters on which we have had direct and friendly discussions with the United States authorities, and the outcome indicates what can be achieved by this means.

Similarly, our defence relationships with the United States continue to be close. These relationships stem from an identity of interest in the fact of the possibility which exists, by reason of technological advances in modern weaponry, of a devastating attack on our two countries. Neither country can defend itself effectively in the face of such a threat without the co-operation of the other. This collective approach to the problem of continental defence is but one segment of a much wider collectivity of effort through the NATO Alliance.

The military planning of joint defence activities and the implementation of specific projects in this field are of primary concern to the Minister of National Defence, who reported fully to the House during last week's defence debate. I shall not, therefore comment on these strictly military aspects of our defence co-operation with the United States. I would, however, like to speak briefly on the other important factors which influence that co-operation. Our identity of interest with the United States in the defence field does not preclude our differences of emphasis on policies designed to serve our common objective. It is for this reason that the Canadian Government insists that we be consulted regularly and fully by the United States Government on a wide range of developments throughout the world which might bring with them the possibility of armed conflict.

In our bilateral dealings on defence matters with the United States the Canadian Government does not hesitate to assert the requirements of Canadian sovereignty. Canadians are convinced, I am certain, that the best physical protection of our sovereignty lies in co-operative continental defence arrangements. Canada must insist, however, that such co-operation shall not jeopardize the political and economic objectives of our own nation.

Relations with Soviet Union

Most of us are inclined to overlook the fact that we have another great neighbouring state, the Soviet Union. As has been mentioned on more than one occasion in this House, Canada has a special interest in its relations with the Soviet Union.

Together our northern boundaries account for the major part of the coast line of the Arctic Ocean. We share a deep interest in problems of northern development, transportation and communication across a large land mass, the exploitation of basically similar timber, mineral, agricultural and other resources. As a consequence each has much to gain from drawing upon the other's experience.

In recent years interchanges between our two countries, particularly in the scientific, cultural and technical fields, have increased in a limited but encouraging way. The appearance in Toronto and Montreal only a few weeks ago of the famed Bolshoi Ballet is a pleasant manifestation of this development. Exchanges of delegations and information are continuing in a variety of other fields.

The developments which have been taking place in Canadian-Soviet relations are in large part a reflection of the Soviet Union's emergence into more active participation in the affairs of the world community. It has been in only comparatively recent times that the Soviet Union has begun to take an active part in many of the agencies of the United Nations, at world conferences in various fields of science and technology and in such international co-operative ventures as the International Geophysical Year. Canada has welcomed this evidence of the Soviet Union's desire to take up some of the heavy obligations which fall to a great world power.

Far East

Turning to a more remote corner of the world, I should like to say something about Indochina, where Canadian civilian and military officers continue to serve on two of the three international commissions which were set up by the Geneva agreements in order to maintain those agreements. I shall begin with Laos where, the committee will recall, the international commission adjourned sine die in July 1958, following the conclusion of political and military agreements between the Laotian Government and the dissident Pathet Lao.

Since the beginning of this year, when it was reported that north Vietnamese troops had crossed into Laotian territory as a result of border disputes, the situation in Laos has attracted some degree of public attention. There have been more recent troubles in Laos caused by the refusal of two battalions of the ex-Pathet Lao to accept terms of integration into the Laotian army, which was provided for by the military agreement reached between the Laotian Government and the former Pathet Lao in November 1957. One of the battalions later accepted integration. The other refused to do so and is now dispersed at the border of northern Vietnam. However, the situation has improved recently and the Laotian Government issued a communique stating that this affair can now be regarded as closed.

The difficulties in Laos prompted numerous requests for reconvening the International Commission for Laos, of which, as hon. members know, Canada is a member. The Canadian position as stated by the Prime Minister in the House on May 8, is that Canada cannot agree to any commission action which would infringe upon Laotian sovereignty. The Laotian Government is understood to be opposed to the reconvening of the commission, but has pledged itself to uphold the Geneva Cease-Fire Agreement. We are in continuous touch with the Indian and United Kingdom Governments on this question--India being another member of the commission, with Poland the third member--and we are watching Laotian developments closely.

As to Cambodia, it was stated in the House on July 25, 1958 that an adjournment formula similar to that used in Laos might be applied to the Cambodian Commission. This has not proved possible, although efforts in this direction are continuing and the strength of the Cambodian Commission has been reduced to a minimum.

In Vietnam, the tension between south and north had not abated, unfortunately, and the Vietnam Commission--on which Canada is also represented, as she is on the Cambodian Commission--continues to perform a valuable task in maintaining stability in the area. However, we hope that it might be possible to effect a reduction of the strength of the Vietnam Commission which would not impair its effectiveness.

I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the way in which India has fulfilled the difficult role of chairman of the three International Commissions. Our work together in Indochina has been and will. I am sure, continue to be one of beneficial co-operation.

