

THE POLITICAL SPEAKING OF THE HON. HOWARD C. GREEN AS VIEWED  
WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF CICERO'S "FIVE CANONS OF RHETORIC"

by

CHARLES EDWARD MONTALBETTI

B.Com., University of British Columbia

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Education

in the Department

of

Speech Communication

We accept this thesis as conforming to the  
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April, 1969

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and Study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Speech Communication

The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date April, 1969

## ABSTRACT

The study has two major purposes:

1. To present a narrative account of the life and speaking career of Hon. Howard C. Green, particularly during those periods when he spoke on behalf of significant issues.
2. To analyze a select number of speeches delivered by Mr. Green in the Canadian House of Commons utilizing Cicero's "Five Canons of Rhetoric" as a unifying framework.

All-over sources of information included personal interviews with Mr. Green and others, personal papers, relevant speeches, and finally, newspapers, magazines, manuscripts and historical text material.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY . . . . .	1
	Historical Preamble . . . . .	1
	Choosing the Subject . . . . .	2
	Purposes of the Study . . . . .	3
	Limitations of the Study . . . . .	4
	Chapter Organization . . . . .	4
11	METHOD OF PROCEDURE . . . . .	6
	General Method . . . . .	6
	Selection of Speeches . . . . .	8
	Method of Analysis of Speeches . . . . .	10
111	MR. GREEN'S BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT . . . . .	12
	Preface . . . . .	12
	Early Period . . . . .	12
	Pre Political Years . . . . .	14
	Political Period . . . . .	19
	Post Political Years . . . . .	30
1V	ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES . . . . .	31
	Invention . . . . .	31
	Disposition . . . . .	46
	Style . . . . .	57
	Delivery . . . . .	68
	Memory . . . . .	75
V	OVERVIEW AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	78
	FOOTNOTES . . . . .	83
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	92
	APPENDIX . . . . .	98



## LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1	Analysis of Quotations Used in Mr. Green's Political Speeches . . . . .	60
11	Analysis of Significant Differences in Mr. Green's Political Speeches Between His Term in Opposition and His Term as Minister . . . . .	82

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is deeply indebted to the Hon. Howard C. Green, whose wise counsel and helpful suggestions have contributed greatly to the present work. Both he and Mrs. Green have patiently answered my numerous questions.

To Dr. P. Read Campbell the author would like to express his profound appreciation for her imaginative and painstaking assistance in this thesis.

## AUTHOR'S COMMENT

For the greater part of the past twenty-five years I have resided with my family in Vancouver, British Columbia. During this span of time, I have grown from a timid preschooler to a college graduate. Throughout my youth I can remember my parents discussing various aspects of politics. Although I was not much concerned, there was one thing that did puzzle me. This was the fact that although my parents and most of their friends were Liberals, yet they persistently voted for a Conservative. This Conservative happened to be our neighbor, Mr. Howard C. Green.

Later in my college career I did become seriously involved with political discussions. It was during this period that I became aware of Mr. Green's deep personal feeling for Canadian people and of his devotion to his work for the good of all Canadians. Over the years the example set by Mr. Green became an inspiration and a guide for me.

When it came time for me to begin graduate work, and later, select a thesis for my program in Speech Communication, it seemed most natural that I should choose Mr. Howard Green as a subject. Mr. Green's speaking and personality seemed an excellent exemplification of certain principles of rhetoric to which I had become sympathetic. The only reservation I have is that this study may not do justice to Mr. Green's political speaking. For this I ask his indulgence.

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

#### Historical Preamble

For the last twenty-five centuries speech and speech-making have been studied and written about. From the experience of these many centuries a number of principles have emerged, principles which, in the main, are found to be as valid today as they were in the time of Aristotle or Cicero or Quintilian. Whether consciously or not, most speakers today apply principles formulated centuries ago. In this study the principles laid down by Cicero, the great Roman orator and writer of the First Century B.C., are used as a structure within which direction and focus are given to the main body of the work. It is not only in his own time that Cicero was conceded the position of a leading speech theorist; his carefully-formulated speech code has stood the test of two thousand years.<sup>1</sup> It is with a fine feeling of satisfaction, then, that the author of this thesis chose to utilize Cicero's "Five Canons of Rhetoric" as his framework of reference.

Rhetoric may be loosely defined as the art and skill of speaking. But speaking has many forms and may be as complex and many-faceted as the human who uses it. In this study major emphasis has been placed on public address, and, even more delimited, on what is commonly

termed "parliamentary speaking." In a free and responsible society the right to genuine deliberation and debate among the people or their representatives is jealously guarded. Debate is thought of as the method of presenting formally to the audience concerned the evidence, reasoning and appeals necessary for reaching conclusions.

### Choosing the Subject

The elected representatives of a country are charged with the responsibility of maintaining the government of that country. The members of this group have in common the task of sharing in the decision-making process referred to as politics. It is the sum total of the collective communication of the elected representatives which serves to direct and maintain the society which they represent. Meaningful insights may be gained by an analyst by focusing on individual members of the political society. To attempt an analysis of several individual figures would have certain additional advantages. However, the length of this paper permits an in-depth study of only one.

The particular member of the political group which the author has chosen is the Hon. Howard C. Green, a former Conservative Member of Canada's Parliament. If one is interested in analyzing Canada's political communication (political speeches delivered in the House of Commons), what direction should the study take? How can one achieve

a clear-cut view of a single politician in a way that makes such study possible? How shall the analyst commence his study of Canada's political arena? These are but a few of numerous meaningful questions which could be considered before a study is generated. For purposes of this paper the discussion will be limited to the rhetorical analysis of one of Canada's most prominent statesmen, Mr. Howard Green. Coupled with a consideration of political rhetoric will be an observation of the rhetorical process used in Canada's political forum.

Selecting a politician from among the large number of living candidates is a rather easy task. However, the selection of a "good" politician is something quite else.<sup>2</sup> Where shall one find a man deeply imbued with a sense of responsibility for, and close solidarity with, the environment in which he lives? Where shall one find a man who is able to exert a profound impact on his society? Choosing a good candidate for study is no simple task! Nevertheless, the author is convinced that he was able to find such a man in the person of Mr. Howard Green.

This study concentrates on those periods of Howard Green's career when he spoke on significant issues in the Canadian House of Commons.

#### Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are: (1) to present a narrative account of the life and speaking career of

Mr. Green; (2) to analyze a select number of speeches which Mr. Green delivered in the Canadian House of Commons from the point of view of Cicero's "Canons of Rhetoric;"<sup>3</sup> (3) to examine Mr. Green's parliamentary speaking and debate through a consideration of the comments of various journalists and numerous Members of the House of Commons.

### Limitations of the Study

When a sample from a population is chosen there is always the question of which units to select (or in this case which speeches to select). Mr. Green delivered one hundred and nineteen speeches in the House of Commons.<sup>4</sup> The author has selected eight speeches characteristic of Mr. Green's speaking from this population. It is not possible in eight speeches to cover every possible speech situation and communication encounter in which Mr. Green was involved. It is realized that the selection of a small sample from a large population will indicate only the general tendency of Mr. Green's speaking.

### Chapter Organization

Chapter 1. Introduction to the Study. Following the historical preamble which provided a backward look at the emergence of speech-making over the centuries and the author's reasons for selecting Cicero as the unifying frame for his study, reasons were then given for the choice of subject.

The purposes and limitations of the study were discussed and the organization of the four chapters outlined.

Chapter II. Method of Procedure. Mr. Green's speeches were collected; journalistic opinion was studied; and press interviews with Mr. Green were conducted. Eight speeches portraying his concern for certain basic issues were selected as a representative sample. These were organized in a time sequence and analyzed in detail. Cicero's classical components of rhetoric formed the basis of the all-over evaluation of the eight speeches which were selected.

Chapter III. Mr. Green's Background and Development. A consideration of Mr. Green's place in Canadian political history was presented. An analysis was made of his development as a political speaker. Quotations are used to exemplify the opinion of various journalists, not only in terms of his political rhetoric but also regarding Howard Green, the statesman and neighbor.

Chapter IV. Analysis of Selected Speeches. Each of Cicero's "Five Canons of Rhetoric" were enlarged upon in turn in order that further dimensions of meaning might be understood more clearly. Relevant excerpts from Mr. Green's speeches were quoted in order to furnish an example of the principle being examined.

Chapter V. Overview and Conclusions. Evaluations and conclusions regarding Mr. Green's strength as a speaker were set forth.



## CHAPTER TWO

### METHOD OF PROCEDURE

#### General Method

In order to analyze the speaking of Howard Green it was necessary to locate all possible material pertaining to his political career. By sifting through historical and biographical data a general impression of Mr. Green's political speaking was obtained. The author then procured the vast number of speeches which Mr. Green delivered. Particular interest centred on his speeches in the Canadian House of Commons. However, other speeches were gathered, including those delivered in the United Nations in New York; speeches delivered to service groups and various other organizations; and a speech delivered over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (radio). The text of Mr. Green's speeches was obtained from the Canadian Government Hansard and from numerous newspaper articles. By contacting Mr. Green and completing a series of personal interviews, it became possible to review all of his speeches given in the House of Commons. Articles and comment from a number of selected newspapers and magazines were studied in order to obtain the opinion of journalists concerning his speeches.

The personal interviews with Mr. Green proved to be most helpful to the writer as he came to know more of Mr. Green's character and stature as a person of rank

and influence.

One of the dangers in analyzing a Canadian politician's speeches (for content and effectiveness) is the author's possible susceptibility to interpretive pressures, particularly from the newspapers. It is important to include both aspects of the interpretation of a speaker:

- a) how the speaker viewed his work
- b) the news media's opinion of his work

Oftentimes the news media misquotes or quotes the speaker out of context. This changes the speaker's intended meaning. The analyst must constantly keep the interpretive pitfalls in mind.

It would be interesting to see how journalists who originally devoted articles to Mr. Green's views would react today to his earlier political statements. For example, one position on which Mr. Green took a determined stand was against the admission of nuclear arms into Canada.<sup>5</sup> At the very time that Mr. Green was being criticized by the press for his stand<sup>6</sup> Canada was trying to provide the world with a neutral power which would enable all countries to embark upon meaningful disarmament negotiations in Geneva. However, the news media were antagonistic to Mr. Green's attitude and proceeded to castigate his stand (reflected in his speeches). In fact the May 16, 1961, editorial in the Vancouver Daily Province had the caption: "Mr. Green Should Resign."<sup>7</sup> How would these same journalists treat his view on nuclear arms today? One has to scrutinize with great care the accuracy and authenticity of the interpretation given by the

newspaper media.

### Selection of Speeches

The author read all of Mr. Green's speeches delivered in the Canadian House of Commons. Because of the complex nature of debate in the Canadian Parliament many different kinds of speaking situations were represented. However, only those speeches where Mr. Green developed a specific issue or series of issues were selected as major political speeches. His passing remarks which were quite short or were used by Mr. Green only as a filler, or used in answering a direct question or covering some point of information have been omitted. In all, one hundred and nineteen speeches were delivered by Mr. Green during his political career.<sup>8</sup>

Mr. Green's public life can be divided realistically into two separate parts: (1) his Opposition role from 1935 to 1957; and (2) his role as a Cabinet Minister during the time the Conservative Government was in power from 1957 to 1963. This division seems warranted because it appears that Mr. Green played two distinct roles while in politics. The first role was that of the Opposition critic, the second was that of a Minister in office. In a personal interview Mr. Green concurred that he saw his political career in this way.

As indicated above it was not the purpose of this dissertation to analyze and authenticate all of Mr. Green's

speech texts, rather to select enough speeches to form a representative sample. From this sample will come a fairly realistic analysis of Mr. Green's political speaking. It was decided to select eight speeches (four speeches from each of Mr. Green's political periods as previously outlined) which were typical of Mr. Green's political speaking in the House of Commons. It was known that the majority of speeches delivered took place in the first years of his political life, however, in order to give an equal weighting to both political periods, it was decided to select the same number of speeches from each. An important consideration in selecting a representative sample from Mr. Green's earlier speaking period was the fact that they were delivered over a twenty-two year period. The time factor and the fact that one hundred and twelve major speeches were delivered by Mr. Green during this period caused an additional problem in selecting the sample. The second political period was only seven years in length and surprisingly enough Mr. Green delivered exactly seven major speeches. Hence it was easier to select representative speeches during the second speaking period. Holding these factors in mind the following speeches were chosen:

a) Period one 1935 - May 1957

- (1) March 9, 1936 - Pensions for the Blind
- (2) March 6, 1941 - Bill Amending Pension Act
- (3) October 18, 1951 - Throne Speech Debate
- (4) November 26, 1956 - The Suez Crisis

b) Period two June 1957 - 1963

- (1) July 9, 1959 - Introduction of Estimates of  
Department of External Affairs
- (2) February 10, 1960 - Canada's Foreign Policy
- (3) April 26, 1961 - Canada in Today's World
- (4) September 7, 1961 - The Crisis Arising Over  
Nuclear Tests and Berlin

Some of the issues with which Mr. Green associated himself during the course of his political career were:

1. War Veterans
2. The Blind
3. Disarmament
4. Strong British Preference for Trade
5. The Commonwealth
6. Canada's Role as a Neutral World Leader
7. Defense
8. United States Influence in Canada

The speeches which were selected focused on the major issues proposed and explored by Mr. Green. Through the process of analyzing the eight representative speeches the author obtained information regarding almost all aspects of Mr. Green's speaking: (1) his development of significant issues, (2) structure and organization of his speech, (3) choice and arrangement of his wording, (4) delivery, and (5) his memory. In addition an overview of his total political speaking career became possible. The selected speeches were presented to Mr. Green as the sample to be analyzed. He agreed that these speeches were representative of his normal mode of political thinking and speaking.

#### Method of Analysis of Speeches

The purpose of this study was to discover and discuss the characteristics of the political speaking of Howard C. Green,

as shown by an analysis of selected speeches he delivered in the Canadian House of Commons.

Various kinds of materials were used to study Mr. Green as a speaker throughout his political career and to establish a semblance or model of him as a man. His speaking career was traced through his speeches and other available materials, through personal interviews concerning the preparation of his speeches from outline to final draft; and finally by comments concerning his speeches as found in newspapers, magazines and historical texts.

Mr. Green's speaking career was evaluated in terms of Cicero's classical components of rhetoric.<sup>9</sup> Eight speeches were selected throughout the political career of Mr. Green which were representative of the type of speeches he used and which identified with the major issues he spoke on.

In analyzing Mr. Green's speeches there were a number of questions which naturally came to the forefront. How did Mr. Green view his political speaking? What were the major issues with which he identified? What were the main ideas presented in his speeches? How did he develop his ideas? What are the characteristics of his invention (development of significant issues), style (choice and arrangement of words), disposition (structure and organization of the speech), delivery, and memory? These questions provided the basic pattern of study for this paper.

## CHAPTER 111

### MR. GREEN'S BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT

#### Preface

There are a number of methods open to the analyst for use in measuring an individual's ability to interact in society. One of the most useful is to attempt to summarize and define the individual's personality in terms of his past actions, ancestry, experience, health record, and other relevant constituents and circumstances.<sup>10</sup> This - the case history method - can range from simple biographical sketches to highly complex interpretative materials couched in psychiatric language.<sup>11</sup> By utilizing the case history method the author studied Mr. Green's background and development as a political speaker. Such knowledge provided some meaningful insights into his political rhetoric.

#### Early Period

The Honourable Howard C. Green, P.C., Q.C., LL.D., M.P., was born into a Kootenay pioneer family on November 5, 1895. He was born in Kaslo, a town situated on Kootenay Lake in British Columbia. His father, Samuel Howard Green, had been brought up in Peterborough, Ontario, and had gone West with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Later he found employment with a construction crew and eventually settled in

Kaslo where he opened a general store.<sup>12</sup>

Mr. Green's mother, Flora Isabel Goodwin, came of a New Brunswick family that had emigrated West as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company opened the country. Now, ninety-four, she is still active and on occasion has interested and incisive comments to make on her son's activities.<sup>13</sup> Her permanent home is still Kaslo although at present she is living with Mr. and Mrs. Green in Vancouver. It should be mentioned that she was made a "Freeman" of Kaslo. This is an honor which is bestowed upon those citizens who make an outstanding contribution in their community.

In time, the Kaslo business enterprise of the Green family grew into a string of general stores in the Kootenay district of British Columbia. This chain was operated by Samuel Green in partnership with his brother Robert. Robert eventually entered politics first by becoming mayor of Kaslo, British Columbia. He was then elected to the Legislature and was appointed a Minister in the provincial government formed by Sir Richard McBride in 1903. (Mr. Green likes to recall that another member of that cabinet was Frederick John Fulton, father of Davie Fulton, the previous Justice Minister under the Conservative Party directed by John Diefenbaker.) Robert Green was elected as a Conservative in the 1913 Federal by-election for Kootenay, British Columbia. He was appointed a senator in 1919 and held this position until his death in 1946.<sup>14</sup> Having strong family ties,



the political career of his uncle had a profound influence on Howard Green's entry and involvement in politics. The seed for a political career was planted early.

Mr. Green attended public and high school in the Kaslo area, completing grades one through thirteen in the same school - a traditional "little red schoolhouse."<sup>15</sup> One individual who initially exerted a strong influence on Mr. Green was his school principal, Mr. George Hindle (1907-1909).<sup>16</sup> The constant encouragement received from the principal helped to increase Mr. Green's bent toward a university education. From this simple background centred in British Columbia, the career of one of Canada's great statesmen began.

### Pre Political Years

After completing senior matriculation in British Columbia, Mr. Green travelled East to attend the University of Toronto in 1912. At that time British Columbia had no university; its one institution of higher learning being a (Vancouver) branch of McGill University where a two-year course was available. In Toronto Mr. Green lived first with an aunt and then for two years resided at the Central YMCA on College Street, close to the University of Toronto.

While at university Mr. Green involved himself deeply in the university paper, the Varsity, becoming managing editor in his last school year. During his three years at

the University of Toronto he wrote a number of articles for the paper and joined with fellow students from the paper in a bid to form the university student government. They called their political organization "The Social Democrats." However, they professed to be a non-partisan organization. In later years the name Social Democrat became a source of embarrassment for Mr. Green, especially in view of the fact that he was now involved with a political party known as the Progressive Conservatives.

When war broke out in 1914, Mr. Green joined the officers' training corps at the university. As soon as he received his arts degree in 1915, he returned to British Columbia and was commissioned in the 54th (Kootenay) Battalion in May (1915). A humorous incident which occurred during the commissioning of Mr. Green involved the examining physician who was an old family friend. He overlooked Mr. Green's imperfect eyesight allowing him to pass the physical examination. When it came time for Mr. Green's eye test the doctor told him to cover one eye at a time and read the eye chart. Although covering his good eye the patient kept his fingers spread to enable him to read the chart accurately! This anecdote corresponds with many other stories concerning First World War medical examinations. A comrade in arms in the 54th was Herbert W. Herridge (Federal CCF Kootenay West - 1945-1968). The political quarrels between the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) and

the Conservatives in British Columbia and in the Commons have done nothing to cool the friendship formed between the two men.

The 54th Kootenay Battalion went overseas December 1915 and arrived in France in August, 1916. Mr. Green served in the trenches for the next year. He was then posted to the Canadian Corps Infantry School in France, where he graduated at the head of his class. Because of his academic and leadership abilities he was appointed an instructor at the School. This teaching position afforded him the opportunity to develop an articulate presentation and good tone control. From March, 1918, until he returned to Canada, he was staff officer (intelligence) first with the 6th Canadian Infantry Brigade - 29th Vancouver Battalion; then the Staff Captain in the General Canadian Section during 1919; and was finally posted as a Staff Officer to British General Headquarters in France. He was demobilized July, 1919, and returned to Canada.

Mr. Green now recalls that he had toyed with the idea of entering journalism upon his return from overseas. However, he became articled to a Vancouver law firm by the name of Abbot MacRae. He then returned East to Osgoode Hall Law School, Toronto, and was able to proceed straight into the second year of the law course. He received the silver medal for academic excellence in his graduating year. He was able to complete his university training and law articling in time to be called to the bar of British Columbia in February, 1922.

It is interesting to note that Chief Justice Davie (British Columbia) was called to the bar at the same time.

His classmates at Osgoode Hall Law School included Premier Leslie Frost (Former Conservative Premier of Ontario 1949-1961), whom he had previously known at the infantry school in France; Attorney-General Kelso Roberts (appointed 1955 in Ontario) and Charles P. McTague, the Toronto corporation lawyer who later became national organizer of the Conservative Party and was named chairman of the Royal Commission on Railway Problems during the Diefenbaker regime. Mr. McTague graduated at the head of the class at Osgoode Hall, while Mr. Green graduated in second place. The picture started to take form. From his comrades in the war years and at school came a select number who went directly into political life. The motivations which affected them also influenced him. His peer group produced a profound effect on Mr. Green, motivating him in the direction of a political career.

In 1923 Mr. Green married Marion Jean Mounce of Vancouver. They had two sons, Lewis H. Green and John W. Green. Lewis, an engineer who used to be employed by the Federal Geological Surveys, now works for the Hanna Mining Company in Vancouver. He took his B.Sc. at the University of British Columbia and his Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin. The other son, John, is the publisher of the Aggasiz-Harrison Advance, a weekly newspaper in British Columbia. John took his B.A. at the University of British Columbia and a degree

in journalism at Columbia University. He was a candidate in the provincial elections in 1963, in Yale, British Columbia.

After serving with the Ladner and Cantelon Vancouver law firm for the four years 1923 to 1926, Mr. Green entered into a law partnership in Vancouver with Mr. F.K. Collins in 1926. Mr. Collins, as Mr. Green, was young energetic and Conservative. He was appointed to the Supreme Court of British Columbia in 1958. There is little doubt that Mr. Green was instrumental in obtaining his appointment.<sup>17</sup>

Apart from his growing law practice Mr. Green was immersed in the political field. Gradually, he became deeply involved in the affairs of the South Vancouver Conservative Association. In 1930 the Conservatives had lost the Vancouver South seat to Mr. Angus MacInnis, one of the original members of the CCF Party. Mr. Green took charge of a young aggressive group of Conservatives who had made up their minds not only to win back the seat but to re-organize the Conservative local.<sup>18</sup> They were determined not to repeat the political catastrophe that occurred in 1930.

