



STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 57/44

ASPECTS OF CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Excerpts from a statement by Mr. Sidney E. Smith, Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the House of Commons on November 26, 1957.

I know the people of this country are indeed interested in the foreign policy of Canada.... and I also know that other governments are equally interested in the actions and policies of this Government. We have been considering in this House, and we shall be considering in this House, matters of great moment which might be described as domestic or national. I am not discounting in any measure the importance and significance of these matters when I observe that the solution of the grave problems which confront the nations of the world in 1957 has a practical bearing on the health and happiness of Canadians and on the welfare and progress of Canada.

We cannot expect in this field of external affairs to find ready made solutions. Only the eradication of fear and the establishment of mutual confidence among the nations will provide the basic solution, and the government will endeavour in every way to bring this about. Second, to bring about this state of affairs we shall need steadiness, strength and patience.

In view of the fact that today I am making my first statement on foreign policy, and having regard to the fact that there are many new members of the House, freshmen like myself, I propose to outline in somewhat general terms some of the relations and relationships of Canada with other nations. In common with Canadians of all political persuasions I take pride in the advancement of our country to a position of respect and influence in the international field. We are regarded as a leading country of middle-status in the world. Our role is an important one in the Commonwealth, in the affairs of the United Nations, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and in all the other various organizations to which Canada adheres. That is a position which Canada has attained by reason of its growing strength, its sense of responsibility and its willingness to accept responsibility; and I believe it is also due to the exercise by Canadians of a certain wisdom and maturity of judgment.

Natural resources and the development of those resources which Canada has achieved have helped to give us a prestige out of all proportion to the size of our population. Our sacrifices in two world wars, and then in recent years in securing the peace in Korea, the Middle East and Indochina, have added to that prestige; our contributions, of which I will speak later, toward raising the standard of living in various parts of the world, and our contributions toward the alleviation of want and suffering have, too, enabled Canada to speak with confidence and authority.

Moreover, I think we bring to the consideration of the solution of international problems peculiar qualities which Canadians possess. We are the heirs of a European civilization, and I would think, having regard to the development of our national scene, that we have a national, or perhaps I should say a natural, tendency and gift for compromise. We are possessed of an idealism which has been somewhat modified by the skepticism which Canadians must have when they realize that the solution of any problem cannot come about by miracles but only as the result of persistent and hard endeavour.

.... It is with these encouraging yet challenging thoughts in mind that I take up my new office as Secretary of State for External Affairs. As I enter this field I assure this House that, having regard to the firm foundations which have been laid in respect of our foreign affairs by successive governments, I will endeavour to build on these foundations and, as a member of this Government under the leadership of the Prime Minister, I will do my best to help in building something distinctive and valuable upon these foundations.

In this context it is clear that Canada must seek to understand the aspirations of other countries; Canada must endeavour to apprehend the motives of other nations, whether they be ill or good, and work closely with friendly nations. But all the while Canadians must think for themselves, and Canada's foreign policy should not be merely a pale reflection of the views of other countries.

UNITED NATIONS

My first assignment after I became a member of the Government was to go to the United Nations. I think that was an excellent introduction for me because it enabled me to study at first hand, at the beginning of my political and diplomatic career, the machinery, the aspirations and the objectives of that great Organization.

There was in the United Nations, I found, a curiosity with respect to the attitude of the new government in Canada toward the Organization, and I can best describe the views of this Government by repeating to this House the words of the Prime Minister when he spoke to the General Assembly on

September 3, 1957. He stated: "We stand on this question now where Canada has always stood since April 1945. And I emphasize this, with the support of the party which is now in power. So far as Canada is concerned, support of the United Nations is a cornerstone of its foreign policy. We believe that the United Nations will grow stronger because it represents the inevitable struggle of countries to find order in their relationships, and the deep longing of mankind to strive for and attain peace and justice." That is the stand of this country toward the United Nations.

Our confidence in the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, is not blind. It is, we know, an imperfect instrument.... The United Nations is not, as the Secretary-General stated in his last annual report, a supra-state, and how can we expect the United Nations to be better than those who constitute it? The United Nations is, indeed, a microcosm of an imperfect world, a world now in the shadow of nuclear weapons. However, the United Nations has had its successes, and I think it warrants the designation or description that it is the work shop of world diplomacy.