The policy of the Canadian Government toward relations with Communist China was examined to some length of the late Mr. Sidney Smith last February, and I do not intend to restate it here. Hon. members will find that statement commencing at page 1405 of the year's Hansard. The Peking authorities, however, do not make things any easier for us. Last year, for instance, when the Chinese question was being discussed in the United Nations, it had to be done against a background of communist attack on the nationalist-held islands of Quemoy and Matsu. More recently there has been the repression of Tibet, the attempt to tamper with its way of life, extinguish its religious values and destroy its autonomy. These actions are not conducive to the peaceful relations which we should like to have with the Chinese people. Let us hope that the situation in the respect will improve.

United Nations

Finally, Mr. Chairman--last but by no means least--I have a few comments to make with regard to Canada and the United Nations. This is the season of the year at which foreign

offices throughout the world begin to turn their attention to the annual General Assembly of the United Nations. It is an opportune moment at which to give hon. members an account of some of the accomplishments of the agencies of that organization during the period since it last met in plenary session, and to give some thought to matters to which its attention will be devoted at the forthcoming fourteenth session.

First there is the matter of disarmament. Hon. Members will be aware that during the past several months discussion of the substantive problems of disarmament has been limited to the negotiations at Geneva on the discontinuance of nuclear tests. These negotiations were begun among the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union on October 31 last. The central problem separating the two sides became clear at quite an early stage. It concerns the procedures to be used for the dispatch of teams to make on-site inspections of unidentified events which could be suspected of being nuclear explosions. The United Kingdom and the United States position has been that inspection should be initiated automatically, on the basis of agreed technical criteria, by the administrator of the control system unless a contrary decision were taken by a two thirds majority of the control commission. The Soviet Union has argued that such arrangements would enable the Western powers to use the control machinery for purposes of espionage. The Soviet Union therefore has demanded that the dispatch of inspection teams should require the concurrence of the three nuclear powers.

With a view to finding a way out of this deadlock Prime Minister Macmillan, during his visit to Moscow, suggested to Premier Khrushchev that each side should have the right to demand that an agreed annual quota of inspections be made which would not require votes in the control commission. Some weeks later the Soviet Representative at Geneva introduced a proposal based upon this concept. I may say that the Canadian Government considers that Prime Minister Macmillan's idea seems more likely than any other suggestion we have seen to provide the basis for a solution to this most difficult problem.

Following a short recess when the Foreign Ministers' meeting started, negotiations were resumed on June 8, and shortly thereafter the three representatives agreed to the formation of a working group of experts to study methods for detection of nuclear explosions carried out at high altitudes; that is, from thirty kilometres to fifty kilometres above the earth. The expert group met beginning June 22 and their report has just been received. I trust that its technical findings will facilitate political agreement.

Also during the past month the United States Representative introduced papers relating to the problem of detecting underground nuclear tests. The Soviet Representative has not as yet agreed to take these new data under consideration or to remit them to a group of experts.

While difficult problems remain to be resolved, it is encouraging to note that to date a total of 17 articles have been approved for a draft treaty on the discontinuance of nuclear tests. We are confident that with continued good will on both sides the conference will result in a workable agreement. Such agreement could hardly fail to give impetus to the renewal of negotiations on other aspects of disarmament.

In order to facilitate such other negotiations it would be desirable to reactivate the former subcommittee of the disarmament commission of which Canada was a member, or to provide in some other manner acceptable to the powers principally involved for a group of manageable size within the present 82-member disarmament commission. Hon. members will, of course, realize the difficulties involved in reaching any agreement in a commission composed of 82 members. I venture to express the hope that when the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the four powers reconvenes next week it may give some consideration to the question of negotiating machinery within the United Nations.

And now a word about outer space. During May and June the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space held a useful session. The Committee was created at the last session of the General Assembly in recognition, as the Assembly resolution phrased it, of "the common interest of mankind in outer space", and "the common aim that outer space should be used for peaceful purposes only".

Canada was one of 18 members elected to the Committee. Unfortunately the Soviet Union, in order to demonstrate its disapproval of the composition of the Committee, has refused to participate. In this policy it has been followed by Czechoslovakia and Poland. India and the United Arab Republic have also felt unable to attend the sessions of the Committee. The Canadian Representative expressed this country's hope that at some time in the not too distant future all these countries would feel able to co-operate. The Committee nevertheless proceeded with detailed studies in accordance with its terms of reference. Technical and legal committees were formed to draft components of the report eventually to be made to the General Assembly and, as hon. members are no doubt aware, Canada provided the chairman of the Technical Committee, Dr. Donald Rose of the National Research Council. The final report of the Committee was approved on June 25. In addition to a number of conclusions relating to specific matters, it suggests that the United Nations might establish a committee suitably composed to carry further the investigations which have been begun. I trust that the General Assembly will agree that such action is appropriate and that in the future Soviet co-operation will be forthcoming.