From the very beginning numerous motivations propelled Mr. Green toward political life. These varied motivations had a direct correlation with his political rhetoric and formed the driving force behind his speeches. Mr. Green was motivated to speak by: (1) his friendships cultivated both in the war and during his university life

in Toronto; (2) his uncle's involvement in politics; (3) the many offices and memberships he held; (4) his war experience; (5) his background as a military instructor; (6) his legal background; (7) and perhaps the most important of all, a sense of duty; a deep feeling for humanity and a sense of the injustices apparent in Canada. It is essentially from these motivations that Mr. Green derived the abundance of energy and direction which led him directly to the Canadian political forum.<sup>19</sup>

### Political Period

In the years following 1930 a political struggle developed between the younger men of the Vancouver South Conservative Association and the old guard. Each sought to gain control of the riding. Both groups were skeptical of the other's chances of regaining the seat in the next general election since each group realized that they held widely differing points of view. In the end the younger men won and Mr. Green received the nomination to represent the Conservatives in the next election. His fight was by no means over. The general election of 1935 found the Conservative Party at its lowest ebb of popularity. There was dissension in the country and a bitter pessimistic attitude toward the government. The people had just weathered the depression years and were in no condition to face another economic setback. The Conservative Party was blamed for

many of the conditions of 1935. As we now know they were charged with the task of trying to solve an almost insolvable situation.<sup>20</sup> Many Canadians were unemployed and had not worked for several years. Mr. Green's prospects for winning the seat were not too promising, but this did not stop him. He worked long hours organizing and making a series of public speeches. The result was that on election night he had won the seat although only with a scant majority of 279 votes. Howard Green's political career had begun! When he arrived in Ottawa to take his place as an elected Member of Parliament he found himself among a small shattered Conservative minority of only thirty-nine Members, in a House of 245 members. However, the small ratio of Conservatives to Liberals in the House worked to his advantage, as in a very short time, he was lauded as the chief Opposition Member to contend with.<sup>21</sup> Bruce Hutchison remarked that, "Howard Green, Vancouver's gaunt and rough-hewn ambassador, was one of the finest men to enter Parliament."<sup>22</sup>

After the 1945 election Mr. Green's majority was increased by nearly 14,000 votes. A redistribution carved up the Vancouver South riding and in 1949 he moved to Vancouver-Quadra, a new constituency. About two-thirds of its voters came from the old Vancouver South riding. Mr. Green represented this riding until 1963 (the culmination of his political career).

For twenty-two years Mr. Green sat in the body of the

Opposition party in the Commons. In order to appreciate the impact he made in Parliament short excerpts from several newspaper articles are quoted below. An article by Ben Metcalfe entitled, "A Man Wise in Matters of Peace," appeared in The Province, June 3, 1959:

....Howard is a man of very high calibre, great experience, complete integrity and sound judgment.

He made his name during the bitter wartime debates with Defense Minister J.L. Ralston over men and arms through his interest as a veteran in service and old age pensions.

His first important sortie into external affairs came in 1950, when he needled Louis St. Laurent over Canada's "hesitation and delay" in sending troops to Korea.

Though commonly described as a "soft-spoken man," he showed himself susceptible to the heat of debate during the Suez crisis of 1956 when he accused the Liberals of stabbing Britain in the back.<sup>23</sup>

Writing some years earlier Don Mason had suggested:

In a firm, persuasive manner, Howard Green does the official debating for the Progressive Conservatives on matters concerning the Transport Department, Public Works and Reconstruction. In addition, he heads the Party's caucus committees on atomic energy and the Research Council. ....In 14 years in the House of Commons Green has become known as the champion of the merchant seamen and war veterans from all services.<sup>24</sup>

An American newspaper had this to say concerning his Opposition years:

Howard Charles Green ..... is a tall, angular bespectacled man who keeps out of the limelight. A wry smile softens the over-all impression he gives of austerity and severity. ....

....For most of those years he has been a member of the Conservative party opposition, scourging the Liberal Government with persistent and pointed questions and criticism.<sup>25</sup>

When a trumped up charge was leveled at Mr. Green the federal Conservative Party came to his aid and attested to his integrity.<sup>26</sup>



In The Sun there appeared an article entitled, "Loyalty, Honesty Set Green Apart."

Howard Green is one of the finest men in our public life, a kindly, honest, sincere man you cannot help respecting.

It does you good just to pass the time of day with him. He makes you realize there are some pretty splendid values to life, if only we'll search for them, and having found them, hang on to them. .... -- tall, slim, with a good, fine face, a pleasant chuckle, a merry quip, a sense of humor and fun.

He is an artist at turning off reporters' embarrassing questions, and leaving no hard feelings. .... One admires his loyalty to his party, to his superiors, through thick and thin, an unwavering loyalty.

He has probably never done a dirty trick in his life, not knowingly, anyway, and if he has he's mightily ashamed of it. He has never tried to promote himself in a personal way. ....

For 22 long years, the Conservative flag was at half mast in this country, but Green never faltered in his loyalty to his party, to the succession of unhappy, thwarted leaders that party had in those years of frustration and deep disappointment.

There were times when he must have been sure he would never live to see another Conservative government in Ottawa. He took defeat graciously, without bitterness, philosophically.

And when victory came at last, he took it with equal graciousness, without blowing or boasting.<sup>27</sup>

During the time Mr. Green was among the Opposition party he was still actively engaged in his law practice in Vancouver. In addition, he applied his talents to a variety of service clubs and organizations. He became chairman of a committee that fought the British Columbia Telephone Company in 1928, on the issue of trying to place the district of Point Grey on a toll rate (as opposed to a flat rate). His efforts were successful and Point Grey remained the only district of the outlying area of Vancouver to remain on a

flat rate telephone charge. Kerrisdale and Marpole (two outlying areas of Vancouver) had to accept the toll on their telephone calls. In 1930 when a group attempted to establish a cemetery near Courtenay Street (in West Point Grey) Mr. Green served as secretary to oppose this move. He was instrumental in defeating the building of the cemetery by convincing the Minister of Health not to issue the important health license. He was also active in the Lions Club and was a Charter Member of West Point Grey Branch of the Canadian Legion. There were numerous other organizations with which Mr. Green was associated and with whom he worked. Among these was the North West Point Grey Home Owners Association (Rate Payers Association) of which he has many fond memories.<sup>28</sup> Mr. Green is of the opinion that perhaps this was the most effective Rate Payers Association in British Columbia.<sup>29</sup>

During Mr. Green's career in the Opposition party of the Commons he held the post of Opposition House Leader during 1956 and 1957. He was successively chief critic of the departments of Veterans Affairs, National Defense, Reconstruction, Transport and Public Works.

Mrs. Green died in 1953 and in March, 1956, he married Donna Enid Kerr, a bacteriologist who was assistant director of the provincial laboratories in Vancouver. Miss Kerr and the first Mrs. Green had been close friends during their days together at the University of British Columbia.

With the election of the Diefenbaker government to power

in 1957, the fortunes of Howard Green took another upward turn. His position as one of Canada's leading political figures began to be more clearly apparent. On June 21, 1957, Mr. Green was sworn into the Privy Council and appointed Minister of Public Works and Acting Minister of Production. There is a wryly humorous story concerning Mr. Green's appointment as a Minister in Ottawa. After the Conservative victory in 1957 Mr. Green was awaiting the departure of his plane to Ottawa. A reporter at the Vancouver airport was interviewing him. Sometime during the interview it was speculated that Mr. Green might possibly receive the post of Minister of Transport. Upon Mr. Green's arrival in Ottawa Mr. Diefenbaker called him aside and asked him to take a ministerial position. Mr. Diefenbaker remarked that he could have any post except that of Minister of Transport. Later Mr. Green learned that the reporter from the Vancouver paper had relayed his interview on to Ottawa, and the newspapers had printed a story suggesting that Mr. Green was sure to receive the post of Minister of Transport (all this because of the comments made during his Vancouver interview).

During the 1957, 1958, and 1959 sessions, he was Government House Leader in Ottawa. This post required of him the tact necessary to arrange the day-to-day business of the House with a minimum of friction among members of his own party and among the House of Commons in general. The doughty fighter of the Opposition became a bland, mellow

peacemaker. He was capable of joking in the House and he took Liberal and CCF intractability with good humor.<sup>30</sup>

He was quite successful as the House Leader keeping friction down to a minimum. He displayed no patronage in his department which surprised both the Members of his party and the rest of the House, particularly since he was such a staunch Conservative. These were undoubtedly some of the factors which contributed to his appointment to the portfolio of External Affairs. On June 4, 1959, he was appointed Secretary of State for External Affairs. There may have been another consideration that led to his appointment. Prime Minister Diefenbaker placed a high value on friendship. Through the years in Opposition Mr. Green had become a close friend of Mr. Diefenbaker. They sat side-by-side in the House of Commons for a number of years. These two men seemed to be the kingpins of Conservative rhetoric. The reaction of the news media was quite favorable to Mr. Green's appointment.

Public Works Minister Howard Green, 64, of Vancouver, will be appointed Canada's external affairs minister. ....

Since the Tory victory on June 10, 1957, he has been minister of public works, government House leader, and a tower of strength in the Diefenbaker ministry.

He is credited with cleaning house in the patronage-dispensing works department, to the annoyance of many Tory MPs. There is a saying in Ottawa that "if you don't want a man to get a job, ask Howard to give him one."<sup>31</sup>

In a column by Charles Lynch the mentioning of good omens ahead for Canada with Mr. Green's appointment is noteworthy.

Mr. Lynch included in his column:

He (Green) is a believer in the Commonwealth, through and through, and he has little use for Communists.<sup>32</sup>

Another journalist, Elmore Philpott, was also much pleased by Mr. Green's appointment to External Affairs:

In the selection of Howard Green as the new secretary of state for external affairs, the prime minister has made a move of real statesmanship. This appointment will please fair-minded people of all political parties.

Mr. Green has a unique combination of characteristics which could very well make him a truly great foreign minister for Canada in the years immediately ahead.

Considering all the background of the vacancy which Mr. Green now fills, and considering all alternatives, Howard Green certainly looks like the right man in the right place at the right time.

It seems to me that Mr. Green has in superabundance the one quality which could make him a really great external affairs minister in the first part of the next decade.

Mr. Green's robust Canadianism is based on belief in the British Commonwealth as an institution which is anything but "washed up."

Contrary to what some superficial critics might assume from his rather furious statements at the time of the Suez crisis, Mr. Green is not anti-American. But he resents the status of collective colonialism in which Canada and the other members of the Commonwealth increasingly find themselves in relation to the United States.<sup>33</sup>

Mr. Green led the Canadian Delegations to the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth sessions of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, and to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee and Conference on Laos, in Geneva. During his appointment to the External Affairs portfolio he represented Canada at all NATO ministerial meetings. He was Special Ambassador for Canada at the celebrations marking the 150th anniversary of the independence of Argentina held in Buenos Aires in May, 1960.

From 1959 to 1963 Mr. Green held the portfolio of Minister of External Affairs. In the Canadian general election of April, 1963, which found the Conservative Party reduced to the status of Opposition, he was defeated. And so, a political career that spanned some twenty-nine years, was ended.

Peter Newman in his book Renegade in Power viewed Mr. Green's effectiveness in external affairs as:

....Green seemed to believe that by showing "friendliness," Canada could somehow lead the world out of confusion. "Canada today has only friends, and no enemies," he assured the Commons during an External Affairs debate on February 10, 1960. Such a Kiwanian approach to world problems exasperated the cynical professionals at the United States State Department, and the sophisticates of Whitehall undoubtedly derided the man's lack of finesse. But at home, the Canadian public seemed at least initially to react with warm sympathy...holding out hope for world peace and goodwill among men, at a time when seasoned statesmen saw only despair.

Green enjoyed deflating the elegant jargon of professional diplomats by speaking of world tensions in such homely terms as, "Canada's main role in the world is to keep the big boys from rocking the boat." Of diplomacy, he once said, "The most important thing is to be friendly. It's just like politics. If you're not friendly you don't get elected."<sup>34</sup>

This comment made by Peter Newman was not too flattering. However one should keep in mind that the presentation of his novel is anti-Conservative, and in particular, anti-Diefenbaker.<sup>35</sup>

During Mr. Green's involvement with the United Nations he established himself as a world leader in international affairs. In an article by Heath Macquarrie, the contention that Mr. Green was in fact a world leader is substantiated

by the following event that occurred one day in the United Nations:

.....evidence of Canadian leadership in world affairs.....A few weeks earlier Hon. Howard Green, our Secretary of State for External Affairs, had stood firm against those who believed that the realities of big power politics rendered meetings of the Disarmament Commission useless at this time (this was in the United Nations).<sup>36</sup> Mr. Green insisted that the peoples of the world demanded a more determined hopeful attitude.

By patient and skillful negotiation the Minister and his delegation were able to bring about support for the Canadian stand from the representatives of the other nations. That the meeting did not fold up in pessimistic gloom is a tribute to Hon. Howard Green.<sup>37</sup>

The above certainly painted a different picture of Mr. Green than was suggested by Tom Gould when Mr. Green took the portfolio of External Affairs:

The man who goes into external affairs will find himself in the shadow of the prime minister throughout his tenure.<sup>38</sup>

A member of Mr. Green's constituency had this comment concerning his work while in office:

Mr. Green was one of the most faithful and devoted members of Parliament. He went to no end of trouble to help people in his constituency. He always attended Parliament even though many other members consistently were absent.<sup>39</sup>

William Stevenson in his article, "Canada and the World," suggested that though "the butt of scholarly wits, Howard Green has intruded on Ottawa his magnificent ob-session for a new and independent role for Canada in foreign affairs."

Down a gloomy corridor in Ottawa's External Affairs Department strides the lanky Canadian whose job it is to create conditions abroad that will permit his country to

defend itself and earn its living. Howard Green is the angular symbol of Canada's changing foreign policy. The Gothic style and substance of the buttressed East Block fit his character. This is the fortress from which he resists, with deprecating smile, the assaults of critics-- and sometimes of Cabinet colleagues.<sup>40</sup>

Throughout William Stevenson's column he developed the thesis that Mr. Green was certainly an able and sincere statesman. Mr. Green's obvious competence where world affairs was concerned gave substance to Stevenson's point of view.

If Howard Green has not enjoyed the triumphs his office might bring, neither has he been pursued by avengers. Press reaction to his performance has frequently been better abroad than it has been at home.....

One wonders "who is the better able to judge the External Affairs Minister, the national or international news media?"

Elmore Philpott summed up Mr. Green's external affairs career by saying, "...there are some bright spots even in this government. No statesman who has ever represented Canada internationally has fought more resolutely or persistently than has Howard Green to halt the race of nuclear arms."<sup>41</sup> He went on to develop his high regard for Mr. Green:

Mr. Green's success in the international field has been all the more noteworthy because his whole lifetime of political experience had been in the domestic field.

Besides, Mr. Green was called on to follow Mr. Pearson, the most brilliant career diplomatist that Canada has ever produced. His task therefore was doubly difficult.

Despite that, or perhaps because of it, Mr. Green adopted what you might call elementary bulldog tactics. He fastened on the most vital of all issues, and stuck to that issue, for all the world like the bulldog in mortal battle.

When Mr. Green vacated his seat in the Canadian political forum there was indeed a significant loss. His



absence was felt not only in the Canadian national scene but in the international as well. Many peace loving and neutral nations lost their ally when Mr. Green's political career was curtailed.

### Post Political Years

Since 1963 Mr. Green has been actively engaged in his law practice in Vancouver. He has found time to be involved in a variety of service clubs and organizations. He is a Director of the National Institute for the Blind (Western Division); a member of the Vancouver Board of Trade, Vancouver Bar Association, Canadian Legion, Conservative Association, the United Church of Canada, the Terminal City Club, and the Central Lions Club. He was past president of the latter. Mr. Green still enjoys addressing numerous audiences throughout British Columbia.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES

#### Invention

M.H. Nicols says that one who makes judgments on the quality of rhetoric must reveal and evaluate the public speaker's interpretation of the world around him and his peculiar means of expressing that interpretation to his generation.<sup>42</sup> How can this be done with the speaking of Mr. Howard Green? More specifically, how can it be accomplished within the confines of "The Five Canons of Rhetoric?" This chapter will attempt to deal with each of the Canons in turn, illustrating the application of the principle in question with quotations from Mr. Green's speeches. We turn first, then, to "Invention" upon which Cicero placed major emphasis.

Inventio is the Latin term (heuresis was the equivalent Greek term) for "invention" or "discovery." Theoretically, an orator could talk on any subject, because rhetoric, as such, had no proper subject matter. In practice, however, each speech that he undertook presented him with a unique challenge. He had to find arguments which would support whatever case or point of view he was espousing. According to Cicero, the speaker relied on native genius, on method of art, or on diligence to help him find appropriate arguments. Obviously, that man was at a great advantage who had a native, intuitive sense for proper arguments. But lacking such endowment, a man could have recourse either to his dogged industry or to some system for finding arguments. Inventio was concerned with a system or method for finding arguments.<sup>43</sup>

In light of the above it would seem that our task has to do

with ways in which Mr. Green analyzed a given issue or subject area, how, after selecting such, he went about organizing his material in terms of the situation of "felt difficulties" he faced. How did he become aware of the issue? And, very importantly, how did he use his life experience as he bent to his task?

An important aspect of invention should be mentioned at the outset of this discussion. This has to do with the three methods of proof which have been utilized in developing a proposition since the days of classical rhetoricians:

(1) logical, meaning that the argument appealed to the listener's reasons; (2) ethical, meaning that the persuasiveness of the argument rested on the character of the speaker himself, as appraised by his audience; and (3) pathetic, meaning that the appeal was directed to the emotions of the audience. <sup>44</sup>

The last appeal mentioned, namely that of pathetic, often-times is referred to as the emotional proof. It is basically from these three proofs that the development of the individual issues will be set out still working within the context of Cicero's "inventions."

The public speaking of Mr. Green in the House of Commons revealed that the principal issues with which he was identified on the local, national, and international scene, were:

- a) War Veterans
- b) The Blind
- c) Commonwealth Preference
- d) Canada's Role As A Neutral World Leader
- e) Defense
- f) Minimum of U.S. Influence In Canadian Affairs
- g) Disarmament

It would be possible to develop all of these issues fully but discussion has to be limited to manageable proportions. Therefore, the author has chosen one major issue from each of Mr. Green's political periods. Each of these issues are typical of the period chosen and will serve to illuminate the method Mr. Green used in his development of "Invention."

First Period - The Blind. An example of Mr. Green's development of a first period issue was found in his speech on March 9, 1936, on "Pensions for the Blind." He developed a particular line of argument for the inclusion of a pension for the blind under the existing Old Age Pension Act (payable to blind people over forty years of age). This pension would be given only to those blind persons who had no other visible means of support.

Mr. Green became aware of the blind issue through the influence of the Provincial Government School for the blind (Jericho Hill), which is located directly across the street from his home (on West Eighth Ave. in Vancouver - 4100 block). The close proximity of the school made Mr. Green more aware of the problems of the blind and gave him a greater insight into their needs and wants. Allied to this were certain wartime experiences which had moved Mr. Green deeply. Many of the veterans who returned from the First War had suffered blindness. Mr. Green, being a staunch supporter of the veterans (himself a veteran) saw an affinity with the problems of the blind people and problems of the blind veterans. He felt that

the Canadian people wished to acknowledge a debt owed to these disabled people. His political ideals included carrying out the wishes of the Canadian people in his position as Opposition critic. Hence his attention to the Pensions for the Blind legislation.

There is very little that I can add to the discussion of this resolution, but there is one material feature which should be brought out .....<sup>45</sup>

His statement set a tone of agreement with previous speakers on the issue. He did want to add an additional comment but did not wish to have the motion defeated on his statement alone. He wanted the support of his hearers, and in particular, those hearers who formed the Government (who in effect controlled the vote on this issue). Cicero believed that a situation such as this involved the speaker's personality and those of his opponents:

...the first steps to secure good will are achieved by extolling our own merits or worth or virtue of some kind, particularly generosity, sense of duty, justice and good faith, and by assigning the opposite qualities to our opponents, and by indicating some reason for expectation of agreement with the persons deciding the case.....<sup>46</sup>

Mr. Green indicated his agreement but went on to mention another side of the affirmative. As previous Members had spoken on this issue Mr. Green was faced with the task of injecting a separate and fresh view to reinforce the resolutions acceptance. And yet attempting to do this without being unduly redundant. To accomplish this end he used basically an emotional (pathetic) appeal.

Mr. Green formed this appeal with a specific example.

First I should like to mention Captain Baker. Captain Baker lost his sight during the war. He was a promising young engineer, a graduate of Toronto university, decorated for gallantry in the field, and one night he was shot across both eyes and blinded. From that time to the present his life has been an epic of courage and initiative, a life that in times to come I think will be looked back upon by the Canadian people as outstanding in his generation.

The figure of a brilliant and courageous officer fighting for his country is presented. During a military encounter he lost the precious gift of his sight. Any person would be touched by this short description. Mr. Green went on to develop what had happened to Captain Baker:

Captain Baker, like most of the blinded soldiers, was trained at St. Dunstan's in England. When he came back to Canada, he took charge of work for blinded soldiers; then he took over work for all blind in Canada.

Captain Baker suffered a tremendous handicap being blind. However, this did not curtail his initiative. He returned to Canada and identified with a cause that would not only benefit himself, but also others who had the same affliction. His direction was to manage the work for all the blind soldiers, but more than this, the affairs of all blind people in Canada. Mr. Green illustrated how this courageous man not only overcame a tremendous personal handicap but, in keeping with his military experience and leadership among men Captain Baker also went out of his way to try to help all Canadians to overcome a similar handicap. Mr. Green went on:

He is now managing director of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, and probably one of the leading younger executives in Canada to-day.