.... Amidst all the portents and dark threats of 1957, I suggest to you, Sir, that the United Nations is the greatest hope for peace. If the United Nations were not in existence I do think mankind would have to invent something like it in order to afford a forum in which 82 nations could sit down together and discuss face to face their differences and their agreements.

It is a gratifying yet a sobering thought for us that Canada will take its seat for the second time on the Security Council. That will happen on January 1, 1958.

I was particularly pleased that my first task at the United Nations was to endorse the admission of Malaya and to welcome that country as the newest member state of that Organization. The United Nations has now become a more universal body, and many of its new members have risen from the status of colony to that of nationhood. It afforded me even greater pleasure to say on that occasion that I saluted Great Britain, because here was another case that we in Canada know so well of Great Britain encouraging a colony to become a nation. I could not refrain from observing that this had been the historic, the outstanding record of Great Britain, while the U.S.S.R. reversed that process of developing colonies into nations by reducing nations to colonies.

Canada has worked and will continue to work with these new members of the United Nations, and as far as my experience is concerned it has been a joy to co-operate with them.

DISARMAMENT

Among the topics which were discussed at the United Nations this year was the question of disarmament, which was perhaps the major topic. I and members of the Canadian Delegation at the United Nations had some reason to be not entirely satisfied about the consideration in the twelfth session of the United Nations of that topic which means so much to mankind. The 24 powers did put forward a resolution that was drafted by the Subcommittee on Disarmament on August 29, 1957, and that resolution did receive endorsement by the General Assembly. In fact the U.S.S.R. was not able to line up any votes in opposition to that resolution except those of its own satellites. It is true that there were some who abstained from voting on that 24-power resolution, but I judged that in many cases the abstention was due not to any opposition to the resolution but because they really thought any resolution put forward and adopted by the United Nations would be ineffective, as the U.S.S.R. said it would not co-operate in further negotiations under that resolution....

After we had obtained for that resolution approval from the General Assembly which was unanimous but with abstentions, the U.S.S.R. said it would not participate in the discussions of the Disarmament Commission or of the Subcommittee. We were greatly disappointed to hear that, because in getting that resolution so admirably supported in the United Nations we felt we had a vote ... that would carry some weight with the U.S.S.R. because it reflected a world-wide opinion that they should consider the rejection of the Western proposals.

We tried to make it clear to the United Nations that the resolution that was so widely supported in the General Assembly was not necessarily in our opinion the only means whereby disarmament could be promoted. On October 23, 1957, I spoke in the Political Committee and asked our Russian friends to look at the resolution; not to regard it as coming from us in a take it or leave it manner, but to accept it on our assurance that it would be a basis for further negotiations. ... After the U.S.S.R. stated definitely that it would not negotiate any further, the Soviet Delegation did put forward the suggestion that the Disarmament Commission should be made up of the 82 member nations of the United Nations, and indeed that the complexion of the General Assembly itself should be reflected in the new Disarmament Commission.

We all felt that this was a manifestly impractical proposition, and we were bound to conclude that it was merely a propaganda move. It would be entirely unwieldy for 82 nations to sit down and discuss the problem in one meeting or series of meetings on disarmament. That was, however, put to the General Assembly by the U.S.S.R. and it was rejected by the General Assembly.

Even after that Canada, taking the lead in some cases and in other cases co-operating with other friendly powers, tried again to find a well-balanced and reasonable group by way of a suggestion for the composition of the Disarmament Commission that would satisfy the U.S.S.R. Finally there was put before the General Assembly a proposal for the extension and enlargement of the Disarmament Commission to include the members of the Security Council, 11, and Canada, and in addition 13 other countries. That was adopted by the General Assembly to the extent that three-quarters of the governments of every group in the United Nations endorsed it. That proved unacceptable to the U.S.S.R., although at one point in our negotiations we did hope that it might be acceptable to them.

Now that the enlarged Disarmament Commission has been established the U.S.S.R. says it will not participate in its discussions, and our only hope is that it will reconsider its views so we can sit down together to the end that the armament race will not be continued, because as I endeavoured to tell the Political Committee of the United Nations - and I have no desire to indulge in scare headlines here today - the issue is in effect and in essence human survival.