Here I should say a few words on the United Nations and radiation. I have already indicated one reason for our concern that the negotiations on nuclear tests should be fruitful; it is that their success might provide a turning point in the armaments race. A further reason is that a definitive agreement would avoid any increase in whatever hazard may be involved in radioactive fallout. Hon. members will recall that last year the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation produced a valuable report, based upon the data made available to it by governments. Because the methods of collecting data vary from country to country, and because not all governments have instituted programmes for the collection, analysis and reporting of appropriate samples, the data available to the Committee necessarily was not as comprehensive as it might have been. In the Canadian Government's view it is desirable that support be given to the efforts of the Committee to enlarge and improve these data.

The next subject to which I should like to refer is the stand-by force. A further issue which received considerable attention at the last session of the General Assembly and which may be up for consideration again relates to the many and varied United Nations activities as a peace-keeping organization and the possibilities that these will in turn evolve into more permanent United Nations stand-by arrangements. Canada's strong support for efforts undertaken under United Nations auspices to secure peace and stability in troubled areas of the world is evidenced by Canadian contributions to, and active participation in, such bodies as the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization in Palestine, the United Nations Military Observers Group in India and Pakistan, the United Nations Emergency Force, known as UNEF, and until its disbandment in November 1958, the United Nations Observer Group in Lebanon.

UNEF represents the largest and most recent of these operations, and within its terms of reference has achieved notable success. I should like here to pay tribute to those young Canadians who have served in this UNEF in the faraway deserts. They have been making a great contribution, and they have kept the name of Canada high. Naturally a good deal of attention has been given to the possibility of extending or transforming UNEF into a permanent United Nations police force. Last year's session of the United Nations General Assembly requested the United Nations Secretary-General to study the experience of UNEF for any lessons which might be derived for future United Nations policy.

It is the Canadian Government's view that experience has shown that United Nations requirements can involve a wide variety of types of service, designed to meet particular situations in particular areas, none of which may offer an exact precedent for a more permanent type of stand-by force. The Canadian Government has emphasized the need for flexibility in our approach to breaches of the peace in view of the complexity and delicacy of the issues presented. During a recent press conference in New York, when

the United Nations Secretary-General was asked whether he visualized a permanent United Nations force along the lines of UNEF, he replied in the negative and used the analogy of a tailor and his cloth in explanation of his position. Mr. Hammarskjöld said:

"We need really to cut the suit to the body ... more carefully in these various cases of which UNEF is an example than any other cases which are of concern to the United Nations ... We cannot afford or usefully have a wardrobe sufficiently rich and varied to be able to pick out just the right suit as the situation arises. It is much better to have the cloth and go into action as a good tailor quickly when the need arises."

It would no doubt be agreed that in a world which is far from perfect we should not be dissatisfied if progress is made by a series of small steps. Nevertheless, these various United Nations operations in the interests of restoring and maintaining peace have provided a very useful body of experience out of which it is hoped to evolve more comprehensive machinery for strengthening the forces of peace. I can assure you that all proposals to this end are given the most careful study by the Canadian Government.

I would be remiss if I were to omit from this account of United Nations activities reference to a most admirable humanitarian project which members of the United Nations are undertaking this year as a common endeavour. Recently I informed the House of the opening of World Refugee Year, which formally began in Canada on June 28 with statements on radio and on television by the Prime Minister. I must say that I have been gratified by the extent of public response to the statement I made at that time, and in particular by the numerous newspaper editorials which have expressed approval of the fact that the Government plans to admit a number of tubercular refugee cases into Canada and provide for their treatment.

Arrangements for such a scheme are now under discussion. I am sure the warm hearts of the Canadian people from coast to coast will see that support is given to this plan and any other plans of a similar nature. Not only is the Government interested, but there is also a Canadian Committee for World Refugee Year which has already been doing excellent work. World Refugee Year began as an idea put forward by a group of private British citizens. Since then it has been given international approval by the General Assembly as a means of facilitating its own task of permanently solving refugee problems. The Government has been participating actively in United Nations refugee programmes, and we shall continue to do so.

I have already occupied the time of hon. members too long with this statement, especially when it is my earnest hope that spontaneous and frank discussions on international problems will increasingly become the rule in this House. I really should

have been setting an example in that regard this morning. I might mention before I close that I felt free to devote my attention entirely to international affairs rather than to details of the estimates in view of the thorough scrutiny given to the estimates of the department by the Standing Committee on external affairs earlier in the year.

Once again I invite hon. members to make their suggestions with regard to Canada's foreign policy and I am sure the result will be very beneficial not only to the Government but also to Parliament and the nation as a whole. My own belief is that Canadian foreign policy should be one that will reflect at all times the common sense and the courage, and above all the character, of the Canadian people. It will be my aim as Secretary of State for External Affairs to do everything I can to see that Canadian foreign policy will fit that pattern, and I am sure that in this task I shall have great help from all hon. members.

S/C