Captain Baker has been able to draw around him several other leading young men, for instance, Mr. Harris Turner, who although blinded overseas was at one time leader of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition in Saskatchewan;

He showed that Captain Baker had great potential and utilized this potential to develop a strong organization for the blind. Too, the magnetism of his personality drew in notables to help him in the task of aiding all blind Canadians. Coupled with this power to draw in other leading Canadians was a fact which hit home more than any other. Mr. Green mentioned that one of the men whom Captain Baker drew into his organization was Mr. Harris Turner. Mr. Turner was not only a blind Canadian but a blind Canadian politician. He was Opposition leader in the province of Saskatchewan. This fact would obviously make an impression in Ottawa. Mr. Green went on to develop his case:

I refer to these men for this reason, that in all their work their main idea has been to help to make the blind people independent, make them feel that they are taking their share in the life of the nation.

This raised the emotional question of whether blind people can participate in society in any meaningful way?

In addition they have tried to raise the morale of the blind. As many hon. members know, blind people easily become discouraged, and it is no wonder they do. These leaders of the blind have started social clubs; for instance in Vancouver we have a club known as the Nil Desperandum club, which might be interpreted as the Never Say Die club. By such means the morale of the blind has been greatly improved.

Here, Mr. Green cited one attempt to overcome the depression or disillusionment of the blind. How Captain Baker and his

cohorts tried to devise means to reach the blind and overcome their mood of discouragement.

Despite this able leadership and good work there is a class of blind people for whom little can be done, and they are the ones for whom we are asking help to-day, the blind over forty years of age. These older blind folks are in many cases not active enough to work for wages; the majority of them have not the initiative to run concession stands, or to carry on a business of their own and are really unemployable; they are just stranded, and I would suggest that the government could very well extend the provisions of the Old Age Pension Act to cover these people.

In this passage the fears of loneliness, helplessness, and frustration are movingly presented. These emotions would elicit a reaction of serious contemplation.

The Old Age Pensions Act is particularly suitable because under its provisions only those people who are not earning a certain income would get assistance, and it would throw a portion of the burden on the provinces, which, while perhaps not so good for the provinces, would ensure their checking very carefully every application for a pension.

This logical shift tried to point out the advantage of utilizing this approach to help the blind people over forty. It also presented the Federal Government with a choice for securing the finances of this pension.

The logical proof developed by Mr. Green is in line with the thinking of Alan Monroe and Douglas Ehninger who state:

Items of logical proof....subpoints should always provide logical proof of the idea they support. Often they consist of reasons or of coordinate steps in a single process of reasoning. When this is the case, you should be able to connect the major idea and subpoints with the word "because".<sup>47</sup>

An example of this is clearly evident in Mr. Green's summation.

- a) Main Point - Old Age Pensions Act is particularly suitable



- b) Sub Points - only those people who are not earning a certain income would get assistance
- it will throw a portion of the financial burden on the provinces
- ensure a check by the province

The logical appeal or proof throughout Mr. Green's early speeches is not developed or utilized to the same extent as in his later speeches. He seemed to rely more on emotional proof. This could be due to his early inclination to defend the issue on a mastery of the subject but at the same time to utilize an emotional tone toward the audience. In company with A. Craig Baird and Franklin H. Knower, Mr. Green showed:

Evidence of your knowledge of and ability to handle the materials of your subject - to interpret soundly and organize well -- will influence your audience strongly. If you can demonstrate your ability to resolve problems and conflicts through unusual insight, you will win their respect and admiration. Avoid dogmatism, often a defensive attitude suggesting weakness. Evidence that your experience has contributed successfully to the needs of others in similar situations is highly persuasive.<sup>48</sup>

Throughout the Blind Pensions issue Mr. Green also utilized ethical proof. In developing the issue Mr. Green cites examples of blind men and gives his audience a vivid description of the background of these men. This description aids in establishing the ethical proof. For example when Mr. Green discusses Captain Baker he mentioned:

.....He was a promising young engineer, a graduate of Toronto university, decorated for gallantry in the field, and one night he was shot across both eyes and blinded. ....

Captain Baker has been able to draw around him several other leading young men.....

...Mr. Harris Turner, who although blinded overseas was at one time leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition in Saskatchewan;...M.C. Robinson, superintendent of the

western division of the Canadian National Institute for the blind. ....Joe Clunk, placement officer of the Institute,....a qualified solicitor.....

The background of these individuals established an ethical appeal. Ethical proof was appropriate for this audience because sitting in the House were men whose background was surprisingly similar (with the exception of blindness) to these men mentioned as examples by Mr. Green. This added emphasis to the ethical proof.

Second Period - Disarmament. On September 7, 1961, Mr. Green delivered a sombre speech on "The Crisis Arising Over Nuclear Tests and Berlin" to the House of Commons.

Some of the reasons motivating him to take a solid stand for world disarmament were related to events of his earlier years:

- a) his experiences while in the trenches in the First World War; his subsequent experience as an officer in charge of training troops; and his service at the Canadian General Headquarters in France;
- b) many of his friends and colleagues in both the war and at university were of the same opinion;
- c) his desire to see Canada as a mediator and influence for world peace;
- d) his years in the opposition position at parliament strengthened this view;
- e) his admiration for the views held by Mr. Pearson, the Liberal Secretary of State for External Affairs - as indicated by the low turnover of staff in this department after Mr. Green's takeover.<sup>49</sup>

Mr. Green led the audience directly into the discussion of the problem.

"A fourth factor today is the question of disarmament." He then went on to use an ethical approach to develop his case for the disarmament position:

As hon. members know, Canada was a member of the ten nation disarmament committee which was torpedoed by the five communist members in June of last year. Two months later, with the United States, we were able to bring the question before the disarmament commission of the United Nations and to obtain a unanimous resolution there that negotiations should be resumed. Subsequently we brought in a resolution at the United Nations general assembly last fall which was designed to help get negotiations under way again. That resolution was co-sponsored by 18 other nations.

His ethical form of proof included:

- a) Appeal on the basis of an international commitment - resolution adopted by commission and submitted to UN general assembly.
- b) Appeal on the basis of Canada's position in the committee and in the United Nations. Also the ethical appeal of the additional inclusion or fusion with the United States.

The resolution was co-sponsored by eighteen other nations; thus there is commitment.

He continued using the ethical approach in the following:

During their meeting in London this spring the prime ministers of the commonwealth issued a very significant statement on the question of disarmament. This was particularly helpful because of the membership of the commonwealth. The prime ministers came from practically every continent and they had varying opinions.

He also mentioned:

At the session of the United Nations which ran over into the Spring of 1961, it was finally agreed that the problem of disarmament and all pending proposals relating to it, which included the Canadian resolution, would be stood over until the session of the general assembly in the fall of this year. In addition the United States and the Soviet Union agreed that they would sit down and try to work out a negotiating group, as well as general principles for negotiations, on the question of disarmament.

He then proceeded with a logical approach:

- a) Showed that the two great powers (United States and Russia) had held extensive discussions on disarmament in which Canada voiced interest and agreement.

- b) That the talks between these two powers were secret and it was not possible to reveal the substance of the talks. His inference here is that Canada had some inside information. In other words he attempted to persuade the members of the House to trust him (Mr. Green) as he could not disclose the substance of the talks.
- c) That yesterday the United States and Russia met in New York to discuss this very matter of disarmament.

Now Mr. Green's tone changed as he stated:

The last few days, Mr. Chairman, have seen barely concealed threats which, as I have said, we must meet squarely.

Here he utilized the technique of repeating a section from a previous portion of his speech for emphasis. He went on:

This situation, however, does not mean that we should downgrade our efforts to further the cause of disarmament. On the contrary far-reaching measures on disarmament are now more vital than ever if we are to avoid even sharper east-west conflicts in a world which daily sees the development of more frightening weapons. We must recognize clearly that until a realistic basis for negotiation is established, we will continue to run the most dangerous risk of all, the risk of nuclear war.

In the latter part of this paragraph Mr. Green started to use an emotional approach coupled with a logical appeal. He then switched back to the ethical appeal by:

During the past months Canada has taken an active part in the drafting of a new western disarmament plan. Throughout this period the United States and the other countries which represented the west on the ten-nation committee have been in close consultation.  
.....We have been represented during these discussions by Lieutenant-General E.L.M. Burns who has played a very large part in the field of disarmament for a long time and who, I suggest, has no peer anywhere in the world in this particular field.

The ethical overtones are quite apparent in this last section.

The structured logic of Mr. Green's legal background came

through. He not only deploys the emotional or ethical forms but he synthesized his whole argument into a reasonable proposition that members could digest.

Mr. Green's method of persuasion was spelled out in the last three paragraphs of his section on disarmament.

Many of our suggestions have been accepted.....

This new western plan will be put forward for negotiation, and not on a "take it or leave it" basis. The western powers are willing to take into account any further suggestions the Soviet Union may have, provided they reflect a genuine willingness to arrive at a realistic and properly safeguarded disarmament program.

At the session of the general assembly which opens on September 19, Canada will work for the endorsement of this new western plan by the widest possible number of states and we will do our best to ensure that any negotiating body which may be agreed upon will have close relationship with the United Nations. We believe that the most important objective in the field of disarmament is to get negotiations started again just as quickly as possible.

Here Mr. Green's logical step by step method of development and proof was at its finest. He carried the endorsement of the western plan to its logical conclusion, that of acceptance. However, he still injected a safeguard that would be adhered to in case of any fast manoeuvres of the enemy. He also placed the Communist group as opposing forces in this struggle for disarmament. This enabled the speech to take on more strength. The memory concerning the Communist attempts to block previous disarmament negotiations would come to the forefront of everyone's mind. The development of Mr. Green's speech followed this general pattern:

- a) An example - Communist world torpedoed ten-nation disarmament committee.

- b) Implied assumption - need for world disarmament
- c) Example - United Nations and Commonwealth prime Ministers concerned over disarmament
- d) Example - United States and the Soviet Union enter into talks concerning disarmament (Canada has a close liason)
- e) Restatement - repeats previous section from his speech concerning threat of destruction if Canada does not meet the issue of disarmament squarely in the face.
- f) Definition - if disarmament not reached the consequences are war and destruction
- g) Example - Canada's involvement with disarmament and their use of Lt.-General E.L.M. Burns (world renowned authority on disarmament).
- h) Statement of what Canada should do - back western proposal
- i) Statement of safeguard - to reaffirm Canada's position and dispel any doubts that members of the House of Commons may have that Canada will sell the issue short.

This development prescribes a logical framework with the main utilization of ethical proofs and, in a minor way, emotional proofs.

An editorial by Elmore Philpott described Mr. Green's effort in this disarmament battle:

.....No statesman who has ever represented Canada internationally has fought more resolutely or persistently than has Howard Green to halt the race in nuclear arms.

It is one of the ironies of our times that the vast majority of the people of Canada still have no clear understanding of the nature of the fight that Mr. Green is waging on their behalf.<sup>50</sup>

James McBurney and Earnest Wrage suggest that:

Speech is purposeful when it is consciously directed to achieve a relatively specific response from an audience. ...Speech without purpose suffers in many respects. It fails to select materials with any relevance, it is seldom well organized, it is likely to be indirect, and it rarely claims the interest of either speaker or listener.<sup>51</sup>

Both of Mr. Green's speeches had the specific purpose of seeking

to motivate the audience to a specific end. However, in the first issue involving the blind it was a conscious effort at reinforcing an already existing platform (this due to the role of Mr. Green in the Opposition). The second issue regarding disarmament was a rather broader issue persuading the House (and in particular the Opposition) to regard Canada's disarmament stand as significant to world peace. Mr. Green then had built into the framework of his speeches specific purposes and specific ends.

I personally am convinced that if we in the parliament of Canada adopt this resolution.....<sup>52</sup>  
 ....far-reaching measures on disarmament are now more vital than ever before.....<sup>53</sup>

In keeping with this:

The classical rhetoricians (notably Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian) insisted.....that an able speaker must be an able person, and their idea of ableness included moral responsibility.....  
 Communication rests upon something to communicate, which means something worth communicating.<sup>54</sup>

In these two instances Mr. Green had a very worthwhile issue to pursue. He developed both with a strong undercurrent of moral responsibility.

Throughout Mr. Green's speaking it has been shown that in order to be effective on the Canadian political scene the speaker must be an educated man.<sup>55</sup> He should be acquainted with all possible facets of his speech and develop the facts or issues in a logical and reasonable manner. This was shown to be true in Mr. Green's handling of the issues on the blind and disarmament. Mr. Green believed that sincerity, honesty, and a completely ethical approach would establish a fundamental

rapport with the audience.<sup>56</sup> A trust may be developed between speaker and audience.<sup>57</sup> High on the list of priorities for the audience is the speaker's background and his record of effectiveness while in a leadership position. As the speaker matures politically the confidential relationship he has with other Members will be an invaluable tool for building good rapport with the audience. In light of these statements Mr. Green took advantage of his ability to be an extremely effective parliamentarian during his period in Opposition. At this time his war experiences and legal background furnished the main elements for establishing a reputation with the audience. After he had experience in the House his abilities as the Opposition critic and an orator not to be lightly dealt with came strongly to the fore. Moreover, the audience was obtaining the impression that Mr. Green had a fund of exhaustive information on each issue he pursued. This established the ethical overtones to his speaking.

Mr. Green felt that the politician must not be too bitter while speaking on an issue nor portray this bitterness through any external physical or vocal mannerisms. He should not "hit the Members (and in particular his opposing Members) over the head with a club."<sup>58</sup> The speaker should not be more partisan than he has to even though party loyalties dictate a certain conformity in behavior. Such techniques helped Mr. Green to build and develop a high degree of ethical proof with the audience. However, because it takes some time for the politician to make use of ethical support from the audience,



Mr. Green found that the ethical proofs were most influential during his second political period.

It is probably true that Mr. Green could not be said to have attained the broad and philosophical wisdom which Cicero ascribed to his ideal orator yet he did indicate a responsive interest in the important issues confronting the Canadian people and a willingness to work toward the solution of national and international problems.

### Disposition

The second part of a discourse, "dispositio" has to do with its arrangement and organization. The discovery and analysis of the ideas and arguments were dealt with above. Disposition is concerned with selecting, organizing, and arranging. In its simplest terms it may be thought of as beginning, middle, and end.

This is to say that speech which pays attention to the unity imposed by its purpose is an organic whole with a beginning, a development, and an end. These parts are close-knit, related one to the other, and flow easily from one to the other.<sup>59</sup>

In analyzing Mr. Green's speeches delivered in the Canadian House of Commons the structure and organization of his thought should probably be considered of major importance. Different audiences require different arrangements, and it is the orator's task to search out the pattern that is most appropriate to a particular audience.<sup>60</sup> The first element to examine in the organization of Mr. Green's speeches is the

introduction.<sup>61</sup> In his early political speaking it was his habit to lead the audience directly into the context of the matter he wished to present. As for example in his speech on March 9, 1936, pertaining to "Pensions for the Blind":

There is very little that I can add to the discussion on this resolution, but there is one material feature which should be brought out, and that is the efficiency with which work for the blind has been carried on in Canada during the last ten or fifteen years, perhaps longer.

Similarly in his speech on March 6, 1941, concerning the "Bill Amending Pensions Act", he began:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Pensions and National Health has just stated that it is the intention of the government to refer this bill to the special committee which was appointed the other day to consider questions of interest to ex-service men.

Mr. Green was less direct in his introduction when he discussed on November 26, 1956, "The Suez Crisis":

Mr. Speaker before going on with the main portion of my speech this evening I should like to say a word about the speech which has just been made by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Pickersgill).

During his second period as a Minister, Mr. Green's introductions tended to become more lengthy. In his speech of July 9, 1959, on the "Introduction of Estimates of Department of External Affairs" he began:

Mr. Chairman, in opening my remarks today on the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs -- I am afraid I have done so much talking in this house on veterans affairs in the last 24 years that I have become accustomed to referring to that department. However, my very old friend the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Brooks) objects strenuously to my interfering with his department. He is always annoyed when my old speeches when in opposition are quoted at him when he

is putting his estimates through, so probably it is because of a guilty conscience that I spoke of the Department of Veterans Affairs. In any event, I will try another start.

Then again, when speaking on "Canada in Today's World" on April 26, 1961, he said:

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

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

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

In this debate on external affairs it is my hope that as many hon. members as possible will participate. There are a great number of members of this house who have had considerable experience in the field of foreign affairs. I need only refer to the large number who, down through the years, have rendered excellent service for Canada at the United Nations, either as delegates or as parliamentary observers.

Even when the news to be discussed was not good Mr. Green used the same technique - slowly edging his way into the issue, apparently bracing his audience for the tidings to come. On September 7, 1961, talking on "The Crisis Arising Over Nuclear Tests and Berlin" with an opening of discussion on the "Estimates of the Department of External Affairs", Mr. Green started

out:

Mr. Chairman, today we meet in the Canadian House of Commons at a time of deep crisis. As hon. members know, for some weeks tension has been increasing steadily over Berlin, and within the last week the premier of the Soviet Union has announced a resumption of nuclear tests. In addition to that, he has stated that his country can develop a nuclear bomb with the power of 100 million tons of t.n.t., and that such a bomb could then be hurled by rocket to any target in the world.

In this speech he does broach the subject much sooner than in previous speeches, but there is still a slow introduction apparently aimed at developing a receptive frame of mind in his audience. Due to the nature of parliamentary debate, it is unwise to spend too much time developing an initial point if the attention of the audience could be lost. It is noteworthy that as his parliamentary career matured his introductions tended to lengthen somewhat. However, one reason for this could be due to Mr. Green's national prestige and varied accomplishments in Parliament, which supplied him with the necessary ethical proof. In addition, the experience and success with Parliamentary audiences tended to increase his self-confidence enabling him to become more relaxed during the earlier stages of a speech.

Leaving the introduction now and turning to the main core of Mr. Green's speeches it would seem that his earlier speeches appeared to centre around one basic issue rather than on a multiplicity of sub issues. For example, in his first speech he centered his discussion around a resolution to expand pensions for the blind at age forty.<sup>62</sup> He did

however use a framework taking one segment of his discourse, expanding and developing it before he went on to the next segment. The framework looked something like this:

1. Leaders of the blind have done efficient work
2. Certain blind men are among the leading executives today
3. Their example has given blind people an initiative and sense of independence.
4. Some blind people are unable to work
5. The Old Age Pension Act should be extended to cover those blind people unable to work.

Each of the above concomitant parts were developed before he went on to the next point.

Similarly in his speech concerning the "Bill Amending Pension Act" given on March 6, 1941, Mr. Green first established the importance of this piece of legislation and then developed, step by step, certain sections of the legislation which were unreasonable in his eyes. He did not appear to jump around. He developed one point fully before he expanded the next point.

The step by step procedure continues in his "Throne Speech Debate."<sup>63</sup> He mentioned that his speech would include factors concerning three Ministers. He dealt with each of these in turn. First, his remarks were directed to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott), secondly to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Lapointe), and thirdly to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson).

When Mr. Green entered the second era of his political life he again developed his assertions on a step by step basis. In his "Introduction of Estimates of Department of

External Affairs" on July 9, 1959, he started off by discussing the Geneva conference. He then turned to other issues such as Canadian appropriation to Pakistan and Ceylon under the Colombo Plan (foreign aid).

On "Canada's Foreign Policy" delivered on February 10, 1960, he not only covered each issue separately and completely before going on to his next point, but he also enumerated the issues to be discussed:

In my remarks today I intend to deal with nine different subjects. They are disarmament, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the commonwealth, Canadian-United States relations, Latin America, Canada and the Pacific, the Middle East, the United Nations, and the law of the sea.

In his last two speeches Mr. Green made no attempt to outline the factors covered before the development of the ideas.<sup>64</sup> In these last two speeches he had to deal with a variety of interrelated topics and perhaps decided it best if he handled each matter by itself, allowing the democratic process of debate to run its natural course. All this is not to say that Mr. Green's speaking lacked flexibility. Evidence of this is seen on those occasions where he used a general outline and presented his speeches extemporaneously rather than in manuscript or memorized form. The nature of debate in the House of Commons as indicated by the number of interruptions in his speeches seemed to indicate that if one tended to be over structured the speech could suffer. In other words the speaker must not become a captive of his speech form or structure. He must be able to use his personality and wit.

The speeches that Mr. Green delivered had strong conclusions.

For example:

I personally am convinced that if we in the parliament of Canada, adopt this resolution we shall be expressing the sympathetic feeling of Canadians generally for the blind and carrying out the wish of an overwhelming majority of the people of our nation.<sup>65</sup>

Or when he said:

I mention these instances in the hope that consideration will be given to them not only by hon. members who happen to be on this special committee but also by all other hon. members. I say that this bill is fundamentally wrong, because the whole tendency is to be "tough", to be just a little tougher than before on the men in the fighting forces. That means that if parliament enacts this bill in its present shape it will be "tough" with the very Canadians who should be receiving the most consideration at the present time.<sup>66</sup>

Again a short concise conclusion is noted:

I suggest that at this time our greatest contribution to world peace would be to take a lead in rebuilding the strength of the British Commonwealth.<sup>67</sup>

During the second period of his political career Mr. Green's conclusions tended to become more lengthy.

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.

On February 10, 1960, he ended his speech with:

In conclusion may I say this. Canada is a strong young nation, steadily growing stronger. It is a nation, as I have pointed out, with a good record in world affairs, with many friends and one that is actively participating in various associations such as the commonwealth, NATO and so on. Above all it is a nation with an idealistic, unselfish approach. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all hon. members of the house that Canada can play a vital part in world affairs today, perhaps just as vital a part as any other nation in the world. These next ten years could be Canada's years in world affairs. This is the great challenge to Canadians, the challenge I should like to place before them this afternoon, and I offer this challenge particularly to those Canadians who from time to time represent the Canadian people in this parliament.<sup>69</sup>

On April 26, 1961, talking on "Canada in Today's World", Mr. Green concluded:

However, in conclusion may I say this. As hon. members know and as they will have found from this sketchy review of problems arising in all parts of the world, Canada is involved everywhere. In practically every part of the world Canada is involved in one way or another, to an extent and in such a manner that she can do something about every one of these problems. I suggest that this is a great challenge to the Canadian people. Whether we accept that challenge, whether we play our full part in world affairs -- the part which is there to be played by Canada -- will, of course, depend on the will of the Canadian people to participate, the idealism and optimism of the Canadian people and the sacrifices they are prepared to make.