In all these arguments in the Committee and in the General Assembly the U.S.S.R. came back time and time again to its proposal.. The first part of its counter-proposal is that the nations of the world who are members of the UN should resolve to ban the use of nuclear weapons. Since I have come to Ottawa I have had letters from many persons throughout Canada which said, "What a laudable proposal that is from the U.S.S.R."

Now, Sir, one must confess it has an immediate attraction and appeal. "Ban the use of nuclear weapons". I ask you, Sir, and I ask this House why, then, can we not accept this laudable proposal? The answer, the grim answer, is that a promise not to use nuclear weapons is good only until one nation decides to break it. There must be, for our security, a measure of inspection that will ensure that the undertakings in that regard are being carried out. Disarmament cannot be achieved by the stroke of a pen or the mere passing of a resolution....

It is evident that the advances or discoveries in the field of science and technology pose a new and urgent problem in international politics. We cannot solve that problem merely by talking about our endeavours of yesteryear. New scientific weapons and scientific discoveries have provided an urgency about the solution of those problems. Canada, I can assure this house, will endeavour in every way possible to advance further discussion and negotiations with respect to disarmament. For 11 years representatives of Canada have carried on those endeavours, and we hope we can keep the Canadian flag waving in respect of a matter of such vital concern to the human race, at least to make suggestions in negotiating a first-stage agreement with the U.S.S.R.

SYRIAN SITUATION

Apart from disarmament there was consideration of political crises. One had to do particularly with Syria. The Syrians lodged a resolution with the Secretary-General that would provide for a discussion of the threat to their security on the Syrian-Turkish border. Several efforts were made toward negotiation in that regard.... Our approach to that problem was that any nation such as Syria should have the opportunity to bring before the General Assembly what it thought was a threat to its security. That did not in any way indicate that we had in mind that Turkey, as a responsible member of NATO, would act in an irresponsible way. But we endeavoured to provide every possible way of finding out the facts.

Hon. members may recall that King Saud of Saudi Arabia offered to intervene and mediate, and there were suggestions that the Security Council might come into the picture. In association with Japan, Denmark, Norway, Paraguay, Peru and Spain we put forward a resolution that would call attention to the availability of the Secretary-General for consultation between Syria and Turkey, or even the availability of the Secretary-General to carry on an investigation; and then rather dramatically Syria and Turkey decided that the debate should be terminated.

I said it was dramatic, but it was not very spectacular. I do not think the press gave it enough publicity. It really was a product of what the Secretary-General of the United Nations has said of the United Nations "diplomacy of reconciliation". There in the General Assembly these charges and counter-charges were exchanged, and it was undoubtedly felt by the U.S.S.R. that it was losing the battle of polemics and that its propaganda concepts and objectives were being turned against it. That was indeed a victory for the United Nations and for the participation of the nations of the world in that debate in the General Assembly.

It would be an illusion, Mr. Speaker, to think that the underlying causes of tension in that area, and the fever and the rise in tempers are gone. We would all hope that the diplomacy, the reconciliation which was provided by the United Nations could be again brought to bear....

UNEF

I now desire to say something about the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.... I can say that the record of UNEF, the United Nations Emergency Force, has been one of great satisfaction not only to the UN but to the world. There have been on the border few incidents in recent months. Indeed, I was talking to Major General Burns and he told me that in the last few weeks there have not been any incidents on that border. Undoubtedly UNEF contributed at least to

arrest the movement that might have resulted in war, and we in Canada must be proud of our participation in that force. One-fifth of the Force come from Canada, 1,200 out of 6,000. We must take a particular pride in the Commander in Chief of the Force, Major General E.L.M. Burns. On all sides he was praised by members of the General Assembly in the debate that took place last Friday morning. I would say, in the words of our Prime Minister, who spoke to the General Assembly in September, that as long as the United Nations considers the presence of the UNEF in that particular area as necessary, Canada will continue to support by participating in its composition.

The Secretary-General in his recent annual report having mentioned the temporary nature of the Force, with the limited mandate in a particular area, went on to say that the value of such a force in such situations has been fully demonstrated. I would certainly subscribe to that view, as all the delegations from the West would. In that report the Secretary-General suggested that an agreed stand-by plan for a United Nations peace force which could be activated on short notice might be given consideration. Small wars, small conflicts, expand into great wars, and if agreement could be reached on the establishment of such a force I would think it would be a most significant step in making the United Nations a more effective organization for the maintenance of peace.

The establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force as an experiment gave rise to certain consequences, and one had to do with money. The estimated cost of the Force during the period from November 1956 to December 31, 1957 is in the region of \$30 million. Against this sum the total amount received or firmly pledged so far is some \$24 million. That includes the recent offer from the United States of \$12 million and the recent offer from the United Kingdom of \$1 million. It now appears that there will be a shortfall for the period ending December 31, 1957, of approximately \$3 million to \$4 million. It is estimated that in the year 1958 the Force will cost \$25 million.

I have used these figures, and I do not regard them as large or high when you put into the balance the great benefit that has followed the establishment and deployment of that Force on that border, the release of tension thereby preventing further expansion of the conflict in the area. On Friday last I introduced in the General Assembly a resolution for which 20 other countries offered their co-sponsorship. That resolution reaffirmed the principle that the responsibility for additional funds required in 1958 for the maintenance of this Force should be shared by all members of the United Nations in accordance with the scale of assessment that is invoked for the normal United Nations budget. That resolution was adopted despite the opposition of the U.S.S.R. bloc, and was adopted by a larger majority than we expected, with the result that I can say to members of the House that the financing of UNEF is now assured.

PALESTINIAN REFUGEES

Other Middle East issues continue to be the centre of attention at the United Nations. One of them has to do with the grave plight of the Palestinian refugees, and in this context one cannot say that any real progress has been made during the past year. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, to give it its full title, has continued to provide essential rations and other relief services, but shortage of funds has increasingly hampered the Agency in its effort to maintain these services or to proceed in an orderly way with the limited rehabilitation projects possible under present conditions.

I am happy to report that Canada during the past nine years has been the fourth largest non-Arab contributor to Palestine refugee relief, and in 1957 Canada was the third largest contributor. We have continued to urge other countries that they should accord greater support to UNRWA in order that there will not be a further decline in the standard of living of these unfortunate refugees. The estimates for 1957-58, at present before the House, seek approval of a Canadian contribution to UNRWA of \$750,000 to cover the 18-month period ending December 31, 1957. When the estimates for 1958-59 are brought before the next session, Parliament will be asked to approve a Canadian contribution to UNRWA of \$500,000 (for the calendar year 1958).

Before I turn from the United Nations I desire to inform the House of certain other contributions to the United Nations extra-budgetary programmes. The following amounts are included in the 1957-58 estimates at present before the House to cover Canadian contributions to these programmes of the United Nations during the calendar year 1957. In the 1958-59 estimates Parliament will be asked by the Government to approve Canadian contributions of the same amounts to cover the programmes of these organizations during the year 1958.

These are the amounts. In addition to UNRWA there is \$2 million to the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, \$200,000 to the United Nations Refugee Fund and \$650,000 to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund. All these proposed contributions are on the same scale as those to which the previous Parliament gave its approval....

There are negotiations going on now at the United Nations - the Minister of Finance referred to this in the House last week - with respect to the providing of financial assistance outside of the Colombo Plan to nations not only in South-East and South Asia but throughout the world. I do not regard the negative vote (cast by the Canadian Delegation to the Economic and Social Council) against the proposal of SUNFED as indicating that the Canadian Government will not support a proposal that I hope will come out of the negotiations....

COLOMBO PLAN

If I may leave the United Nations and go to the Colombo Plan, I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any single task in the international field which Canada has undertaken that should receive greater approval and endorsement from Canadians of all walks of life and all political persuasions. No reasonable man could doubt the benefits which this type of enterprise is bringing....

Two of my colleagues in the Government have recently been in South and South-East Asia, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Macdonnell) and the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Browne). They have returned to Ottawa, and from each of them I have heard of the unceasing struggle of the undeveloped countries in that part of the world to raise their standards of living. The hon. member for St. John's West, who attended in my place the Saigon meeting of the Consultative Committee of the Colombo Plan, can testify to the benefits that have accrued from Canada's investment in these particular projects.