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

In the last speech under analysis the lengthy conclusion was again in evidence:



In conclusion, I repeat what I said at the beginning. This House of Commons is meeting at a time of deep crisis. In times such as these a nation shows its calibre. Canada has done so on more than one occasion. We remember Canada in the first war. We remember Canada in the second war, the June day 21 years ago, when France was falling and when our then minister of defence was killed in a terrible air crash. It looked as though the United Kingdom would be invaded. I do not believe that in my lifetime there has ever been a darker day than that particular Monday. But no Canadian member of parliament had a thought in his head that there was going to be any surrender, that we were not going to face that situation and were going to win through. I know that Canada will show her calibre and her mettle in these present trying times.

The road ahead will be hard. Perhaps we have had enough of the soft life anyway. But the road ahead is certainly going to be hard and there will be tension for a long, long time. We might just as well face that fact. From Canadians courage will be required, both physical and moral, and sacrifice; and I believe above all, a return to our deep abiding fundamental faiths. If we face this challenge we will win through and the result may very well be to make our nation one of the leading nations of the world.<sup>70</sup>

In the main, his endings were shorter at first and then lengthened into a strong motivating message. No summary of points was given in his endings.

It is not until his third speech on October 18, 1951, dealing with the "Throne Speech Debate", that Mr. Green used the technique of complimenting someone in his audience.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I did not have the privilege of hearing the speeches of the mover (Mr. Cauchon) and the seconder (Mr. Simmons) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, but I understand their efforts were excellent. I can quite believe that from my acquaintance with them around the halls of the building.

This directed compliment to two members in the House was the only one paid during the selected speeches of the first period. During the second period of Mr. Green's political

career he used a number of compliments throughout. This could be accounted for by the tendency for a man to become more benevolent when in power. (Particularly so in Mr. Green's case. He had had some twenty-two years in the Opposition camp before the Conservatives were given the mandate to form the Government.)

Similarly in his speech on "Canada's Foreign Policy", on February 10, 1960, Mr. Green started his delivery with the following quote:

.....These acts of kindness mean a great deal and reflect so clearly how much good will there is in this house.....

There seemed to be a pattern emerging. In his introduction of the first two speeches under analysis, Mr. Green included a compliment directed to his audience or some portion of the audience. Again in Mr. Green's speech delivered on April 26, 1961, close to the beginning of his development, he included this compliment:

There are a great number of members of this house who have had considerable experience in the field of foreign affairs. I need only refer to the large number who, down through the years, have rendered excellent service for Canada at the United Nations.....

In the body of this speech is found another compliment directed to previous members of the House who are now serving in the Senate. Indirectly this compliment is for the House also.

When there is a snap decision to be made in a complicated situation, it helps a great deal for a foreign minister to be able to talk to an old friend from the Senate who has been in the House of Commons for many years, even though in another party, and to get his view as to what Canada should do. I have

appreciated more than I can say the advice and the assistance that I have received during this last session from those Senators who have been in attendance.<sup>71</sup>

In Mr. Green's last speech on September 7, 1961, concerning "The Crisis Over Nuclear Tests and Berlin," there were no compliments paid as in his earlier speeches of this second period. This was undoubtedly due to the nature of this last speech. It seemed as if the war clouds were beginning to gather and Canada might be involved in another global struggle. The sombre mood of this speech ruled out any niceties.

The structure of Mr. Green's speech was a simple one, being for the most part, direct and to the point. The speech itself seemed arranged almost according to a formula. Because of the nature of parliamentary debate Mr. Green had to utilize a rather formalized speech structure. Upon deciding which subject he wanted to explore and what images he wanted to project to the audience, he then developed a brief outline of his speech. To supplement this outline he gathered a number of newspaper and magazine clippings and articles. He would decide precisely what point he was going to make and then inject some specific factors of interest - factors calculated to hold the attention of his audience. It is interesting to note that Mr. Green personally composed all of his speeches giving even minute details great care. He did not utilize either a research staff or professional speech writers but rather depended on his own ability.

## Style

The third of Cicero's Canons was elocutio. To the classical rhetorician elocutio meant "style."

Style, like the other rhetorical canons, should be adapted to the variable components of the speaking situation. For this reason it is a mark of inflexibility for a speaker to be characterized by one style. The able speaker, rather, will become proficient in several styles to have freedom to speak appropriately in a variety of situations.

Furthermore, it is erroneous to assume that a speech should maintain the same style throughout. It is better to have the style consistent with the varying thoughts and emotions that run through the speech than to have a consistency of sameness depriving the speech of needed variety.<sup>72</sup>

As there are innumerable aspects of style only some of the more pertinent will be discussed. Mr. Green in his speeches was able to adapt to different audience situations. By varying his style, interest and attention was secured. For example, the basic form of Mr. Green's speeches was prose. However, he found it appropriate in his speech "Throne Speech Debate" of October 18, 1951, to use:

From the stable  
To the table  
We brought back the horse,  
Lacking sincerity  
We called it prosperity --  
Fido will be the next course.

Mr. Green agreed (tongue in cheek) with this; then forcefully went on to suggest a slogan for the next political encounter or general election.

"Vote Liberal and eat horsemeat"

However, the Liberal Minister of Finance got in his lick

when he retorted:

"Vote Conservative and eat no meat"

Mr. Green, not taking a back seat to anyone fired back a quick reply:

The Prime Minister was extremely smug about the whole question. He said that only certain sectors of the population are being bothered by the increased cost of living and that the others are doing better than they have ever done before. He said, "Of course, I hope that the inflation will stop." I suggest one thing to the Prime Minister; that is that he start eating horsemeat right away and continue doing so until he wakes up to what is going on in Canada.

This point illustrates Mr. Green's adaptability to vary his style to the political audience.

At first quotations or inclusions of supporting materials in the form of newspaper articles, personal letters or sections of Hansard, were used quite sparingly. There was no such inclusion in his speech on March 9, 1936, regarding "Pensions for the Blind."

The first quotation appeared during his speech on March 6, 1941, where he was addressing the House on the "Bill to Amend the Pensions Act." In order to make a significant influence on the House, Mr. Green quoted a personal letter from a veteran pleading for fair treatment of all married pensioners or veterans. In his speech Mr. Green pointed out that not all persons were treated equally under the Bill. The passage from the letter that was included in Mr. Green's speech read:

Can there not be some provision made so that an honest man can be provided for to the end that all married pensioners or veterans are afforded the same benefits of the Pensions Act?

The use of this passage seemed to inject an added spark helping Mr. Green make his point more strongly.

By the time Mr. Green presented his third speech on October 18, 1951, there were no less than twelve separate quotations. It appeared that the use of supporting quotations was in direct proportion to Mr. Green's realization that valuable use could be made of the opinion of other authorities. In this speech Mr. Green utilized six separate sources for obtaining these quotes. He used a quote on the development of the North from Macleans Magazine; a summary of a report from the Bank of Canada; articles from the Vancouver Province and the Vancouver Sun; quotations from various sections of Hansard; and a quotation from a speech by the Right Hon. Vincent Massey delivered in Vancouver on November 15, 1946. It thus becomes evident that the profuse use of quotations did effect Mr. Green's style of speaking.<sup>73</sup>

TABLE 1  
ANALYSIS OF QUOTATIONS USED  
IN MR. GREEN'S POLITICAL SPEECHES

DATE OF SPEECH	TITLE OF SPEECH	NUMBER OF QUOTATIONS USED
<u>FIRST PERIOD</u>		
March 9, 1936	Pensions For the Blind	0
March 6, 1941	Bill Amending Pensions Act	1
October 18, 1951	Throne Speech Debate	12
November 26, 1956	The Suez Crisis	6
<u>SECOND PERIOD</u>		
July 9, 1959	Introduction of Estimates of Department of External Affairs	2
February 10, 1960	Canada's Foreign Policy	2
April 26, 1961	Canada In Today's World	3
September 7, 1961	The Crisis Arising Over Nuclear Tests And Berlin	4

One reason for the difference in the volume of quotations used from the time of Mr. Green's first political period to his second, may involve his change in position from the opposition camp to that of a Minister in office. The burden of proof formerly resting on his shoulders is now placed on the shoulders of those who wish to change or oppose moves made by the government. When one is a member of the Opposition there is a great deal of pressure brought to bear on the individual striving to prove his point. In fact, when the Opposition wants anything they usually have to overprove the point in order to obtain the necessary attention! When the party in power speaks through the voice of a single Minister the need to prove in great detail becomes much less.

Another explanation for the change in volume of quotations from one period to another lies in the fact that Mr. Green's earlier speeches dealt with more specific issues and tended to deal with these in depth. As stated earlier in this study, some of the issues in his earlier period were: Pensions for the Blind and Veterans Allowances. By their very nature these issues required more specific argument, persuasion or debate analysis. During Mr. Green's second political period he dealt with more general issues. For example, he handled issues such as: Canada's relation to Egypt and Commonwealth ties. These issues tended to permit a broader basis for discussion and thus allowed more leeway for interpretation and development. Throughout his second



period a tendency to close the door somewhat on cross-debate of the issues was in evidence.

In his second stage of political rhetoric Mr. Green tried to convey a government "feeling tone",<sup>74</sup> whereas in the first stage he tried to defeat some specific major or minor point in a particular bill. His second period tended to encircle the general issues and become more philosophical. In his first period he tended to portray the picture of a watchdog or a thorn in the side of the party in power. This inevitably affected the use of quotations as illustrated.

Throughout the course of Mr. Green's political career he enjoyed injecting the odd bit of humor to spice his speeches. In his first period the following:<sup>75</sup> "Vote Liberal and eat horsemeat; I suggest one thing to the Prime Minister; that is that he start eating horsemeat right away and continue doing so until he wakes up to what is going on in Canada." In a sortie with Mr. Fleming the following takes place.

Mr. Green: ....He compared Washington prices with the prices of modest, sensible Ottawa.  
 Mr. Fleming: Where is modest, sensible Ottawa?  
 Mr. Green: Right here. You should know it. If you would just get away from Toronto you would realize some of the good qualities of Ottawa.

In his second political period he used humor in describing the report of the Department of External Affairs for the calendar year 1960:

Mr. Green: ....We believe it has a new look, and that it will not be as dry reading as some of the reports of past years have been.  
 Mr. Nowlan: It is unfortunately printed between red covers.

Mr. Green: I hear a remark made by my colleague the Minister of National Revenue to the effect that the report is printed within covers of a bad color, but I point out that they are really not red but a sort of salmon pink.<sup>76</sup>

In his introduction of a speech on "Canada's Foreign Policy" this airy beginning:

Today I have escaped from the bonds of the department, in that I am not reading a speech. I am rather speaking from notes, so if a third world war should start tomorrow as a result the department will not be to blame.<sup>77</sup>

There was also evidence of ironic humor in his speech delivered on July 9, 1959.

I would prefer to be able to speak today without notes or with very scanty notes. However -- and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will confirm my findings in this regard -- this seems to be a heinous offence from the point of view of the officials of the department, and they are most insistent that one's remarks should be very carefully weighed and that extensive notes should be used. I must admit that I have lost out in this battle and appear here today with a few notes from which I propose to read. I hope the hon. members will bear with me, because I know just as well as they do that it is extremely difficult to read remarks and keep people awake. Perhaps, however, we will be able to do just a little better in that regard this morning.<sup>78</sup>

It appeared that he used humor more often in the second segment of his speaking career. Again, this could in part be due to the confidence of office and also the experience of many sessions of debate he weathered in parliament. However, the inclusion of humor did enable Mr. Green to vary his style. Mr. Green's use of humor would fall generally within the remark by Waldo Braden who listed the essential aims for which humor can be used.

1. To recapture attention and interest.
2. To gain a favorable hearing.
3. To give emphasis to or to amplify a point.
4. To relieve tension or to disarm unsympathetic or hostile listeners.
5. To express good will towards listeners, showing appreciation for the listeners by depreciating yourself.
6. To serve as a thought break, that is, to permit the listeners to relax during or after a difficult presentation.
7. To cope with the unexpected or embarrassing incident.
8. To answer a damaging attack of an opponent, turning the barb and recapturing the offensive.<sup>79</sup>

Mr. Green's use of humor seemed to be mainly concerned with points three and five. He liked to illustrate a point through the use of humor but did not like to use bitter or biting humor.

Another aspect of style, this one concerning the clear and appropriate use of language, has relevance in the Canadian political arena.

The speaker's style holds attention and interest. The manner in which he expresses and relates ideas can be interesting in and by itself.<sup>80</sup>

The images Mr. Green used were intended to maintain a high level of interest. For example, in discussing the plight of the blind people:

I suggest that these men have done all that could possibly be done, and they are now up against a blank wall.<sup>81</sup>

In the same speech he referred to Captain Baker, who had lost his sight during the First World War, as:

....decorated for gallantry in the field, and one night he was shot across both eyes and blinded. From that time to the present his life has been an epic of courage and initiative .....

This use of imagery is of importance because:

Style acts as proof. The speaker's word choice helps to establish the impression of familiarity and knowledge of his subject, which is an important part of ethical proof.<sup>82</sup>

As mentioned before Mr. Green used the ethical proof in his invention. The imagery then, became part of the proof. In his speech on the "Bill Amending Pensions Act,"<sup>83</sup> his concise comment was, "it smacks of officialdom." He continued projecting the same image when he referred to the fact that, "Throughout it I can see in different sections the deft touch of departmental officials." There is no doubt that he most strongly disapproved of this bill. In this same speech he drew an analogy with the British pension laws suggesting that they were administered in a "hard-boiled" manner, and that Canada should not adopt this same attitude. Referring to the present bill he suggested that the government was "hedging" in a variety of areas, particularly those sections most associated with the treatment of widows.

During "The Throne Speech Debate" of October 18, 1951, he used vivid language to drive home his point when he mentioned, "Americans eat our beef, Canadians are eating horsemeat." This analogy described the imbalance of foreign trade and commodities between Canada and the United States; and the resultant imbalance of standards of living. In this same speech he used such expressions as "we are in a half-war period; I would hope that this increase will be granted at this session (pension increase), and that there will not be an attempt to do more cheese-paring by bringing in an increase

of 20 percent or 25 percent. Perhaps the gravest danger of war today is that we live in a two-power world, which is of necessity a highly dangerous condition."

During the second segment of Mr. Green's political career he used the following type of expressions: "Heinous offence, thermonuclear age, luxury of a slackening, fundamental community of interests."<sup>84</sup> In his second speech: "Canada has only friends and no enemies; the time has come to drop the idea that Canada's role in world affairs is to be an "honest broker" between the nations; I had thought that NATO would be a forum for settling the difficulties about European trade."<sup>85</sup> Mr. Green used this direct and simple imagery in his last two speeches: "very stirring days; incalculable consequences; This is a day when Canada in world affairs can urge cool-headed action; This could be the greatest work-producing project; the world does not stand still."<sup>86</sup> In his fourth speech he went on to include: "time of deep crisis; In amplifying that statement; a very statesmanlike step; For Canadians it is so important at this time not to add fuel to the flames with the world hovering on the brink of a nuclear war; clear cut, analytical, and statesmanlike speech; peaceful solutions to this dangerous problem; barely concealed threats; if the cold war ever gets hot; greater expansion of freedom; main hope of mankind. If it grows and succeeds, there will be world order. If it fails, there will be world destruction."<sup>87</sup>

Corbett, speaking of Cicero says:

Various terms were used to name the kinds of style, but there was fundamental agreement about three levels of style. There was the low or plain style (*attenuata*, *subtile*); the middle or forcible style (*mediocris*, *robusta*); and the high or florid style (*gravis*, *florida*).<sup>88</sup>

Mr. Green appeared to use a simple and direct style. He avoided flowery language or language that was too academic. According to Cicero this would place him in the category of the plain style. His imagery seemed vivid and down to earth. The usual result of over-attention to the niceties of style is the deterioration of the speaker's eloquence. The main reason for this is that those words which give the impression of simplicity, sincerity and reality become much more meaningful to the audience than words which seem to be over developed and too ornate or academic. Due to the nature of the parliamentary audience this aspect has considerable importance. Mr. Green would agree with Eton Abernathy, who suggested:

The proper end result of a speech is communication of thought. If the language employed is so flowery, so vague, so precise, so incorrect, or so stilted that it is noticed, then to that extent thought is not communicated and the speech is a failure.<sup>89</sup>

One aspect of political speaking that bothered Mr. Green in his first political years was the time limit that was placed on his speeches. Another was the aggressive attitude of the party in power. It is possible that the imposition of a time limit may have affected his style. It is true that in his second period Mr. Green's speeches were longer but the style appeared much the same. It can be reasoned that the time limitation did not adversely affect Mr. Green's style.

## Delivery

The fourth division of rhetoric was "delivery" or "pronuntiatio." Corbett gives us a definitive description of delivery:

Involved in the treatment of delivery was concern for the management of the voice and for gestures (actio). Precepts were laid down about the modulation of the voice for the proper pitch, volume, and emphasis and about pausing and phrasing. In regard to action, orators were trained in gesturing in the proper stance and posture of the body, and in the management of the eyes and of facial expressions. What this all amounted to really was training in the art of acting, and it is significant that all the great orators in history have been great "hams."<sup>90</sup>

Cicero was even more explicit:

Delivery, I say, has the sole and supreme power in oratory; without it, a speaker of the highest mental capacity can be held in no esteem; while one of moderate abilities, with this qualification, may surpass even those of the highest talent.<sup>91</sup>

Since the author was not present during Mr. Green's speeches the discussion on his delivery will have certain limitations. In a study of delivery a first consideration is an understanding of the nature of the audience. Specifically, Mr. Green's comprised the two-hundred and sixty-five Members elected by due process to the Canadian House of Commons. These men came from all walks of life and had widely different backgrounds. The majority of the members gave allegiance to a single political party. The more prominent parties - Progressive Conservative, Liberal, New Democratic Party (formerly CCF), Social Credit and Creditiste -

could be classified as:

- a) The Government-party with a majority of members
- b) The Official Opposition-second largest party represented
- c) Remaining Members

Even though there seemed to be three distinct segments in the Canadian political structure on the Federal level, for practical purposes only two of these segments were significant in the political sense. For the most part, the Canadian Federal House has traditionally maintained a Liberal or Conservative orientation. The author is not suggesting that other political parties in Canada make no substantial contribution to Parliament. What is suggested is that these two parties seem to have controlled Federal politics almost from the inception of Canada as a Dominion in 1867.

As a Member of the Opposition camp (as Mr. Green was for the first twenty-two years) it was most important to obtain recognition from the floor when presenting a speech to the House. The Opposition Member found it almost impossible to hold the attention of the House if he failed to get down to business quickly. He was limited in the time allotted for speaking. The majority of Members were quick to question the Opposition if an error was made. If one was a Member of the party in power (the Government) then the coin changed sides. In particular if one was a Minister introducing a bill, there was always needed time to state his case and receive support from his party colleagues. This



support or lack of it forced the individual Members to use different ways of speaking (depending on whether or not he was with the majority). This point will be developed later in the paper as it has particular relevance to Mr. Green. The reader must be aware of the two distinct audiences Mr. Green faced during his political career.

Political speeches are delivered in the Canadian House of Commons for three distinct reasons: (1) to stimulate or evoke emotions; (2) to persuade; and (3) to instruct or inform. Depending upon which side of the House he was sitting on, Mr. Green, by his choice of purpose adapted to the mood of his audience. In his early years persuasion and stimulation of emotion ranked high on his priority list. Later on in his political career he introduced the informative speech to enlighten the House on the activities of his department. When the Conservatives held the majority, Mr. Green could afford to become more benevolent in his speaking, as he had a loyal band of colleagues to back up his statements. It becomes obvious then that the nature of the political audience addressed shaped the format of Mr. Green's speech as well as his speech strategies. Indeed one feels sometimes that the audience shaped the speech situation into a rather static entity. Perhaps the audience was not as important as it appeared, for although it did shape the speech situation and the techniques employed by the speaker it continued in a somewhat fixed position. This probably was

due to the fact that the audience either accepted or rejected the speaker's arguments on the basis of party affiliation or party roles.

A further important consideration in delivery is speech preparation. Because of the essential character of parliamentary debate Mr. Green employed the extemporaneous method of speech as his main form of delivery in the Canadian House of Commons.

The extemporaneous method gives you the opportunity to prepare systematically over a period of time and yet leaves you free to choose your language as you follow through with your listeners the sequence of ideas you have previously determined.<sup>92</sup>

Particularly during his early speeches Mr. Green hoped that by using this method he would be natural and effective. Even when it was an accepted practice for a Minister to use a prepared speech, we find him saying:

Today I have escaped from the bonds of the department, in that I am not reading a speech. I am rather speaking from notes.<sup>93</sup>

Mr. Green shared the view:

that the only natural eloquence is that which most resembles ordinary conversations. .... all efficacious oratory is natural eloquence. .... a certain amount of ornament and emotional effect must be allowed to suit the spirit of the age; .....<sup>94</sup>

This is the type of delivery characteristic of Mr. Green. He attempted to transmit his thinking in a meaningful way by approximating a conversationalized structure. He appeared to attempt to communicate to the members at a level below that of the podium. This method was in keeping with his simple and direct style.

To give greater flexibility to his speeches Mr. Green used the impromptu method when necessary.

Clearly you must rely upon what you already know, and you must select, organize, and adapt your material quickly on a dominant theme drawn from your experience between the time you are called upon and the moment you face your audience.<sup>95</sup>

Due to interruptions and heckling from the audience Mr. Green had to be prepared with a speech diversion at a moment's notice. In the House he could be called upon to illustrate a point or develop an issue that he had not counted on. For example:

Mr. Green: ...that is a new suggestion in Canadian policy

Mr. Abbott: How are we going to pay for the excess of United States production that we bring to Canada?

Mr. Green: We do not need to sell them all of our production.