These grants, hon. members of the House - and I say this from the bottom of my being - are not hand-outs. We should really think of them as helping hands. There is another feature, members of the House, about our investment in the Colombo Plan. Famine, distress and low standards of living create the seed-beds of unrest and indeed could create - and in some instances have done so - the seed-bed of war. It worries me to talk in this vein, but if anyone wants to talk about these matters in mere monetary terms, I would offer a good argument and, I think, a conclusive one that in time these countries in which we are making investments will become good customers and provide much opportunity for Canada. But I put that suggestion forward in second or third place.

As some hon. members of this House know, particularly the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Pearson), the Colombo Plan was a concept initiated and brought about in the Commonwealth. Here is another instance of the Commonwealth creating a nucleus which in due course produced a strengthened, forward-looking and beneficial international enterprise. In the routine aspect of carrying forward the programme under the Colombo Plan there always has had to be and there will have to be discussions with engineers, administrators and economists. Then there will have to be discussions with the countries to whom help might be offered, as to their needs. When decisions in that regard are made, Mr. Speaker, we will of course report to the House.

On November 22 in this session of Parliament the Prime Minister informed the House that the Government will seek Parliamentary approval of an appropriation for 1958-59 of \$35 million. The estimates that will be considered in a few days provide for a contribution of \$34,400,000. We are proposing an increase of \$600,000 for 1958-59.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS IN INDOCHINA

Time does not permit me to go into detail with respect to other parts of South and South-East Asia but in passing I would refer to the work of the International Commissions in Indochina. The task of the Commission in Cambodia is, in our opinion, about completed. There have been difficulties in the way of dissolving or disbanding the Commission. In Laos, where we are members of an international commission, after nearly three years of negotiations between the Royal Government and the Pathet Lao, an agreement has finally been reached whereby the Pathet Lao, which has been controlling one part of Laos, will be integrated into the national community. I seize this opportunity to say that we sympathize with the desire of the Laotian people to achieve a political settlement within the terms of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. We hope that this latest development will result in a strong Laos and a continuation of the democratic approach that has been followed by the Royal Government.

Viet-Nam remains divided. It is in this area where the sort of international supervision that is provided by the International Commissions has been most important for the maintenance of peace.

In relation to South and South-East Asia I would reiterate what I have endeavoured to say, namely that the recent visits of Ministers of the Government to that part of the world should be taken as indicative of our interest in the area, our close interest in Commonwealth ties, our desire to help the countries of the area to improve their standard of living and of our willingness to do our part in preserving peace.

THE COMMONWEALTH

A few moments ago I mentioned the Commonwealth. May I interpolate here - and this is a personal note - that after I reached the United Nations in the middle of September I was asked to attend a meeting of the Commonwealth group. It was not a bloc but a group. I am sure that no one else in the room could appreciate how thrilled I was, indeed how excited I was, at that first meeting. Here sitting around a horseshoe table were representatives of ten independent nations of the British Commonwealth, men and women coming from various climes, of various religions and cultures. There they sat. It seemed to me - and this is the basis of my thrill and of my excitement - that there was before me a brilliant page of British history, the bringing of colonies to nationhood. There was no treaty binding them together. Indeed I would say, for the want of a better word, that there was something mystical in their adherence to common ideals of the dignity of the individual, of justice, fairness and fair play.

LATIN AMERICA

I now come closer to home, Mr. Speaker, and I desire for a moment or two to mention our neighbours in this hemisphere. I would point out first our relationship to the republics of Latin America. Some of my first conversations at the United Nations in September were with representatives of the republics of Latin America. Since I have been in Ottawa I am gradually beginning to get to know better the Ambassadors from Latin America. I know that in the Assembly and the Councils of the United Nations our Canadian representatives over the years have acquired a deep appreciation of the strength, the wisdom and the vision which representatives of the Latin republics have brought to the discussions, deliberations and decisions of that body.

I refer, just by way of example, to only two. Colombia and Brazil made contributions in men and equipment to UNEF. Colombia and Brazil have each served three times on the Security Council. I think of Brazil today, which is the largest Latin nation in the world, with a population larger than that of Spain or Italy or France, with enormous natural resources scarcely tapped, a country of great promise. We have traded with those countries over many years, indeed for a century, I am informed. I hope that the substantial volume of our two-way trade with the Latin American nations today is only a stage on the way to greater expansion.