Mr. Abbott: We do not. We buy more from them than we sell to them.

Mr. Green: One of our greatest problems in Canada today is our increasing dependence on the United States. ...<sup>96</sup>

In the above Mr. Green had to deviate from his original issue of economic savings. Later in this same speech he faced another query.

Mr. Abbott: We use American steel.

Mr. Green: I have a letter....

The above indicated Mr. Green's quick reaction to a question from the floor and of how he had thoroughly researched the issue and was prepared with evidence if needed.

Mr. Green's speaking after 1957 became more relaxed. He switched to the manuscript form of speech.

This method offers the advantage of a specifically prepared text with language chosen for precise meaning.<sup>97</sup>

The speech was read to the audience from a prepared manuscript. In his second political period Mr. Green read a number of reports which were prepared by his department. He used the exact words given to him. In light of his reliance on ethical proof during this period, the use of the manuscript method of speech delivery seemed especially useful. Mr. Green felt however, that by using the manuscript method, the speaker might lose his effectiveness. Constant reference to the printed page will prove distracting. The benefits of a more pronounced audio and visual contact with the audience was lost. When the Liberals formed the Opposition Mr. Green had already established a reputation as an honest individual and straightforward politician. In this situation he felt the House was more receptive to his speeches (as his party now held the majority of Members) and he could now be more benign in his speaking. He also found that the major purpose of his speeches during this second political period tended to be informative. If the speaker is considerate, understanding and reasonable in his delivery the audience will treat him in the same manner. Research indicates that there were very few biting charges directed toward Mr. Green compared to other Conservatives such as Mr. Diefenbaker or Mr. Donald Fleming (former Finance Minister).

The speaker must be calm and deliberate. Mr. Green felt that the speaker should talk "with" rather than "to" the

audience.<sup>98</sup> One should have a confident air but at the same time portray an honest concern for the issues at hand. A straightforward and honest approach seemed to be characteristic of Mr. Green's delivery. The speaker must talk the common language and have an appreciation of human nature. This will enable the speaker to perceive the needs of the audience and strengthen his presentation.

Mr. Green appeared to deliver his speeches in quite a relaxed and confident manner. He likes to recall the following incident.<sup>99</sup> It was during his maiden speech at the United Nations in New York. He went to the platform and began his speech. Part way through, feeling the need for added emphasis, he struck the podium with his fist. He inadvertently struck a button which began the release of the podium to the floor. It started to disappear! Mr. Green's speech was lying on the podium and he began to wonder if he might be the only representative at the United Nations to conclude his speech on his knees! However, he was able to stop the downward course of the podium and to resume his speech. This did not shake his confidence. Charles Lynch said of this speech:

....This speech is one of the best ever made by a Canadian at the United Nations, and would seem to indicate that Mr. Green has carried with him into the field of diplomacy the sure touch that he displayed in the political forum of the House of Commons.

The re-emergence of a firm Canadian voice in world affairs is something over which Canadians of all political stripes can rejoice.<sup>100</sup>

Mr. Green appeared to be firm and persuasive<sup>101</sup> soft

spoken,<sup>102</sup> and critical.<sup>103</sup> His manner appeared to be a standard one throughout the course of his political career. He utilized all of the three elements to be effective.

The only discernable gesture of any note in his career seemed to be the habit of extending his right hand and pointing to someone in the audience.<sup>104</sup> This could have the effect of making someone in the audience squirm.

After 1957 Mr. Green's speaking became more benevolent with an increased reliance on logical and ethical proof. He was a calmer and more philosophical speaker during this period and many of his speeches were masterpieces of the expression of Canadian ideals.

All in all, Howard Green, in the tradition of the Hon. Vincent Massey provided the type of leadership in the House that won for him the respect of his countrymen on the local, national and international scenes.

### Memory

The fifth part of rhetoric according to Cicero was "memoria," concerned with the memorizing of the speech. In its earliest beginnings Greek literature was essentially oral and depended on recitation and oral communication. This fact made memory an important art for them. Today we recognize that the process of speech has its own inherent symbols and methods of arrangement; the very form of an outline, with its numbers and letters to label points, provides a kind of location pattern by means of which we may recall ideas. More-

over, we have the language symbols in which our communication is carried on. Thus little consideration is given in this study to this aspect of rhetoric although a perceptive observation by Marsh appears to have a certain applicability to Mr. Green's speaking.

Sometimes misunderstood, the canon of memory may provide the speech with an additional probative force because the speaker's experiences are able to be recalled at the appropriate time. Skill in the use of this canon requires habitual techniques of memory, a knowledge of where to find needed information, and a broad, liberal education.<sup>105</sup>

Mr. Green's extensive legal background gave him ample opportunity to utilize the technique of memory many times. One principle inculcated in his method was that of constantly expanding the development of his ideas beyond the prepared dissertation. With his legal background came a solid fund of information concerning key issues and the knowledge of where to find this information. The ability to locate crucial information often saved Mr. Green time. Mr. Green did his own homework and did not utilize the services of an extensive research staff. This meant that his material was first hand and not subject to as much distortion as some of the information obtained by other members. On the issue of veterans affairs Mr. Green made profitable use of the technique of memory. He could quite clearly refocus his experiences on their plight either on the issue of the blind veterans pension or on other matters concerning general veterans allowances. Memory could be considered the actual memorization of a prepared

speech and the ability of the speaker to recreate it. As Mr. Green spoke extemporaneously, he would have had the opportunity to use this method if he had wanted to. However, he preferred to be spontaneous and stay away from the memorization of his speeches.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### OVERVIEW AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Overview

Howard C. Green was active on the Canadian Political scene from 1935 till 1963. During this period he established himself as a national leader and one of Canada's great statesmen. The most important channel used by Mr. Green to obtain his national and international prominence was his speeches in the Canadian House of Commons. While in Opposition, he played the role of Government critic, forcing the Liberals to concede ground on several issues. In effect he became the conscience of Parliament. Once a Minister, his honesty and sincerity set him apart from other politicians. He managed his department in a highly efficient and objective manner. Through his experiences serving Canada in the United Nations, he was able to orient most countries of the world toward an objective of peace. He was also able to foster an independent Canadian viewpoint in foreign affairs that had been lacking in previous years. His ability to speak on and defend significant issues was repeatedly tested throughout his political career. In the context of Quintilian it has been shown that in fact Mr. Green was, "The Good Man Speaking Well."

## Conclusions

A. Much information has been gleaned since this study was undertaken. Certain conclusions have been drawn.

1. Mr. Green's political career can be divided into two separate parts: (1) his Opposition role from 1935 to 1957 (2) his role while the Conservative Party directed Canada from 1957 to 1963.

2. Some of the issues with which Mr. Green associated himself were:

- a. War Veterans
- b. The Blind
- c. Commonwealth Preference
- d. Canada's Role As A Neutral World Leader
- e. Defense
- f. Minimum of U.S. Influence in Canadian Affairs
- g. Disarmament

3. Mr. Green was motivated to speak by:

- a. Friendships
- b. Offices and Memberships He Held
- c. Background As A Military Instructor
- d. Feeling For Humanity
- e. Legal Background
- f. Canadianism
- g. War Experiences

4. Speech Preparation. Mr. Green would make a decision regarding the nature of the general areas to pursue; from here he would choose the specific points to be covered; then develop a general brief outline.

5. Audience. Mr. Green faced two separate and distinct audiences depending on his role. When he sat in the Opposition the audience constantly put him on the offensive. When his party formed the Government he faced a much more

receptive audience. He did not have to assume the attitude of attack as his opinions tended to be automatically accepted by the majority of the House.

B. Information and Conclusions in the Context of the Canons.

1. Invention. Mr. Green used a predominantly emotional and logical approach in the first years of his parliamentary speaking. Because of the nature of his speeches while in the Opposition camp, he found this method of proof most effective. When his position changed, and he became a Cabinet Minister, he utilized an ethical appeal within a logical format. This progression can be traced to his legal training and his political maturity.

2. Disposition. The structure of Mr. Green's speeches was simple and direct. He led the audience directly into the issue to be considered. Both the introduction and conclusion of his speeches tended to become longer as he matured politically. The speech itself appeared to be arranged almost according to a formula. However, it was flexible enough to allow deviation from his original plan.

3. Style. In affinity with his speech structure Mr. Green's speech style was simple and straightforward. He avoided flowery or wordy language. During the development of his address he used a number of quotes. His imagery was one that seemed quite vivid and down to earth. He had a

number of expressions which he liked to use throughout his speaking career. The basic format he used for his speeches was the prose style. He had the ability to inject humor into his speeches, particularly during the second segment of his political career. Throughout his political speaking his style was natural and unconstrained reflecting his love of simplicity and his direct and honest manner.

4. Delivery. At first Mr. Green used the extemporaneous method of speech delivery. Then he turned in his second political period to the manuscript method. On occasion throughout his career the impromptu method was utilized. He used few gestures. He was critical, firm, soft spoken, and persuasive.

5. Memory. His past experiences were the strongest factor in his use of this principle.

The study attempted a comprehensive comment and clarification of Mr. Green's role as a speaker.<sup>106</sup> Further, an attempt was made to show the impact that Mr. Green made on Canadian politics, both at home and abroad. The author tried to portray, at least in part, the influence of the political speaking career of a truly "Great Canadian."

TABLE 11

## ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

## IN MR. GREEN'S POLITICAL SPEECHES

## BETWEEN HIS TERM IN OPPOSITION AND HIS TERM AS MINISTER

FACTORS	OPPOSITION FIRST PERIOD 1935-1957	MINISTER SECOND PERIOD 1957-1963
Approach to Issue	Localized	Internationalized
Meaning-Tone	Attack, Pleading	Benevolent, Patriotic
Appeals	Emotional, Logical	Ethical, Logical
Level	Practical	Practical-Tending Toward Philo- sophical
Introduction	Shorter	Longer
Conclusion	Shorter	Longer
Humor	Some	More
Attitude	Less Tolerant	More Tolerant
Mood	Cool but ready for Combat	Cool but more Benevolent
Stand Taken	Issues	Policy
Speech Delivery	Extemporaneous, Impromptu	Manuscript, some Extemporaneous, Partially Impromptu

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>It is recognized that Cicero's influence waned in the nineteenth century. One of the reasons for this was the use of language for more functional purposes. The expression of scientific facts is an example of this. In the nineteenth century there was lack of leisure to study composition for its own sake. People felt critical of the classics.

Today the printing of cheaper editions has markedly increased the popularization of classical literature. Cicero has become better known. Another reason is primarily political. "An age which has seen the freedom of the civilized world threatened by a succession of dictators has become less sympathetic to Caesar and correspondingly more appreciative of Cicero as the propounder par excellence of the republican ideal; the second is philosophical: an age which is, probably more than any other, hostile to dogmatism has found a sympathetic echo in this voice of common-sense liberalism and humanism." John Higginbotham, (trans.) Cicero: On Moral Obligation, (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967), p. 30.

<sup>2</sup>R.G. Austin, (trans.) Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Liber XII. (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. xiii. Quintilian is referring to the good man speaking well. In this context the good man is a moral man.

<sup>3</sup>See Keith Brooks and others, The Communicative Arts and Sciences of Speech. (Colombus: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc., 1966), p. 22.

<sup>4</sup>See Appendix.

<sup>5</sup>Personal Interview with Mr. Green.

<sup>6</sup>Editorial in The Vancouver Daily Province, May 18, 1961.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., May 16, 1961.

<sup>8</sup>See Appendix.

<sup>9</sup>Brooks, loc. cit. Mr. Brooks has outlined the traditional "Canons of Rhetoric" in the following manner: invention--the discovery and analysis of subject matter and proofs;

disposition-the structure and arrangement of the discourse; style-appropriate use of language; delivery-voice, articulation and bodily action; and finally memory-reflecting on past experience.

<sup>10</sup>Fryer and others, General Psychology. (fourth edition; New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1954), pp. 202-203.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ben Metcalfe, "A Man Wise in Matters of Peace," The Vancouver Province, June 3, 1959.

<sup>13</sup>During the personal interviews with Mr. Green the author had the rewarding experience of meeting his mother, truly a remarkable woman.

<sup>14</sup>Harvey Hickey, "The Hills," The Globe Magazine, Toronto, July 4, 1959, p. 7.

<sup>15</sup>The traditional one room schools.

<sup>16</sup>In a personal interview with Mr. Green he expressed his gratitude for the influence Mr. Hindle exerted on his early years orienting him towards a university education.

<sup>17</sup>Hickey, loc. cit.

<sup>18</sup>Vancouver South riding.

<sup>19</sup>The motivations listed were expressed during a personal interview with Mr. Green.

<sup>20</sup>The depression in Canada was influenced and directed to a great extent by external forces. The most notable pressure felt at this time was the economic collapse of the United States. It is highly doubtful if any party in Canada could have accomplished more during this period or could have changed the sequence of events that occurred during the depression years of the 1930's.

<sup>21</sup>Peter C. Newman, Renegade in Power. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1963), p. 24.

<sup>22</sup>Bruce Hutchison, Mr. Prime Minister. 1867-1964. (Toronto: Hunter Rose Co. Ltd., 1964), p. 331.

<sup>23</sup>Metcalfe, loc. cit. It should be mentioned at this point that the quotations given from Mr. Green's speeches and other sources have not been grammatically corrected.

<sup>24</sup>Don Mason, "Law Second With Green," The Vancouver Daily Province, November 17, 1949.

<sup>25</sup>"Canada's Top Diplomat," editorial in The New York Times, November 2, 1960.

<sup>26</sup>Edwin Robert Black, "The Progressive Conservative Party in British Columbia" (unpublished Master's thesis, the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, April 1960, pp. 145-148. In a letter from Mr. George Drew (National leader of the Progressive Conservative Party) to Mr. Deane Finlayson (Provincial leader of the Progressive Conservative Party) on June 9, 1954, the following is pertinent:

".....I can only express my very strong objection to the unwarranted imputation against the good faith of an outstanding Canadian, whose reputation in every part of the country should be a source of pride to the people of his own province. Howard Green commands the respect of every Member of the House of Commons, as I am sure he also does of the overwhelming majority of the people in British Columbia, who have followed for years his untiring efforts on behalf of his own province, as well as the constituency which has expressed its confidence in him for so many years."

This letter was in reply to certain charges from the provincial leader that Howard Green was not very co-operative with the Conservative Party (Provincial) in British Columbia. It was further inferred that he was not interested in the provincial organization at all. The insinuations went deeper than this. However, Mr. Drew speaking on behalf of the federal organization dispelled any doubts about Mr. Green's character. He also destroyed any accusations that had been made against Mr. Green.

<sup>27</sup>James K. Nesbitt, "Loyalty, Honesty Set Green Apart," The Sun, Vancouver, December 10, 1959.



<sup>28</sup> Mrs. Robert McKee, who held the post of Executive Secretary of the North West Point Grey Home Owners Association from 1957 to 1966, had the following comment regarding Mr. Green: "Mr. Green had the time to do the little things that needed doing. The kind of things that concerned the individual in his riding was high on Mr. Green's list of priorities, even when he was Minister of External Affairs. He was never too busy to help his constituents." In a personal interview with Mrs. McKee she mentioned that she was not a Conservative but respected Mr. Green for his honest effort and unselfish service over the years he spent representing the Canadian people.

<sup>29</sup> As a small single unit this organization was quite active and very effective (politically). The Association dated back to the "Ward System" of small units within a city. Unfortunately, the "Ward System" was abandoned by Vancouver, which weakened the concern over ward issues on City Council, and tended to fuse an impersonal whole. These observations were made during a discussion the author had with Mr. Green.

<sup>30</sup> Hickey, loc. cit.

<sup>31</sup> Tom Gould, news item in The Sun, Vancouver, June 3, 1959.

<sup>32</sup> Charles Lynch, news item in The Province, Vancouver, June 3, 1959.

<sup>33</sup> Elmore Philpott, "Green Fine Choice," The Sun, Vancouver, June 9, 1959.

<sup>34</sup> Newman, op. cit., pp. 256-257.

<sup>35</sup> My conclusion is supported by John Andrew Munro in his M.A. dissertation, "The Difficult Art of Canadian Foreign Policy, 1957-1963" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, April, 1965), p. 155.

"Its material is of considerable value, if employed discerningly. Mr. Newman's book does Mr. Diefenbaker and cabinet colleagues a distinct injustice, not so much in its sensationalistic presentation of events and characters, as it does in leading the reader to unwritten conclusions by tendentious presentation."

<sup>36</sup>My own brackets and inclusion.

<sup>37</sup>Heath Macquairie, "The Conservative Theme: Greatness on the International Stage," The Conservative Canadian, (Ottawa: Progressive Conservative Association of Canada. Volume 1, Number 3, Fall, 1960), p. 14.

<sup>38</sup>Tom Gould, news item in The Sun, Vancouver, May 25, 1959.

<sup>39</sup>This statement was relayed during an interview with Mr. Joe Brown who lived in Vancouver-Quadra during Mr. Green's political career. Mr. Brown was a member of the Board of Broadcast Governors from 1958 to 1968.

<sup>40</sup>William Stevenson, "Canada And The World," The Globe and Mail, Toronto, December 21, 1961.

<sup>41</sup>Elmore Philpott, "Green's Fine Fight," The Sun, Vancouver, December, 1960.

<sup>42</sup>Marie Hochmuth Nichols, Rhetoric and Criticism. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 78.

<sup>43</sup>Edward P. Corbett, Classical Rhetoric. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 22-23.

<sup>44</sup>Alma Sarett and others, Basic Principles of Speech. (fourth edition; New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966), pp. 291-292.

<sup>45</sup>All quotations from Mr. Green's speeches will be found in the Appendix.

<sup>46</sup>Cicero, De Oratore (Vol. two; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948), p. 333.

<sup>47</sup>Alan H. Monroe and Douglas Ehninger, Principles And Types of Speech. (sixth edition; Palo Alto, California: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1967), p. 232.

<sup>48</sup>A. Craig Baird and Franklin H. Knowler, Essentials of General Speech. (second edition; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960), p. 185.

<sup>49</sup>It may be contended that the virtual absence of resignations from the Department of External Affairs after Mr. Green's appointment as Minister substantiated the fact that these civil servants were happy with the way the Department was being run. One must remember that this Department was created by the outgoing Liberals. In order for the Department to make the transition from Mr. Pearson to the Conservatives, there must have been some common ground for agreement concerning the managing of External Affairs. This point is made in: John Andrew Munro, op. cit., pp. 76-77.

<sup>50</sup>"Green's Fine Fight," loc. cit.

<sup>51</sup>James McBurney and Ernest Wrage, The Art of Good Speech. (New York: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1955), p. 38.

<sup>52</sup>See Mr. Green's speech of March 9, 1936, in Appendix.

<sup>53</sup>See Mr. Green's speech of September 7, 1961, in Appendix.

<sup>54</sup>E. Winston Jones, A Guide to Effective Speech. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1961), pp. 9-10.

<sup>55</sup>Metcalf, loc. cit.

<sup>56</sup>Nesbitt, loc. cit.

<sup>57</sup>Article, "Green Lauded by Opposition MP," The Globe and Mail, Toronto, April 1, 1962. In this article the CCF Member from Burnaby-Coquitlam, Erhart Regeir said: "Mr. Green has won growing prestige in world councils. If the New Democratic Party has to lose the constituency of Vancouver-Quadra in the interests of world peace we will be happy to do so."

<sup>58</sup>A direct quotation from Mr. Green.

<sup>59</sup>McBurney, op. cit., p. 226.

<sup>60</sup>Patrick O. Marsh, Persuasive Speaking (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967), p. 16.

<sup>61</sup>All of Mr. Green's speeches in this section are found in the Appendix.

<sup>62</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Pensions for the Blind," March 9, 1936, see Appendix.

<sup>63</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Throne Speech Debate," October 18, 1951, see Appendix.

<sup>64</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Canada in Today's World" April 26, 1961, and "The Crisis Arising Over Nuclear Tests and Berlin" September 7, 1961, see Appendix.

<sup>65</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Pensions for the Blind," March 9, 1936, see Appendix.

<sup>66</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Bill Amending Pension Act," March 6, 1941, see Appendix.

<sup>67</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Throne Speech Debate," October 18, 1951, see Appendix.

<sup>68</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Introduction of Estimates of Department of External Affairs," July 9, 1959, see Appendix.

<sup>69</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Canada's Foreign Policy" February 10, 1960, see Appendix.

<sup>70</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "The Crisis Arising Over Nuclear Tests and Berlin," September 7, 1961, see Appendix.

<sup>71</sup>Mr. Green is referring to his United Nations work. During the previous session at the United Nations some Canadian Senators had attended, and had rendered him valuable assistance.

<sup>72</sup>Marsh, op. cit., p. 280.

<sup>73</sup>See Table 1, page 60.

<sup>74</sup>The Government interpretation of the issue.

<sup>75</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Throne Speech Debate," October 18, 1951, see Appendix.

<sup>76</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Canada in Today's World," April 26, 1961, see Appendix.

<sup>77</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Canada's Foreign Policy," February 10, 1960, see Appendix.

<sup>78</sup>House of Commons Speeches, "Introduction of Estimates of Department of External Affairs," July 9, 1959, see Appendix.

<sup>79</sup>Waldo W. Braden, Public Speaking: The Essentials (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), pp. 161-162.

<sup>80</sup>Raymond G. Smith, Principles of Public Speaking (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1958), p. 154.

<sup>81</sup>House of Commons Speech, "Pensions for the Blind," March 9, 1936, see Appendix.

<sup>82</sup>Raymond Smith, loc. cit.

<sup>83</sup>House of Commons Speech, "Bill Amending Pensions Act," March 6, 1941, see Appendix.

<sup>84</sup>House of Commons Speech, "Introduction of Estimates of Department of External Affairs," July 9, 1959, see Appendix.

<sup>85</sup>House of Commons Speech, "Canada's Foreign Policy," February 10, 1960, see Appendix.

<sup>86</sup>House of Commons Speech, "Canada in Today's World," April 26, 1961, see Appendix.

<sup>87</sup>House of Commons Speech, "The Crisis Arising Over Nuclear Tests and Berlin," September 7, 1961, see Appendix.

<sup>88</sup>Corbett, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

<sup>89</sup>Alton Abernathy, Fundamentals of Speech (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1961), p. 106.

<sup>90</sup>Corbett, op. cit., p. 28.

<sup>91</sup>Eugene E. White, Practical Speech Fundamentals (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1960), p. 40.

<sup>92</sup>Wilbur E. Gilman and others, An Introduction to Speaking (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962), p. 7.

<sup>93</sup>House of Commons Speech, "Canada's Foreign Policy," February 10, 1960, see Appendix.

<sup>94</sup>Austin, op. cit., pp. xxi-xxii.

<sup>95</sup>Gilman, loc. cit.

<sup>96</sup>House of Commons Speech, "Throne Speech Debate," October 18, 1951, see appendix.

<sup>97</sup>Gilman, loc. cit.

<sup>98</sup>Mr. Green's statement.

<sup>99</sup>Mr. Green mentioned this incident during an interview.

<sup>100</sup>Charles Lynch, "Mr. Green Makes Good" The Province, Vancouver, September 26, 1959.

<sup>101</sup>Mason, loc. cit.

<sup>102</sup>"A Man Wise in Matters of Peace," loc. cit.

<sup>103</sup>"Canada's Top Diplomat," loc. cit.

<sup>104</sup>Obtained this information in an interview with Mrs. Green (his wife).

<sup>105</sup>Marsh, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

<sup>106</sup>For a concise breakdown refer to Table 11 on page 82.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Abernathy, Elton. Fundamentals of Speech. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1961.
- Auer, Jeffery J., and Ewbank, Henry Lee. Discussion and Debate. Second Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.
- Auer, Jeffery J. An Introduction to Research in Speech. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Inc., 1959.
- Austin, R.G. (trans.). Quintiliani-Institutionis Oratoriae Liber XII. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Bachrach, Arthur J. Psychological Research. Second Edition. New York: Random House, Inc., 1966.
- Baird, A. Craig. Rhetoric: A Philosophical Inquiry. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1965.
- Baird, A. Craig, and Knowler, Franklin H. Essentials of General Speech. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.
- Black, Edwin. Rhetorical Criticism. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965.
- Bormann, Earnest G. Theory and Research in the Communicative Arts. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Braden, Waldo W. Public Speaking: The Essentials. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Brebner, J. Bartlet. Canada, A Modern History. Toronto: Ambassador Books Ltd., 1960.
- Brooks, Keith, and others. The Communicative Arts and Sciences of Speech. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967.
- Brown, Charles T., and Van Riper, Charles. Speech And Man. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Brown, James A.C. Techniques of Persuasion. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1963.

- Bugelski, B.R. An Introduction to the Principles of Psychology. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1960.
- Burt, A.L. The Romance of Canada. Toronto: W.J. Gage & Co., Ltd., 1937.
- Butler, H.E. (trans.). The Institution Oratoria of Quintilian. 4 vols. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1920.
- Cicero. De Oratore. Vol. Two. (De Partitione Oratoria, VIII:28) Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Clevenger, Theodore, Jr. Audience Analysis. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966.
- Corbett, Edward P.J. Classical Rhetoric For The Modern Student. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Engelmann, Frederick C. and Schwartz, Mildred A. Political Parties and the Canadian Social Structure. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1967.
- Fraser, Blair. The Search for Identity. Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, 1967.
- Freeley, Austin J. Argumentation and Debate. Second Edition. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1966.
- Gilman, Wilbur E., and others. An Introduction To Speaking. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962.
- Grant, George. Lament for a Nation. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1965.
- Gray, Giles Wilkeson, and Braden, Waldo W. Public Speaking. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1951.
- Gray, Giles Wilkeson, and Wise, Claude Merton. The Basis of Speech. Third Edition. New York: Harper & Bros., Publishers, 1959.
- Grube, G.M.A. (trans.). Aristotle: On Poetry and Style. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, Inc., 1958.
- Higginbotham, John (trans.). Cicero On Moral Obligation. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.
- Hutchison, Bruce. Mr. Prime Minister 1867-1964. Toronto: Hunter Ross Co. Limited, 1964.



- Jones, Winston. A Guide to Effective Speech. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1961.
- Lamb, George (trans.). H.I. Marriu: A History of Education In Antiquity. New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1956.
- Marsh, Patrick O. Persuasive Speaking. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1967.
- Massey, Vincent. Speaking of Canada. Toronto: The MacMillan Company of Canada Limited, 1959.
- McBurney, James H., and Wrage, Ernest J. The Art of Good Speech. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.
- Monroe, Alan H. Principles and Types of Speech. Palo Alto, California: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967.
- Mouat, Lawrence Henry. A Guide to Effective Public Speaking. Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1953.
- Newman, Peter C. Renegade in Power. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1963.
- Nichols, Marie Hochmuth. Rhetoric and Criticism. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. Informative Speaking. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1968.
- Oliver, Robert T. History of Public Speaking in America. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
- Oliver, Robert T., and others. Communicative Speech. Revised and enlarged edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.
- Oliver, Robert T., and others. New Training For Effective Speech. Revised Edition. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
- Rahskapf, Horace G. Basic Speech Improvement. New York: Harper & Row., Publishers, 1965.
- Richardson, B.T. Canada and Mr. Diefenbaker. Toronto: Hunter Ross Co., Limited, 1962.
- Ross, Raymond S. Speech Communication. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Smith, Raymond G. Principles of Public Speaking. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1958.

- Thouless, Robert H. Straight and Crooked Thinking. London: Richard Clay and Company, Ltd., 1961.
- Veatch, Henry (trans.). Aristotle: Ethics, Book 1; Politics, Book 1. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, Inc., 1958.
- Weaver, Andrew Thomas, and Ness, Ordean Gerhard. The Fundamentals And Forms of Speech. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1957.
- Weaver, Andrew Thomas, and others. The Teaching of Speech. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.
- White, Eugene E. Practical Speech Fundamentals. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960.

#### PERIODICALS

- The Canadian Who's Who. Volume X. Toronto: Trans Canada Press, 1966.
- The Conservative Canadian. Ottawa: Progressive Conservative Association of Canada. July 1960 to August 1961.
- The Speech Association of America. Speech Monographs. New York: The Speech Association of America. August, 1966 to January, 1969.
- Murray, Eldwood, and others. The Student as Speaker and Listener. A summary of proceedings of a conference on communication skills and interpersonal relations. Antioch College, March 25-26, 1966.
- Underhill, Frank H. Canadian Political Parties. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1957. Historical Booklets No. 8.

#### MAGAZINES AND NEWSPAPERS

- The Globe Magazine, Toronto, July 4, 1959.
- The Sun, Vancouver, January 1954 to December 1963.
- The Vancouver Daily Province (also referred to as The Vancouver Province and The Province), January 1954 to December 1963.
- The Globe and Mail, Toronto, January 1959 to December 1962.

The New York Times, November 2, 1960.

#### PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, Ottawa.  
House of Commons Debates. "Speeches of Howard Green."  
 March 9, 1936 to October 5, 1962.

Information Division, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa.  
Statements and Speeches of Mr. Howard C. Green to the  
United Nations General Assembly. September 24, 1959 to  
 July 24, 1962.

Information Division, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa.  
Biographies: Mr. Howard C. Green. November, 1962.

#### UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Statement by the Honourable Howard C. Green in First Committee  
of United Nations, speaking to the 8-power resolution on  
the Soviet 50-megaton bomb. October 20, 1961.

Trans-Canada Network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.  
"The Nation's Business" A Dying Government. February 12,  
 1948. Broadcast.

#### UNPUBLISHED MANUSCRIPTS

Black, Edwin R. "The Progressive Conservative Party in  
 British Columbia." Unpublished Master's thesis, The  
 University of British Columbia, Vancouver, April, 1960.

Lazar, Harvey. "Parliamentary Control of Defense in Canada  
 1945-1962." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University  
 of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1963.

Lindgren, William M. "Canada: The League of Nations and the  
 U.N.O." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of  
 British Columbia, Vancouver, April, 1946.

Munro, John Andrew. "The Difficult Art of Canadian Foreign  
 Policy 1957-1963." Unpublished Master's thesis, The  
 University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1965.

Ostle, Bernard. "War Finance in Canada." Unpublished Master's  
 thesis, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver,  
 August, 1946.

Rhodes, Denis H. "The Political Speaking of Joseph Taylor Robinson." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Southern Illinois, Carbondale, 1965.

Workman, Aruin Leroy. "A Rhetorical Analysis of Selected Public Speeches of James Russell Lowell." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1965.

## APPENDIX

### MAJOR SPEECHES DELIVERED BY MR. GREEN IN THE CANADIAN HOUSE

#### OF COMMONS

March 9, 1936 - Pensions for the Blind  
March 17, 1936 - Canada-United States Trade Agreements  
March 17, 1936 - Suggestions on the Budget-Mining-Aviation  
in Canada  
June 17, 1936 - War Veterans' Allowance  
February 5, 1937 - Postal Service-on Holidays  
February 6, 1937 - Divorce Appeals in British Columbia  
February 23, 1937 - The Unemployed War Veteran  
March 16, 1937 - Old Age Pensions Act  
March 25, 1937 - Trans-Canada Air Lines  
April 7, 1937 - The Unemployed War Veteran  
February 17, 1938 - Japanese Immigration  
March 17, 1938 - War Veterans' Allowance  
March 23, 1938 - Transport Bill  
April 1, 1938 - Defense and Foreign Policy  
May 13, 1938 - Defense and Foreign Policy  
May 26, 1938 - The Unemployed Veteran  
January 26, 1939 - Speech from the Throne  
February 28, 1939 - Canada-United States Trade Agreement  
March 9, 1939 - Pension Act  
April 3, 1939 - Canada Foreign Policy  
May 12, 1939 - The Defense of Canada  
May 23, 1940 - War Appropriation Bill  
July 4, 1940 - Budget Debate  
July 25, 1940 - Treachery Bill  
September 11, 1940 - First (1939) War Appropriation Bill  
November 29, 1940 - First (1939) War Appropriation Bill  
February 20, 1941 - War Appropriation Bill (1941)  
March 3, 1941 - Naturalization and Deportation  
March 6, 1941 - Bill Amending Pension Act  
May 2, 1941 - B.C. Telephone Co. Bill  
March 10, 1941 - Building Merchant Ships  
March 14, 1941 - Compulsory Military Training  
January 29, 1942 - Speech from the Throne  
March 23, 1942 - War Appropriations Bill (1942)  
April 28, 1942 - Our Fighting Men and Their Dependents  
May 1, 1942 - Army of the Pacific  
May 28, 1942 - War Risk Insurance for Fishermen  
June 19, 1942 - The Japanese Question  
June 22, 1942 - Bill Amending National Resources Mobilization  
Act

July 13, 1942 - Liquor  
 February 17, 1943 - Speech from the Throne  
 March 16, 1943 - Fuel Shortage  
 April 2, 1943 - Request for Fish Trap Policy  
 May 11, 1943 - Request for Shipping Policy  
 May 18, 1943 - Canadian Army  
 May 26, 1943 - Protection for Men in Forces  
 June 17, 1943 - Iron and Steel Industry  
 June 30, 1943 - Japanese Question  
 July 9, 1943 - Canada's Foreign Policy  
 February 10, 1944 - Speech from the Throne  
 February 18, 1944 - Naturalization and Deportation  
 February 24, 1944 - Our Fighting Forces  
 March 10, 1944 - Industrial Development Bank  
 March 27, 1944 - Shipping Policy  
 March 31, 1944 - Air Policy  
 May 5, 1944 - Japanese Problem  
 May 18, 1944 - Disability Pensions  
 June 2, 1944 - Old Age Pension  
 June 21, 1944 - Air Transport Board  
 July 5, 1944 - Budget Debate  
 July 27, 1944 - Family Allowances  
 March 22, 1945 - San Francisco Conference  
 April 3, 1945 - Veterans' Affairs  
 September 20, 1945 - Speech from the Throne  
 September 28, 1945 - National Defense  
 October 29, 1945 - Civil Aviation  
 November 8, 1945 - The Flag  
 November 22, 1945 - The Japanese Problem  
 April 1, 1946 - Peace River Outlet  
 April 10, 1946 - Old Age Pensions  
 June 3, 1946 - Crown Companies  
 June 7, 1946 - Logging Strike  
 June 10, 1946 - Research Council  
 June 11, 1946 - Atomic Energy Control  
 July 31, 1946 - Veterans' Affairs  
 February 11, 1947 - Chinese Immigration  
 June 20, 1947 - Community Centres  
 June 23, 1947 - Canadian Maritime Commission  
 December 10, 1947 - Geneva Treaties and the British Preference  
 February 10, 1948 - Speech from the Throne  
 March 19, 1948 - Bell Telephone Company Bill  
 April 13, 1948 - Freight Rates  
 February 1, 1949 - Speech from the Throne  
 March 11, 1949 - Freight Rates  
 September 22, 1949 - Throne Speech Debate  
 September 27, 1949 - Appeals to the Privy Council  
 October 3, 1949 - National Social Security Program  
 October 7, 1949 - Crime Comics  
 October 27, 1949 - Amending the BNA Act  
 October 31, 1949 - Atomic Energy Committee

March 2, 1950 - Throne Speech Debate  
May 15, 1950 - Pipe Line Debate  
May 18, 1950 - War Veterans' Allowance  
September 4, 1950 - Canada and the Korean Crisis  
February 7, 1951 - Throne Speech Debate  
February 15, 1951 - Throne Speech Debate  
October 18, 1951 - Throne Speech Debate  
October 23, 1951 - Canada's Participation in Korea and Europe  
March 13, 1952 - Throne Speech Debate  
March 25, 1952 - External Affairs  
December 2, 1952 - Throne Speech Debate  
February 12, 1953 - External Affairs - the Pacific  
February 17, 1953 - Atomic Energy  
February 1, 1954 - Bill to Increase Indemnities to  
Senators and Members  
February 15, 1954 - Unemployment  
March 30, 1954 - Should Red China be Recognized? Need for  
a Policy for the Pacific.  
January 12, 1955 - Throne Speech Debate  
June 14, 1955 - International Rivers  
January 23, 1956 - Throne Speech Debate  
May 15, 1956 - Closure of Debate and Amended Gas Pipe-Line  
Policy  
January 21, 1957 - Throne Speech Debate  
February 14, 1957 - The Canada Council and Parliament  
June 2, 1959 - The National Energy Board Act (Columbia  
River)  
July 9, 1959 - Introduction of Estimates of Department of  
External Affairs  
February 10, 1960 - Canada's Foreign Policy  
July 14, 1960 - Consideration of Estimate of Department of  
External Affairs  
April 26, 1961 - Canada in Today's World  
September 7, 1961 - The Crisis Arising Over Nuclear Tests  
and Berlin  
October 5, 1962 - Emergency Program, Commonwealth Conference  
and Canada's Position in the World

## TEXT OF EIGHT SELECTED SPEECHES DELIVERED BY MR. GREEN

## PENSIONS FOR THE BLIND

Monday, March 9, 1936.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South):

There is very little that I can add to the discussion on this resolution, but there is one material feature which should be brought out, and that is the efficiency with which work for the blind has been carried on in Canada during the last ten or fifteen years, perhaps longer. That is a material point, because the leaders of the blind come before this parliament to-day as a group who have done efficient work. I suggest that these men have done all that could possibly be done, and they are now up against a blank wall.

I should like for a minute or two to deal with the work of some of these men. It has been my privilege to see some of them at work. First I should like to mention Captain Baker. Captain Baker lost his sight during the war. He was a promising young engineer, a graduate of Toronto university, decorated for gallantry

in the field, and one night he was shot across both eyes and blinded. From that time to the present his life has been an epic of courage and initiative, a life that in times to come I think will be looked back upon by the Canadian people as outstanding in his generation. Captain Baker, like most of the blinded soldiers, was trained at St. Dunstan's in England. When he came back to Canada he took charge of work for blinded soldiers; then he took over work for all the blind in Canada. He is now managing director of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, and probably one of the leading younger executives in Canada to-day.

Captain Baker has been able to draw around him several other leading young men, for instance, Mr. Harris Turner, who although blinded overseas was at one time leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition in Saskatchewan; also there is Mr. Myers, and we have in Vancouver M. C. Robinson, superintendent of the western division of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. Mr. Robinson was blinded overseas at the age of nineteen,



and his work and experience have almost duplicated that of Captain Baker. Then we have Joe Clunk, placement officer of the institute, an American, a qualified solicitor doing wonderful work; and we have the work of the Layton family in Montreal.

I refer to these men for this reason, that in all their work their main idea has been to help to make the blind people independent, make them feel that they are taking their share in the life of the nation. In addition they have tried to raise the morale of the blind. As many hon. members know, blind people easily become discouraged, and it is no wonder they do. These leaders of the blind have started social clubs; for instance in Vancouver we have a club known as the Nil Desperandum club, which might be interpreted as the Never Say Die club. By such means the morale of the blind has been greatly improved. Despite this able leadership and good work there is a class of blind people for whom little can be done, and they are the ones for whom we are asking help to-day, the blind over forty years of age. These older blind folks are in many cases not active enough to work for wages; the majority of them have not the initiative to run concession stands, or carry on a business of their own and are really unemployable; they are just stranded, and I would suggest that the government could very well extend the provisions of the Old Age Pensions Act to cover these people.

The Old Age Pensions Act is particularly suitable because under its provisions only those blind people who are not earning a certain income would get assistance, and it would throw a portion of the burden on the provinces, which, while perhaps not so good for the provinces, would ensure their checking very carefully every application for a pension.

I personally am convinced that if we in the parliament of Canada adopt this resolution we shall be expressing the sympathetic feeling of Canadians generally for the blind and carrying out the wish of an overwhelming majority of the people of our nation.

**BILL AMENDING PENSION ACT**

March 6, 1911.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Pensions and National Health has just stated that it is the intention of the government to refer this bill to the special committee which was appointed the other day to consider questions of interest to ex-service men. If Bill No. 17 were merely a bill containing more or less routine amendments to the Canadian pension law, perhaps there would be no need to discuss it further at this stage. But it is of more importance than that, of more importance than the minister himself has just indicated, because it lays down principles to be followed in the treatment of men of the new fighting forces who suffer disability, and the principles to be followed in the treatment of their dependents.

The approach to this whole question on the part of the Canadian people and the members of this house certainly is that at least as much consideration as the men of the last war received should be shown to the men who are serving in the present fighting forces of Canada; and that any changes in the Pension Act should be of a type which will give these new soldiers, airmen and sailors at least as much consideration as the fighting forces of the old war have received at the hands of different parliaments of Canada.

I was astonished, on receiving this bill yesterday for the first time, to find that, while in some respects it gives additional consideration to our fighting forces, in most

respects it restricts their rights. It is tightening up not only on the soldiers of the last war but on the men who are in the fighting forces at the present time. To me it smacks of officialdom. Throughout it I can see in different sections the deft touch of departmental officials, and I think that the house should realize that fact before this bill is sent to committee. I propose to-day to give several instances supporting the statement I have made.

For example, if hon. members will look at page 5 of the bill, at the top of the page they will find subsection 2 of section 11 of the Pension Act. The amendment is a departure in Canadian pension law, something entirely new, and something which restricts in a great degree the rights of these fighting men. It provides that men serving in Canada cannot receive pension for disability, nor can their dependents receive pension in the event of their death, unless the injury or disease "arose out of and was directly connected with such military or war service." In practice this means that it is almost impossible for a member of our forces who is serving in Canada, not having yet got overseas, or his dependents, to obtain a pension, because it must be shown that the injury or the disease was caused directly by the service; it must have been directly connected with the performance of military duties. The proof of my statement is found in the small number of men who have been able to receive pension. The minister told us the other day that 10,829 men of Canada's fighting forces, exclusive of the air force—for which he promised to get me the figures; I do not know whether they are yet available—have been discharged from the fighting forces as physically unfit, and of that number only 484 have been able to establish claim for pension. This includes, of course, dependents receiving pension in the case of the death of the fighting man. That works out at a percentage of about 4.4 of the number of men who have been discharged as medically unfit. In other words, only 9 men in every 200 have been able to qualify for pension. This is largely because of this restrictive provision which we now find in the Pension Act and which has been used, in the shape of an order in council, for the last nine or ten months.

Mr. CHURCH: What about the fifty-four soldiers who have been killed on the highways by hit-and-run drivers?

Mr. GREEN: I will leave my hon. friend to deal with that. He has spoken of it before, and spoken very well.

This situation shows that there is something wrong with the pension provision for men serving in Canada. They have been

given a far more thorough medical examination than recruits in the last war, and yet we find that only 4.4 of those discharged as medically unfit are able to qualify for pension. I suggest to the house that this change in the basis of awarding pensions to Canada's fighting forces must be given careful consideration, because if we carry on under the new provision which the government now proposes, great hardship will be suffered, as the years go on, by the men who are disabled in the fighting forces and by their dependents.

Another instance of restricting the rights of the men in the forces will be found on the same page of this bill, in section 7, which enacts a new section 13 of the Pension Act. That section deals with what we call the dead-line. Hitherto, at least since the special committee met in 1936, the position has been that if a man served in the last war in Canada or England only, he or his dependents could not apply for a pension after the first day of July, 1936. There was a further provision that, in the case of a man who served in an actual theatre of war, application could be made up to the first day of January, 1942. Originally, I believe, the date was January 1, 1940, but it has been extended until now it stands at the first of January, 1942. Time and again returned soldier members in this house have asked that the government remove that dead-line entirely, so that a man who served in a theatre of war would be able to apply for a pension whenever he broke down, regardless of whether it was before or after the first day of January, 1942. One reason for the demand was that thousands and thousands of Canadian soldiers who were wounded in the last war are not yet in receipt of pension; as they grow older many of them break down, and it was felt that there should not be a dead-line with respect to applications by such men. However, the government insisted that the dead-line stand as the first of January, 1942, and now, in this bill, the dead-line remains at that date.