But it is only in the post-war years since 1945 that there has been an increased exchange of personnel, visitors and businessmen between Canada and the Latin American republics. Attending our colleges and universities are a considerable number of students who have come to us from Latin America. Visitors and tourists are increasing. Commercial aviation has been a significant factor in helping us to become better acquainted with the Latin American countries. The Mexican air line operates a regular service between Mexico City and Windsor, Ontario. Our own Canadian Pacific Air Lines now ranks as a major air service in the Americas. Those 20 independent nations are playing an increasing part in deliberations that are designed for the solution of international problems - and I express the hope that the cordial relations which now exist with those 20 nations will be enhanced and increased.

UNITED STATES

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to our closest neighbour, the United States. A kindly providence has willed the geographical location of that country with respect to Canada. With the United States we share a continent and a common heritage from many lands beyond the seas, moulded around political philosophies which have become, in some measure perhaps, the central core of the institutions of both our countries.

LATIN AMERICA

I now come closer to home, Mr. Speaker, and I desire for a moment or two to mention our neighbours in this hemisphere. I would point out first our relationship to the republics of Latin America. Some of my first conversations at the United Nations in September were with representatives of the republics of Latin America. Since I have been in Ottawa I am gradually beginning to get to know better the Ambassadors from Latin America. I know that in the Assembly and the Councils of the United Nations our Canadian representatives over the years have acquired a deep appreciation of the strength, the wisdom and the vision which representatives of the Latin republics have brought to the discussions, deliberations and decisions of that body.

I refer, just by way of example, to only two. Colombia and Brazil made contributions in men and equipment to UNEF. Colombia and Brazil have each served three times on the Security Council. I think of Brazil today, which is the largest Latin nation in the world, with a population larger than that of Spain or Italy or France, with enormous natural resources scarcely tapped, a country of great promise. We have traded with those countries over many years, indeed for a century, I am informed. I hope that the substantial volume of our two-way trade with the Latin American nations today is only a stage on the way to greater expansion.

But it is only in the post-war years since 1945 that there has been an increased exchange of personnel, visitors and businessmen between Canada and the Latin American republics. Attending our colleges and universities are a considerable number of students who have come to us from Latin America. Visitors and tourists are increasing. Commercial aviation has been a significant factor in helping us to become better acquainted with the Latin American countries. The Mexican air line operates a regular service between Mexico City and Windsor, Ontario. Our own Canadian Pacific Air Lines now ranks as a major air service in the Americas. Those 20 independent nations are playing an increasing part in deliberations that are designed for the solution of international problems - and I express the hope that the cordial relations which now exist with those 20 nations will be enhanced and increased.

UNITED STATES

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to our closest neighbour, the United States. A kindly providence has willed the geographical location of that country with respect to Canada. With the United States we share a continent and a common heritage from many lands beyond the seas, moulded around political philosophies which have become, in some measure perhaps, the central core of the institutions of both our countries.

LATIN AMERICA

I now come closer to home, Mr. Speaker, and I desire for a moment or two to mention our neighbours in this hemisphere. I would point out first our relationship to the republics of Latin America. Some of my first conversations at the United Nations in September were with representatives of the republics of Latin America. Since I have been in Ottawa I am gradually beginning to get to know better the Ambassadors from Latin America. I know that in the Assembly and the Councils of the United Nations our Canadian representatives over the years have acquired a deep appreciation of the strength, the wisdom and the vision which representatives of the Latin republics have brought to the discussions, deliberations and decisions of that body.

I refer, just by way of example, to only two. Colombia and Brazil made contributions in men and equipment to UNEF. Colombia and Brazil have each served three times on the Security Council. I think of Brazil today, which is the largest Latin nation in the world, with a population larger than that of Spain or Italy or France, with enormous natural resources scarcely tapped, a country of great promise. We have traded with those countries over many years, indeed for a century, I am informed. I hope that the substantial volume of our two-way trade with the Latin American nations today is only a stage on the way to greater expansion.

But it is only in the post-war years since 1945 that there has been an increased exchange of personnel, visitors and businessmen between Canada and the Latin American republics. Attending our colleges and universities are a considerable number of students who have come to us from Latin America. Visitors and tourists are increasing. Commercial aviation has been a significant factor in helping us to become better acquainted with the Latin American countries. The Mexican air line operates a regular service between Mexico City and Windsor, Ontario. Our own Canadian Pacific Air Lines now ranks as a major air service in the Americas. Those 20 independent nations are playing an increasing part in deliberations that are designed for the solution of international problems - and I express the hope that the cordial relations which now exist with those 20 nations will be enhanced and increased.

UNITED STATES

I come now, Mr. Speaker, to our closest neighbour, the United States. A kindly providence has willed the geographical location of that country with respect to Canada. With the United States we share a continent and a common heritage from many lands beyond the seas, moulded around political philosophies which have become, in some measure perhaps, the central core of the institutions of both our countries.

These philosophies, coming from our twin motherlands, Great Britain and France, have been shared by us as comrades in arms during two world wars. Again, when we fought with the Americans under the flag of the United Nations in Korea, we Canadians knew the value of our American friends.

We have been in close association with our neighbour in the United Nations and we also work closely with them in NATO. Particularly, those of us who remember the years before the First World War welcome their assumption of world leadership during the last two decades. I must however observe that sometimes in pursuit of common objectives the means chosen by the United States to effect these ends may have side effects which are injurious to Canada and which in many instances are not made clear to the American people and of which therefore they are not properly aware.

When we in Canada consider that such effects may stem from any action or inaction on the part of the United States and may affect what we deem to be the best and just interests of our country and our people we must, without petulance or sophomoric sensitivity, seek from our United States neighbours the consideration of those effects. There is nothing wrong or improper with conscientiously facing the problems or difficulties separating true friends. This is also true in the field of international relations. What to my mind would be wrong and improper would be for us to dig and dig for slights and to magnify oversights. It would be equally improper for the two governments to allow old and burning problems to fester.... and to continue unresolved. It is in that way that misunderstandings grow and fair-mindedness of the people and their governments may be warped. There have been problems between our countries throughout our history. The territorial part which we know as Canada did not exist in the early days but those who have read the biography of Sir John A. Macdonald by Professor Creighton will appreciate what I have been saying.

From those early years there have been problems between us and they have continued, indeed, down to our present difficulties with respect to the United States wheat surplus disposal programmes. I declare, Mr. Speaker, that considerate frankness will not endanger true friendship between our countries. Above all, it is of paramount importance to international peace that Canada and the United States, unequal as they are with respect to military and economic force but equal in their common respect for the dignity of the individual, should set a continued example to the whole world of how friendly nations can live together.

May I state as simply as I can how I see the development of our relations with the United States. We must be friends; friendship however means something more than the absence of enmity. Friendship really means the existence of positive and effective interest on the part of each nation in the welfare of the other.

In recent weeks.... we have been forced to give closer examination to our collective security arrangements by reason of the success of the U.S.S.R. in the launching of the inter-continental ballistic missile and in the launching of two earth satellites. It has been a shock but it has had a salutary effect in terms of the re-appraisal of our common defence.

NATO

We in the democracies are apt to relax until pressure is brought upon us by the course of events; then we jump into action.... In this age of infinite risk we should have some concern about this characteristic tendency to relax in the absence of pressure. That attitude of relaxation when there is no pressure on us may, and in this case probably has, tempted fate. However, we have now been dramatically reminded of the terrible menace of nuclear warfare and as a result all members of NATO recognize they are faced with the necessity of making far-reaching decisions in the military field while, at the same time, having to cope with political problems of exceptional complexity.... I wish to say a word about the military and political problems because I think the success of NATO in rising to the occasion will depend largely on how it can merge its military and its political objectives.

Despite Soviet accusations that NATO is an aggressor and was designed for aggression, the sole military purpose of NATO - this has been declaimed over and over again and we have no reason to doubt it - is to deter aggression by providing firm evidence that aggressors would be quickly and successfully met if they should attack any member of the Alliance. In NATO there is a formidable capability - as General Norstad stated in Ottawa 10 days ago - to deter aggression. In this connection he also said that this capability is not altered or modified by the possession by any other power of a nuclear intercontinental ballistic missile.

This is a field, I am aware, where theories abound and often conflict. I do not intend to do more at this point than to state the Government's position, indeed its conviction, that the value of NATO as a deterrent remains intact and that it is incumbent upon us - we who have banded together in NATO - to exploit the opportunities which exist for closer co-operation in the fields of military, economic and scientific affairs.