The provision regarding men of the new fighting forces is even more drastic. It will be found on page 6; it provides that in the case of a man serving in the present war, no application for pension will be received after seven years from the date of his discharge. If that same provision had been in the Pension Act after the last war, men would have been cut off in 1925; under this provision, seven years after a man is discharged he will be out of luck, he will not be able to apply for a pension. There is not even a proviso to that subsection such as partly protects the man who served in an actual theatre of war in the last war; in his case the pension commission have discretion to hear the applica-

tion after the dead-line is reached, but under this new provision for the men of the present fighting forces, the pension commission have no discretion to grant such special leave.

This new provision is copied from the pension legislation of Great Britain. As every member of this house who has had anything to do with returned soldier problems knows, the British are far more strict in their pension laws. It has been a great deal more difficult to get a pension there than in Canada. They have many more men to consider, men scattered all over the empire, and they have been hard-boiled in dealing with their veterans. Under this section the Canadian government proposes to be just as hard-boiled, and that, I suggest, is contrary to the wish of the Canadian people, contrary to the wish of the members of this house. It should not be embodied in our pension legislation.

Another example of hedging in these men will be found in the treatment of widows under this amending bill. Hon. members will find it at page 11 of the bill. There has been a demand from all parts of Canada during the last few years for an extension of pensions to various classes of widows, and I think a great deal can be said in support of the contention that these women should be receiving more consideration. But we find that there is nothing in this bill to give them that further consideration. There is no extension whatever of their rights; and as for the widows of men who lose their lives in the present war, they are further restricted in that they can get a pension under the provisions of section 16 of the bill only if they were married to the pensioner before he was granted a pension. Otherwise they cannot qualify. That is a narrower clause than we have in our Pension Act as it stands at present.

There is also a good example of tightening up on the part of departmental officials to be seen in subsection 4 on page 11 of the bill, where it is provided that if a woman has been separated from her husband she can get a pension upon his death only if she has been receiving alimony. Previously the law said, if she had been awarded alimony. There are many cases in our courts in which a woman is awarded alimony but does not receive it. In other words, she gets judgment but cannot collect. This section has been changed so that although she may have been awarded alimony she cannot get a pension on her husband's death unless she has been actually receiving it. It is an example of departmental tightening up.

At the bottom of page 11 there is the provision dealing with pension to a widow whose husband has died of his pensionable

disability. At the present time the widow of a pensioner who was wounded in the last war can get that pension provided she was married before he was granted pension or before the first of January 1930, which of course was twelve years after the war. Under this bill the widow of a member of our new fighting forces cannot get the pension unless she was married to the pensioner at the time he was granted pension; in other words, no provision is made for the case of marriage within a period of years after the war.

The sum and substance of the provisions for the widow of a pensioner is this, that if the pensioner marries after he has been granted pension and then dies, upon his death his widow will be cut off. The result will be that in a few years' time there will be hundreds of widows of men now serving in our fighting forces coming to us and asking for more consideration and they will be quite right in doing so. Provision should be made for them in this bill. At any rate, discretion should be given to the pension commission to award a pension to the widow even though she was married to the veteran after he had received his pension.

Another restriction has reference to the wife. From time to time each one of us gets complaints about these cases, and as hon. members know, there is no allowance payable for the wife of a soldier who served in the last war, if they were married after May 1, 1933. That was introduced in 1933 as an economy measure. It was unjust at that time but it has been continued ever since. Complaints have been made in the house but nothing could be done about it. The bill introduces a provision, to be found at page 16, that unless the new soldier and his wife have been married within a period of ten years after the termination of the war no allowance will be paid for the wife. There is the same restriction with respect to children. In other words, the children of our fighting forces who are lucky enough to be born within ten years of the war will receive an allowance. Any children born after that date will not. That is unfair. There is no reason for it. All the children of a pensioner should be entitled to the allowance, and none should be cut off at a date which is arbitrarily set.

This morning I had a letter from a veteran of the last war living in Manitoba, in the riding of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ward). He says:

Can there not be some provision made so that an honest man can be provided for to the end that all married pensioners or veterans are afforded the same benefits of the pension act?

There is another restriction to be made in the act in the change that is being brought about in the appeal board. Hon. members will find it at page 15 of the bill. When soldier questions were considered by the special committee in 1936, the veteran at that time had the right to apply first of all to the pension commission, then to be heard by a quorum of two members of the pension commission—they sat in different parts of the country, saw the man and heard evidence—and finally he had the right of appeal to the pension appeal court, sitting in Ottawa and consisting of three men. Subsequently that was changed and to-day the veteran applying for a pension has the right, first of all, to what is called a first hearing, which is really not a hearing at all but a first consideration by the pension commission in Ottawa—all done by correspondence. Then, if his application is rejected, he has the right to a second hearing, which again is merely consideration given at Ottawa. Then he has the right of final appeal, to an appeal board, which sits in different parts of the country, for example in Halifax or Vancouver. The veteran can go before that board of three men, take his witnesses with him and have a proper hearing; and he derives great satisfaction from being able to tell his story to those three men. Now under section 22 of this bill the government proposes to cut that final appeal board down from three men to two; and section 23 goes on to provide that in case of a split verdict, in case one member of the new board is for the soldier and one against him, the decision will be made by a man sitting here in Ottawa, a commissioner appointed by the chairman of the pension commission.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Who did not hear the appeal or see the witnesses.

Mr. GREEN: Who did not hear the witnesses at all and did not hear the ex-service-man's story, but who sits here in Ottawa and looks through a file. That is not good enough. Certainly it is one of the provisions of the bill which should not be retained. Nothing will do more to stir up the veterans across the country than to have some man here in Ottawa given the power to throw out their application for pension on a final appeal.

There are some provisions of the bill which are helpful. One in particular will be found on page 13: I refer to the provision for extending the Pension Act to cover Canadians who serve in the Royal Air Force or the Royal Navy. But it also is too restricted. The hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Gladstone), when the resolution which preceded this bill was under consideration, brought out the fact that those young

Canadians who enlisted in the Royal Air Force before the war broke out cannot get pensions under the act. Under these amendments the only airmen who can benefit are those who have enlisted in the Royal Air Force since the war started; it does not cover those who went to England in 1939 or 1938, or the other years preceding the war. I suggest that the bill should be extended to cover those cases.

I mention these instances in the hope that consideration will be given to them not only by hon. members who happen to be on this special committee but also by all other hon. members. I say that this bill is fundamentally wrong, because the whole tendency is to be "tough," to be just a little tougher than before on the men in the fighting forces. That means that if parliament enacts this bill in its present shape it will be "tough" with the very Canadians who should be receiving the most consideration at the present time.

NOTE: Certain changes were made in this bill by the special committee.

October 18, 1951

## THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

**Mr. Howard C. Green (Vancouver-Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I did not have the privilege of hearing the speeches of the mover (Mr. Cauchon) and the seconder (Mr. Simmons) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, but I understand their efforts were excellent. I can quite believe that from my acquaintance with them around the halls of the building. I was particularly interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Yukon-Mackenzie River in connection with Canada's northland. He pointed out that eventually railroads should be constructed to connect the various northern centres. I often wonder whether Canada will ever become a great nation unless she develops her northern country to the fullest extent. Probably most hon. members read an article by that great explorer Mr. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, in the August 1 issue of *Maclean's Magazine*. It dealt with Canada's northland and the title was "We're Missing our Future in the North." Here is what the sub-heading had to say:

A famous explorer says that by exploiting our rich northland we can match United States industrial wealth and support as many people.

The author then went on to prove those statements. I think it was most timely for the house to hear the speech of the hon. member for Yukon-Mackenzie river. I am sure that any proposal within reason for the development of the north will have the support of the vast majority of the members of 'his parliament. We saw that last year when a bill was introduced to provide for the construction of a railroad line from Sherridon to Lynn Lake in northern Manitoba.

In British Columbia the Canadian National line from Jasper to Prince Rupert cuts across the centre of the province and practically all the area for hundreds of miles north of that line is untapped, of course with the exception of the Peace river country and the district around Atlin. There is great work to be done in the north and one practical thing the government could do would be to provide separate seats for the Yukon and the Mackenzie river districts in the redistribution which is to take place shortly. That was advocated when the last redistribution measure was enacted but the suggestion was not accepted. I think the time has come when each of these districts should have a member, as it is quite impossible for one member to represent such a huge area.

I propose to direct my remaining remarks to three ministers in particular, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott), the Minister of

Veterans Affairs (Mr. Lapointe) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson). I appreciate greatly the fact that they are all here to take their medicine.

**Mr. Abbott:** We were warned.

**Mr. Pearson:** We were especially invited.

**Mr. Green:** First of all, the Minister of Finance. The subject which involves the minister is perhaps the most important of the three, although I submit they are all important. I am thinking particularly of the cost of living and inflation. In his speech earlier in the week the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) asked for suggestions as to how these great issues might be met. I am going to try to make some suggestions today. I have been somewhat disappointed that there have been so few suggestions from private members on the government side. I hope they will not be so bashful in the remaining days of the debate. They can do a great service to their fellow Canadians as well as to their constituents by getting up and expressing their views on these subjects. While the Prime Minister asked for suggestions, I really believe word went out from the government whip that anyone who opened his mouth would be shot. That seems to be the way in which this debate has been developing. I suggest that my good friends on the back benches on the Liberal side be a little more courageous and step in and tell the government what they think.

Of course there has been a tremendous rise in the cost of living. It has been going up in a startling way, a way which has been distressing, not only to the Canadian people but to every member of this house regardless of party. The Canadian cost of living index is now definitely higher than the United States index. I could not understand the Prime Minister's statement the other day to the contrary. Mind you, he covered it very cleverly. He took us down to Washington which is the centre of the world now, that great, roaring, busy city where everybody is a millionaire, or perhaps a billionaire, and where prices do not mean very much. He compared Washington prices with the prices in modest, sensible Ottawa.

**Mr. Fleming:** Where is modest, sensible Ottawa?

**Mr. Green:** Right here. You should know it. If you would just get away from Toronto you would realize some of the good qualities of Ottawa. The Prime Minister reached the conclusion that because prices in Washington were a little higher than in Ottawa everything was lovely, and Canada's cost of living index was lower than that of the United

States. I have here a report of a summary of the Bank of Canada published on September 1 and headed:

Canada's c.o.l. now higher than in U.S. Food, especially meat, big factor in sending price index soaring.

The article reads in part:

For years living costs in Canada were a lot lower than they were in the United States. Now, says the Bank of Canada, it is the other way round. The reversal in the cost of living pattern took place in June. Before that the cost of living index in the United States was running a lot higher than the one in Canada. In June, says the bank in its monthly statistical summary, the paths of the two indexes crossed. The United States index levelled off; the one in Canada kept on climbing. Going a step further, the bank makes a revealing comparison of living costs in the two countries over the twelve month period, July, 1950, to July, 1951. The upward drive in living costs, it finds, was far more significant in Canada than in the United States.

How the Prime Minister can take a contrary view is beyond my understanding. So much for the rise in the cost of living. Then there is the question of inflation. The inflation we already have in Canada means that the insurance policies taken out by most Canadians to protect their families and the government bonds purchased by most Canadians against sickness or old age have lost approximately half of their value. That is the position in Canada today, and it cannot be gainsaid by anyone. I believe that the cost of living and inflation are worrying the Canadian people far more than the Prime Minister of this country realizes.

It seems to me there are two basic facts which must always be kept in mind in considering this question. First of all, increases in wages are now largely tied to the cost of living index. When the index goes up, in most cases wages automatically go up, and of course the result eventually is a further increase in prices. There is also irresponsible—and I repeat the word "irresponsible"—price setting going on in this country, as there has been for many months. I do not believe, and I do not see how any member of this house can believe, any authority in the country other than the government can put a stop to that sort of business. The government alone has the authority to take some steps to break this chain.

The second basic fact which must always be remembered is that we are in what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg) the other day very aptly called a half war half peace era. In fact he summed it up very neatly when he said, "the period of half war and half peace of unknown duration". That is the situation in which we are today and it will continue for many years, certainly until Russia decides that it is going to pay her to make more friendly arrangements with the

free nations. We are not in a time of peace when there are the usual checks and counter checks. That simply is not the position in which Canada stands today. Those two factors should be remembered at all times by Canadians when considering the questions of the cost of living and inflation.

The government, largely through the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott), has taken certain steps to meet the situation. There has been an increase in taxation, principally in income, sales and excise taxes. Then there have been consumer credit regulations. They were designed of course to meet these two problems. They may have helped. I think that as things are working out a change should be made in the credit regulations. I think, for example, that longer time should be given people to pay for their cars and other commodities, but in this debate I am not going into details on this particular question.

Then the government arranged through the Bank of Canada for the restriction of credit to business concerns. I believe that has hit small businessmen a great deal harder than the large ones. I think it has been unfair in that way. Then of course there have been appeals to produce. The Minister of Finance and other ministers have urged the Canadian people to produce more goods. In some instances people were urged to work longer hours. There has always been behind such statements a sort of veiled suggestion that Canadian workmen were not earning their wages and I think the suggestion was unwise and unfair. However there have been these appeals for greater production.

Then there have been appeals to save. Not quite a month ago the Minister of Finance advised the women of Canada that they should be thrifty, that they should cut out thoughtless spending and cultivate an attitude of mind in which prudent household management is both patriotic and fashionable.

**Mr. Graydon:** How did that go over at home?

**Mr. Abbott:** Loud cheers.

**Mr. Knowles:** Did Mrs. Abbott turn the radio off?

**Mr. Green:** I have an immediate reaction as expressed in an editorial in the *Vancouver Province* of September 29 which is entitled, "A Long Way From the Kitchen". It reads:

Canadian housewives are hoping that Mrs. Doug. Abbott will shove a shopping basket in her husband's hand and send him to market to buy the family groceries. After hearing the finance minister urge the ladies to beat inflation by cutting down on "thoughtless spending" and cultivating "an attitude of mind in which prudent household management is both patriotic and fashionable," householders wonder where Mr. Abbott has been all the time. As

4.

far as people working for average wages are concerned, "prudential household management" is the only thing that keeps good food on the table.

**Mr. Abbott:** Prudential?

**Mr. Green:** Then the editorial ends by saying—

**Mr. Abbott:** Prudential? Is it not "prudent"?

**Mr. Green:** It says "prudential". I think it should be "prudent".

**Mr. Abbott:** I think it should be "prudent". We are not an insurance company.

**Mr. Green:** I have no doubt the minister is sorry that he said it, anyway.

**Mr. Abbott:** Far from it. I am interested in the opinion of editorial writers but I do not necessarily look on them as the last word.

**Mr. Green:** The editorial ends by saying:

If he puts on an apron, helps with the dishes—

**Mr. Abbott:** He does.

**Mr. Green:** It continues:

—and pays a few visits to the grocery store he won't wag his finger at the housewives again. Right now they have for Mr. Abbott the same answer they have when their husbands try to raise Cain over household expenses. "Let's see you do any better."

In his speech the other day the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) admitted to the house, and to the country, that the government's policy for meeting inflation has failed. This admission will be found at page 33 of *Hansard*. It reads:

I must confess that there are many of our friends on this side, and in that other corner of the house near Mr. Speaker disturbed at the fact that the government has not been able to devise any more effective measures of combating inflation than those which have been so far proposed to parliament.

Now, in October, 1951, he has only one proposal. We find a reference to that at page 41 of *Hansard*:

... as regards immediate additional measures to curb inflation, while others may develop, the only one we are prepared to submit at this time is the one that will arise out of this report of the combines committee with respect to resale prices.

I do not think that is going to have a very substantial effect on the index of the cost of living;

The Prime Minister admits that it will not be of much effect. I am wondering if this one proposal will not even be detrimental. On the surface it looks as though it might be a good thing but since coming here I have had representations from extremely reliable and responsible businessmen in Vancouver, largely men in small businesses, who point out that a measure of this kind is simply opening the way for the large stores to use what is known as the loss leader system. In other words, the large store will cut the prices of these goods upon which

the price has hitherto been set by the manufacturer, and in that way draw people into the store and sell them other goods at greatly increased prices. In the process the little fellow will be put out of business.

I do recommend that the government, in considering this legislation, try to work out some prohibition of this practice of loss leader selling. Certainly the measure is going to be of little help if it results in putting a great many small merchants in Canada out of business. If that happens the consumers are going to be hit worse than they are at the present time.

Also I should like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) to make a frank statement on the following suggestions, which I am making in all earnestness. In the first place, why would it not be good policy to reduce the sales tax from 10 per cent to 8 per cent? The revenues which are rolling in show conclusively that an increase in the tax was not needed to carry out the government plans for this fiscal year. Obviously the tax had the effect of increasing prices, in fact it pyramided prices because it was levied at the manufacturer's level. If a reduction were made in that sales tax at this session, the effect might be to start a reduction in prices right along the line. It might have an effect far greater than one would expect under normal conditions. If the government gave that lead by cutting down the sales tax and saying to the Canadian people, "We cut that tax for the one purpose of helping to reduce the cost of living", then I believe the results would be very beneficial. Someone has to take the lead in reducing the cost of living.

Incidentally, with regard to taxation, I believe the Minister of Finance must bring up to date his ideas of what are necessities in Canadian homes. He still believes an electric range, an oil range or gas heater is a luxury. In most centres that is not the case, and certainly not in Vancouver. These things are necessities. They have to be bought by practically all the young people setting up homes, and the Department of Finance should keep that fact in mind.

I would ask the Minister of Finance to explain also why it would not be possible to establish a basic food menu and basic clothing requirement for Canada, and to maintain that standard. In this way a good home manager would know what her cost would be for this basic standard. One of the most distressing features of the situation today is the uncertainty of prices next week. It does seem to me it should be within the ingenuity of the departmental advisers to work out a basic standard, one without any frills, and then adopt some scheme of maintaining that



standard. I realize that might involve subsidies. It might involve certain controls. It might involve such things, for example, as helping with the shipment of feed grain into the Fraser valley in British Columbia so that dairy farmers could produce milk at lower cost. Of course, they would have to pass that saving on to the consumers in Vancouver and the other cities in the area. I only mention this as an example.

I should like to hear from the Minister of Finance just why some scheme of this kind cannot be worked out.

**Mr. Abbott:** Just to be clear on what my hon. friend means, does he refer to the sort of utility garment they have in the United Kingdom? Is that what he has in mind, utility suits and so on?

**Mr. Green:** Milk and bread, for example, would be in the basic standard, and the same for clothing.

**Mr. Abbott:** What is meant by "a basic standard"? Does he mean a fixed price for those commodities?

**Mr. Green:** Yes. Then the minister does not get very far by merely urging the Canadian people to save. Mind you, I think he is quite right in doing that, but why would it not be possible to go farther and arrange for refundable savings as was done during the war. There could be a provision that money spent for life insurance and for the payment of mortgage principal would be exempt.

**Mr. Abbott:** That means compulsory savings?

**Mr. Green:** Yes, such as we had in the war. I believe some scheme of that kind would help. It would certainly be an incentive to the Canadian people to save.

I believe further that the government must tackle these unjust prices which, in effect, amount to profiteering. There is a great deal of that, and I know it is difficult to meet. I believe the situation in Canada today is such that we must tighten up our laws to curb this type of profiteering.

Then why is it not possible to take steps to enable our own people to get our own products at reasonable prices? As I said before, we are in a half-war period. The United States is running short of many resources. She is a wealthy and powerful neighbour, and becoming more wealthy and more powerful every day. She is depriving our people of some of their own production. The other day the Prime Minister said, as reported at page 34 of *Hansard*—

**Mr. Abbott:** We are buying more of United States production than we are exporting of Canadian production.

**Mr. Green:** Just a minute. The minister has not yet got my point. In dealing with the export of our commodities—he was dealing with prices and one reason that prices went up—the Prime Minister said as reported at page 34 of *Hansard*:

That is true here as well as it is in the United Kingdom;—

He was referring to the necessity to import goods and to pay the price charged by the other countries. Then he said:

—and in this country there is not only the prices we have to pay for the goods we import but the prices our Canadian producers can obtain for the goods they export, unless we prevent them from exporting them and force them to take from the Canadian market for their labours less than they can obtain by exporting.

He lays down the policy there that this country is going to allow all its goods to go out, if necessary, if a higher price can be obtained beyond the boundaries of Canada, and the Canadian people are going to have to go without. That is a new suggestion in Canadian policy.

**Mr. Abbott:** How are we going to pay for the excess of United States production that we bring to Canada?

**Mr. Green:** We do not need to sell them all of our production.

**Mr. Abbott:** We do not. We buy more from them than we sell to them.

**Mr. Green:** One of our great problems in Canada today is our increasing dependence on the United States. That is one of the biggest problems we are facing right now. The picture is all neatly put in the fact that while the Americans eat our beef, Canadians are eating horsemeat.

**Mr. Abbott:** We use American steel.

**Mr. Green:** I have here a letter written to the *Vancouver Sun* which sums up the situation neatly. It is entitled "Meat for Thought" and reads as follows:

The present trend of piling up revenue surplus at the rate of over a billion and a half annually while aged veterans are existing on \$35 monthly each for man and wife is a terrible indictment of the political party that cheerfully admits full responsibility for our so-called prosperity.

This in addition to the fact that more and more thousands of Canadians are daily being compelled to resort to horsemeat in their family diet, because of Ottawa's strange reluctance to impose controls on essential food costs, may have repercussions in the not too distant future.

I can foresee the day coming when the Liberal party, seeking votes for re-election, is greeted with a loud horse laugh and a resounding "neigh! neigh!" from Canadians too full of horsemeat for words.

In the meantime, would suggest the following slogan the Liberals could use in their next campaign:

From the stable  
To the table  
We brought back the horse,  
Lacking sincerity  
We called it prosperity—  
Fido will be the next course.

I can suggest a much better slogan. It is: "Vote Liberal and eat horsemeat".

**Mr. Abbott:** Vote Conservative and eat no meat.

**Mr. Green:** The Prime Minister was extremely smug about the whole question. He said that only certain sectors of the population are being bothered by the increased cost of living and that the others are doing better than they have ever done before. He said, "Of course, I hope that the inflation will stop". I suggest one thing to the Prime Minister; that is that he start eating horsemeat right away and continue doing so until he wakes up to what is going on in Canada.