We must seek for co-operation by increased exchange of scientific and technical information and from the stimulation of scientific education and research in the NATO countries. We should be able to find that further co-operation is possible in the economic production of modern weapons.

Military problems will loom large on the agenda of the NATO meeting which is to be held next month in Paris but, in the minds of many governments and of many peoples, that meeting will be judged just as much by its achievement in the non-military field as in the military field. With the challenge of communism all the time advancing, NATO must move with the times in the field of politics.

It is essential that we of the NATO alliance should intensify and develop our military contribution. But that is not enough. It is essential that we should work together to improve our machinery for consultation and promote the intimacy of our intramural understanding. These obligations are with us and they must be observed, but they are limited. To confine ourselves in NATO to attaining them alone would be to cultivate our own interdependence as members of NATO without realizing that the health and strength of the Alliance depends on its relations with the world outside. There is, in other words, a global interdependence in this age of scientific discovery and nationalist ferment, and it is important for us and important for NATO not to underestimate that need.

No one should think of letting down his guard at the present time; no prudent man can deny the need for defence insurance. What I am suggesting is that the security organization will be successful or unsuccessful according to the degree of intelligence with which its political policies are formulated and pursued.

To give an example, I turn for a moment to the problem of (Soviet activity in) uncommitted neutral states. This is a serious and growing danger. How are they going? Are they going toward the Russians or toward the West? This cannot be ignored by NATO members, and yet NATO as such is perhaps not well equipped to deal with such a problem.... The Asian and African nations which are uncommitted have no more desire than we have to see greater domination of other countries by the U.S.S.R. But, having regard to the historic relations they have had with the West and having regard to their desire to flex their muscles as new and independent nations, they might think that the steps which are being taken at NATO are designed for our security, and of course they are, and they would not necessarily adopt them wholeheartedly as their measures.

We must recognize, too, that nationalism is not necessarily synonymous with communism in young countries, but we have to realize also that nationalism has been exploited by communism. There are real risks in dealing with these uncommitted nations. Their peoples may succumb to the blandishments and to the plausible and insidious appeal of Soviet tactics, but we must respect them as independent nations. We must work with them and assure them that we regard them as independent nations, and try to establish a mature and wise

relationship with them. Or, to put it another way, unless we assure them by word and deed that our participation in NATO is complementary to and not in conflict with our membership in the Commonwealth and in the United Nations we may not be able to make much appeal to them.

Canada is a middle power with roots in the three associations, in NATO, in the Commonwealth and in the United Nations. I think Canada has a special reason for avoiding an absolutely rigid dependence on any one of these organizations as the sole instrument or channel of its foreign policy.

I come now to my final point in relation to the NATO meeting projected for Paris in December. The House will not expect me - and even if it did I could not do this - to predict the specific terms of the agenda or the likely outcome of the deliberations. I am more concerned to suggest to this House the general philosophy which I think should govern our approach to that meeting. We must... start from the premise that new and intensified efforts at military and scientific co-operation are essential, and we must be prepared to do our part in developing that co-operation. We must, in the second place, in view of the unhappy events of the last two or three weeks, renew our determination to consult frankly on issues which have caused, or are likely to cause, divisions in NATO. And, thirdly, to return to the point I was trying to make a few moments ago, we must assure the world outside NATO that no one need fear aggression from us; that far from regarding the forthcoming meeting as an end in itself, the whole world, including ourselves, regards it as a symbol of our determination to protect ourselves and, no less important, of our genuine and sustained interest in finding ultimate peaceful solutions to the issues that divide us from the communist world.

I have endeavoured to put before this House a diagram of Canada's relations with other nations. Nothing that I have said should obscure our intense resolution to reduce tensions between the West and the U.S.S.R. No sane person could run the risk of shutting any promising door on the possibility of co-existence. Yet - and this is not double talk - we should not fall into a propaganda plot; we should not be lulled into complacency by empty or hollow professions such as happened after the Geneva meeting. We must keep up our defences pending the arrival of the day for which we have hoped, the arrival of the day of substantial mutual trust between the West and the East. And I should add this: we must have convincing proof that the U.S.S.R. has abandoned its policies of domination. Co-existence cannot be used as a cover for subversion on the part of the U.S.S.R. in free countries. What I have been trying to say, Sir, is that we must keep our powder dry and put the hand out.