**Mr. Martin:** Under these hours he is not getting a chance to eat anything.

**Mr. Green:** A discussion of the increased cost of living brings me to the next minister, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Lapointe).

**Mr. Abbott:** I hope there will now be more constructive suggestions.

**Mr. Green:** Last session the Minister of Veterans Affairs admitted that the basic disability pension is too low, and he tried to meet that situation by a handout known as the unemployability supplement. His supporters on the veterans affairs committee found themselves in great difficulties. The bell wether of the Liberal flock in the veterans affairs committee, the hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Croll) had a terrible time backing up the government and explaining why it was not increasing the basic rate of pension. Finally he produced the good alibi: Oh, well, the cost of living was probably going to stop going up right away anyway, and it was not necessary to do anything at once. From what he said when he spoke last night, I observe that he has at last become bold enough to say, as reported at page 146 of *Hansard*:

I do not think we can delay any longer that which is now long overdue. It has now become an urgent matter, and must be dealt with at this session.

It has become urgent, Mr. Speaker, because the veterans from coast to coast have put the heat on with regard to this question and are demanding action. The Minister of Veterans Affairs and the government obviously thought that this unemployability supplement would stop the protests and that they would get by with that measure.

Now the veterans of Canada are incensed over this treatment. I have never seen them as incensed over anything before. The plan is obviously inadequate. It breaks down the whole basis for disability pension, which was that the pension is paid as of right and that it is based on the cost of living and on wages. There can be no doubt of those statements. It is not based on the average wages paid in Canada. It is based on unskilled wages. I have that statement here in the Ralston report away back in 1924. Hon. members will find it in the second interim report of the Royal Commission on Pensions and Re-Establishment dated May, 1924, at page 44. The principle is this:

The earning power of a man in the class of the untrained labourer will be sufficient to provide decent comfort for himself and his family, that is to say, a little more than enough for subsistence.

From the start that has been the principle in pension legislation in Canada. Since last there was an increase in pension, in 1948, the cost of living has gone from about 140 to about 190. The average unskilled wage last year stood at 244.6, as compared with the year 1939 and this year is expected to be over 260. These figures are from the Department of Labour.

The requests of the veterans organizations of this country for an increase of 33½ per cent in the basic pension are therefore entirely reasonable. I would hope that this increase will be granted at this session, and that there will not be an attempt to do more cheese-paring by bringing in an increase of 20 per cent or 25 per cent. There is a wrong which should be righted at once. It is a disgrace that we have had to fight in this house all during this present year for fair treatment for the veterans of Canada. The same argument applies in large measure with regard to the war veterans allowance. It also should be increased, certainly to the level of the old age pension in the respective provinces.

My final remarks, Mr. Speaker, are directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson). When he speaks, I would ask him to answer two questions. The first one is this. Why has Canada taken no stand with regard to the abrogation by Egypt of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty and the threats which have been made by Egypt to the United Kingdom and actually to all of the nations of the commonwealth? I asked him two days ago what position the Canadian government is taking on this question and I received this strange reply, as reported at page 69 of *Hansard*:

The situation in the area to which my hon. friend's question refers is a difficult one indeed at the

moment, and highly inflammable. I do not think any statement from me at this time in answer to a question will be helpful.

Well, New Zealand and Australia answered at once. Yesterday the United States answered. I hold in my hand a clipping from last night's paper and right across the front page we find the following:

U.S. backing Britain in Egypt.

In the same article we find the same statement from France. These great allies of ours did not find the situation too inflammable to make a statement as to where they stood with regard to these actions in Egypt. Why is Canada waiting? Is she waiting until her two warships get out of the Mediterranean? Is that the reason for the delay?

The minister cannot argue that Canada is not interested in the middle east. In the speech from the throne we find that the government is going to recommend to this house that Greece and Turkey be admitted to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That means if Turkey is attacked Canada will be bound to come to her defence; yet no stand is taken with regard to Egypt where the whole lifeline of the commonwealth is in danger; in fact this may mean life or death to the free nations of the world.

Last spring, when there was a commonwealth defence conference for the Mediterranean, Canada would not even send a minister because she said she was not that much interested. She sent somebody from one of the departments. I would ask the minister to tell us very frankly what is the position of the Canadian government with regard to this Egyptian trouble.

Second, let him tell us why the government declines to enter a Pacific pact. When the pact was signed at San Francisco Canada was invited to join. I hold in my hand the *Vancouver Daily Province* dated September 1, 1951 which says:

United States, Australia sign Pacific pact. Nations hope Canada will join.

The three countries in this new alliance, which is similar to the security arrangement entered into earlier in the week between the Philippines and the United States, are anxious that Canada become a partner to stretch the alliance from the Arctic to the Antarctic.

When the minister was in Vancouver telling Canada for the first time about what had happened at San Francisco he said that there is a Pacific pact between the United States, Australia and New Zealand; another peace pact in the Pacific between the United States and the Philippines; and that the United States and Canada have a Pacific pact. Well, that was just evading the issue. United States and Canada have no Pacific defence pact. They have a general defence pact, I agree. But the general situation is that

Canada, which is a country involved in the Pacific, should be in this defence pact, and should be urging that other nations of the Pacific become members of the pact. I have not time to quote the editorials I have, but certainly in British Columbia I believe there is no difference of opinion on this question. We all believe that Canada should be a member of the Pacific pact.

These are the two questions. Finally I have just one suggestion to the minister. It is that Canada should urge upon the other commonwealth partners that there be adopted at once a policy of rebuilding the strength of the commonwealth until it is once again the third world power. Perhaps the gravest danger of war today is that we live in a two-power world, which is of necessity a highly dangerous condition. If the commonwealth were a third world power it would be an influence for peace. I think the people of the nations of the commonwealth are more peace-minded than our neighbours to the south. That is because of our geographical situation. I do not blame the people of the United States a bit for their attitude but the fact is—and everyone here knows it—that the people of the commonwealth are more peace-minded than either the people of the United States or the people of Russia. Perhaps if we had a strong commonwealth again we could give a lead in the settlement of these disputes. We are not in a position to do so now because of the weakness of the various nation members of the commonwealth who are all more or less camp followers in the United States camp.

The Canadian policy on this question, as announced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs a few days ago, has been to be on both sides. He made a speech on September 25—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member's time has expired.

**Some hon. members:** Go on.

**Mr. Green:** I am sorry. I thank hon. members for allowing me to finish. In that speech he was dealing with the United States-Canada relations, and he used very significant words in explaining that the—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Has the hon. member unanimous consent to continue?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Lesage:** Go on.

**Mr. Green:** He referred to the fact that Canadian troops going to Europe were to serve with commonwealth troops but that the airmen going to Europe were to serve

with the United States air force. Of course that was confirmed today by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton). The Secretary of State for External Affairs used these words: "So that Canada as usual would be on both sides." I am sure that is a grave mistake. I think the time has come for Canada to review the direction that she is taking and to give a lead in rebuilding the commonwealth. That would be of far greater advantage to the United States as well as to ourselves and to the other members of the commonwealth; the greatest support the United States could get would be from a strong and united commonwealth. Canadian policy from now on should be directed to the rebuilding of the commonwealth.

I would remind the minister that one of his predecessors at Washington, one of the greatest living Canadians and one of the greatest members of his own party, Right Hon. Vincent Massey, has made various significant statements in Canada on this policy. I hold in my hand a quotation from a speech he made in Vancouver on November 15, 1946, and with this I close. It is entitled: "Canada's place in a troubled world." He said:

We have, in my belief, far greater influence in the world as a member of the British family than otherwise would be ours. We have, in a sense, a double status. I am quite sure from any experience that I may have been able to gain that the fact that Canada appears on the international scene, not only as an important country on her own account—which we are—but also as a member of a great association gives her both enhanced prestige and increased importance.

I suggest that at this time our greatest contribution to world peace would be to take a lead in rebuilding the strength of the British commonwealth.

# THE SUEZ CRISIS

3

November 26, 1956.

**Mr. Howard C. Green (Vancouver-Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, before going on with the main portion of my speech this evening I should like to say a word about the speech which has just been made by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Pickersgill). I hope he will not feel that he is doing everything that could be done to get these patriots from Hungary to Canada. After all, the actions of these people have aroused great sympathy in the minds and the hearts of the Canadian people from coast to coast. Furthermore, by their actions in Hungary they have shown that they would make excellent Canadian citizens. We cannot have too many citizens of this kind who have known the tragedies of communism and who are prepared to stand up and fight against it. I hope the minister will have a further look at his plans. For example, why should not Canada extend an invitation to these refugees right in Austria, pointing out to them the advantages of coming to Canada? From his remarks I took it that the minister was just worrying about getting out those people who happen to ask about coming to Canada.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I am sure the hon. gentleman is not trying to be unfair. I said that we were asked by the Austrian government not to go into the camps. As long as that is the view of the Austrian government we will not go into the camps; but the day the Austrian government invites us to go there, or the next day, I will send a team there.

**Mr. Green:** I have one other suggestion which perhaps the minister will take a little more kindly. It seems to me that it would be possible for him, with the co-operation of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg), to set up some scheme of rehabilitation under which these patriots coming to Canada can be assisted to learn skills which will fit them into our industrial life,—and possibly also into our agricultural life.

Then I should like to say a word about the speech by the leader of the C.C.F., the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). Unfortunately I was not able to hear that speech, but I understand that he largely followed the line of the Labour party in the United Kingdom which, of course, is what we expect in this house from his party on these questions. I understand also that he said the people of Great Britain were overwhelmingly opposed to the policies followed by the Eden government. It so happens that I have here a dispatch to the Vancouver *Sun* from my neighbour, the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Philpott), who was

in the United Kingdom last week. This is in the issue of November 20, and here is what he had to say on that point. I do not always vouch for his accuracy, but probably in this case he is nearly right. He said:

Several factors have tended to push the Suez crisis out of the picture here.

That is in England.

The cease-fire in Egypt changed the public attitude in the twinkling of an eye. Instead of being damned up hill and down dale by half the nation as the man who got Britain into a war, Eden was and is increasingly hailed as the man whose timely action prevented the third world war.

I hope the member for Vancouver South will take the same stand when he speaks in this debate. Then he went on to say:

Several staunch supporters of the Labour party have told me privately that they think the Prime Minister did the right thing in the circumstances.

Feelings on these questions raised by the Suez crisis, Mr. Speaker, are running very deep in Canada, far deeper I believe than the government has the slightest conception. Listening to the Prime Minister I could not help but think he has been living in some other land altogether so far as public reaction to these issues is concerned, and particularly reaction to the attitude of the Canadian government.

This attitude has come as a great shock to millions of Canadian people. In Vancouver the story broke in the headlines on October 31, and I must admit that even I was shocked, although the stand taken was just in line with the stand this government has been taking for the last 10 years. It has been going steadily in the direction of the stand taken on this occasion. This time they happened to get caught. They spoke off the cuff before they had a nice, cover-up explanation prepared. Here we have the headlines, "Canada Turns Her Back on U.K."—it should have been the U.K. and France—"Supports U.S.". This is a dispatch by Mr. Leiterman and it begins this way:

With a wrench that will make history, Canada turned her back on Great Britain Tuesday night . . .

Then he went on to point out the ill-concealed annoyance shown by the minister for external affairs when he was interviewed on this particular day. Mr. Leiterman had this to say:

Mr. Pearson had three possible courses. He could have supported Britain. He could have supported the U.S. or he could, like Australia in the security council, have abstained and said nothing at all.

Hesitantly, almost as if surprised at his own boldness he chose in effect to desert Britain and "associate" Canada with the United States.

That was on October 31.

**Mr. Pearson:** May I ask the hon. member a question? Would he tell me to what he is referring in reading that newspaper, what vote?

**Mr. Green:** I am referring to a report of a press conference or an interview by the minister with the press, and the date of the report in the *Vancouver Province* is October 31. This was only the beginning. The minister went down to the United Nations, I believe it was on November 2, after the United Kingdom and France had vetoed the resolution brought into the security council, and he voted with Russia and the United States against the United Kingdom and France to put this question on the agenda of the assembly.

**Mr. Pearson:** Everybody else did, too.

**Mr. Green:** Let the minister and the government laugh it off. This afternoon the Prime Minister was very careful not to refer to that. He had not a word to say about that particular vote. He talked about—

**Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East):** He very firmly approves of that vote.

**Mr. Brooks:** That does not make it right.

**Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East):** And the fact that you say it is wrong does not make it wrong.

**Mr. Green:** The Prime Minister had an opportunity to make his speech this afternoon, and perhaps he will allow me to make mine.

This afternoon the Prime Minister said that when the vote came up about the cease-fire, then Canada abstained. He did not explain that while the minister for external affairs abstained, in his speech the minister showed very clearly that he was condemning the United Kingdom and France. The Prime Minister should have made that clear. This has been the course followed by this government right down through the piece since this serious situation first arose.

Again, just two days ago in the assembly of the United Nations when the second resolution about the cease-fire was under discussion the minister got up and said that this was all wrong, there had already been a resolution passed and the United Kingdom, France and Israel were complying with it. They had already taken steps to comply with that resolution and this second resolution should not be passed. Then the Canadian government did not have the courage to get up and vote against it. Only the United Kingdom, France, Israel, Australia and New

Zealand voted against that foolish and provocative resolution. The Canadian government, representing the land of courageous people, did not have the backbone to get up and vote against that resolution; they were so busy currying favour with the United States.

The feature of the speech the Prime Minister delivered today, Mr. Speaker, was the anger, almost the hatred he showed in his remarks. I wish the Canadian people could have been here to watch him.

**Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East):** So do I.

**Mr. Green:** He made a violent attack on the big nations.

**Mr. Garson:** It is too bad they cannot hear you.

**Mr. Green:** He talked about the use of the veto. The veto was written into the United Nations charter because the big nations have to carry a great deal of responsibility. But the Prime Minister pushed that aside and talked about the life of a person in a small nation being as valuable as in a big nation.

**Mr. Hosking:** Is that not true?

**Mr. Green:** It is just dragging a red herring across the trail. Then he went on to talk about the United Kingdom and France taking the law into their own hands, and in effect the Prime Minister lumped the United Kingdom and France with Russia in his condemnation.

**Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East):** How silly can you be?

**Mr. Green:** Then he made this amazing statement. He said, "The era of supermen in Europe is coming to an end". I suppose he considers that all the supermen are in the Canadian government. If they are not all in the Canadian government, then I presume the opinion of this same Prime Minister is that they are in the United States government. Here you have the prime minister of France and Prime Minister Eden of the United Kingdom. They do not claim to be supermen. I am amazed at the Prime Minister of Canada making slurring remarks of that kind this afternoon. Those men in the United Kingdom and France are simply doing the best they can for their people; they are trying to give good leadership. I suppose the Prime Minister of Canada sneers at Sir Winston Churchill as a superman and includes him in his nasty, biting remarks this afternoon. His whole attitude this afternoon was one of bitterness.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** We have one doing that right now.

**Mr. Green:** The Uncle Louis kissing babies went out the window this afternoon; so smug, so full of self-righteousness, so hypocritical.

Where was Canada earlier this year when this question was blowing up? This government was washing its hands of the whole problem. Now young Canadians are going to have to go to the Middle East, perhaps to fight in the Middle East, perhaps to stand up against young men from Great Britain and France. There is the situation we may be facing in the near future; yet this spring and summer the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister took the position, well, the Suez is a long way off; Canada is not concerned. They did nothing about it, nothing to try to solve the problem. All the time President Nasser was openly boasting that he was out to destroy Israel and to drive the United Kingdom and France out of the Middle East. He was fomenting trouble in North Africa for the French. The Canadian government was not interested at all.

Then he seized the canal. He had no right to do it. That action was taken in direct and violent breach of the treaty. The United Kingdom and France moved their troops into the Mediterranean area at that time. The Canadian government knew it; the whole world knew it. These two nations had to act to save their own national existence. What did Canada do? I hold in my hand a press dispatch of July 28, headed, "Canada Plans No Move On Suez Canal". The dispatch goes on to say:

Canada is making no representations in the Egyptian nationalization of the Suez canal, External Affairs Minister Pearson told the Journal.

The subject was brought up in the house by the Leader of the Opposition on July 30. He asked the Prime Minister this question:

In view of the developments over the week end, has the government given consideration to the advisability of presenting a formal protest to Egypt which would indicate the position of this government in relation to the events which have taken place there in a manner that is not merely a question of reporting, but would constitute a direct representation from this government?

And here is the answer of this Prime Minister, who is so full of indignation today, reported at page 6655 of *Hansard*. Here is his answer at that time:

The matter has, of course, been under consideration, but we have not decided yet to submit any formal protest.

I do not believe any formal protest was ever submitted. The United States took the same attitude at that time. I hold in my

hand a statement by Defence Secretary Wilson. It is quoted on August 8, and reads as follows:

Defence Secretary Wilson today described the Suez situation as a "relatively small thing".

The article goes on:

At another point, a reporter asked Wilson if he looked upon the Suez crisis as a minor upset. He replied: "You described it well".

That was Canada and the United States just a few months ago, absolutely failing to take any stand to try to clear up the situation in the Suez at that time.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

**Mr. Green:** I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Green the debate was adjourned.

CANADA

---

House of Commons Debates  
OFFICIAL REPORT

---

SPEECH

of

HOWARD GREEN

Member for Vancouver Quadra

and

Secretary of State for External Affairs

on

Introduction of Estimates of  
Department of External Affairs

---

Made in the House of Commons on July 9, 1959

---

(These reprints were paid for by Howard Green)



**Hon. Howard C. Green (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Chairman, in opening my remarks today on the estimates of the Department of Veterans Affairs—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

**Mr. Green:** I am afraid I have done so much talking in this house on veterans affairs in the last 24 years that I have become accustomed to referring to that department. However, my very old friend the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Brooks) objects strenuously to my interfering with his department. He is always annoyed when my old speeches when in opposition are quoted at him when he is putting his estimates through, so probably it is because of a guilty conscience that I spoke of the Department of Veterans Affairs. In any event, I will try another start.

In opening the discussion on the estimates of the Department of External Affairs I am deeply conscious of the sadness of the fact that the late Hon. Sidney Smith is not here to carry on with these estimates for which he had been responsible and in the presentation of which, some months ago, he had done so well. During the time I have been the minister of this department I have had confirmation of my opinion that Sidney Smith was making a great contribution to public life and was about to become one of the great foreign ministers in the world.

We all realize what a tragedy it was that he was taken from us so suddenly' and perhaps the best way in which we can show our feelings in this regard is to keep in mind the unselfish contribution he made to the welfare of his fellow Canadians when he left such an important post in university life to enter the hurly-burly of political life. And he did so, I know, in the hope that he would be able to do something to further the cause of world peace. I shall be trying at all times to keep in mind the example he set in this department.

Before I go on to deal with foreign affairs I should like to thank the members of the House of Commons once again for the very kind reception they have given me today and for the encouragement they have given in the last few weeks. This is most helpful, and there has been similar encouragement from many other sources; for example, from Canadians in all walks of life and in all parts of the country. And it has been somewhat of a surprise to me to realize how deeply Canadians today are interested in what goes on beyond the borders of our nation, though I suppose one should have realized that that would be the case because of the terrific issues at stake in external affairs in a nuclear

age. Certainly I have no doubt that Canadians today are very much concerned over the part their nation is going to play in world affairs and, in particular, over the part their nation will play in furthering co-operation among all the nations of the world.

I have also had understanding and encouragement from the representatives in Canada of other nations. Members of this house—and I include myself in that group—sometimes do not realize that we have here leading men from all over the world, men who have made a success in their own country and who have come here to represent their nations. Each and every one of them is a friend of Canada, and each and every one of them has a great contribution to bring to the public men of Canada with whom they come into contact.

There has not yet been time for me to have a long talk with each of the ambassadors and high commissioners, but I have been able to talk to quite a few and in every case I have learned a great deal and have been greatly helped as I approach the problems confronting a minister of foreign affairs in Canada. I hope that from time to time it will be possible to meet these representatives in other places, perhaps at the United Nations or at NATO conferences or in their own homelands, and I would suggest to members of this house that they should lose no opportunity to get acquainted with the ambassadors and high commissioners, and the staffs of the various missions in Ottawa, in order not only to show that we are friendly to other nations of the world but also to learn, as leaders of the Canadian people, more of what is being done and more of the aims and ideals of those nations which are so ably represented in Ottawa.

Also, Mr. Chairman, as I expected, I have received very great help from the officials of the Department of External Affairs. They have had the difficult task of beginning the education of a new minister. There have been many memoranda prepared. Perhaps most of them would not have been necessary if I had been doing my homework during the last 24 years.

**Mr. Pearson:** You were doing your home work.

**Mr. Green:** In any event, the relationship between us has been very happy, and here again I doubt whether many members of the house have a clear idea of just what these Canadians are doing for their country. Two days ago I attended the annual picnic of the Department of External Affairs, and yesterday I attended the annual picnic of the Department of Public Works. In fact I am

getting to be quite good at picnics. But at that picnic the families and particularly the children of these men who have represented Canada in places all over the world gave me a much clearer picture of what they are doing. One little girl, seven or eight years of age, speaks four languages and I expect that before very long she will be learning a fifth.

Then there was a foot race on snowshoes for the heads of divisions; that is to say, for the men who are giving the leadership here in Ottawa in the Department of External Affairs. After seeing them in action I am convinced of their great vitality and vast speed, and I think the winner and the runner-up are very well qualified to be appointed ambassadors in Antarctica. These men and their families are great Canadians, probably more so from the fact that abroad, in these various countries, they have spoken for the people of Canada. I have the utmost confidence not only in the work they are doing now but in the work they will do in the years ahead.

In the external affairs debates I hope it will be possible to have frank discussion. The department would be very glad to have the suggestions and criticism of hon. members, provided there are not too many bricks in the criticism. There are a great many members of the House of Commons who are now well qualified to express opinions on external affairs. I think of those hon. members who have served on the standing committee on external affairs, which I believe is the topnotch committee of the commons. Many hon. members have been taking part in these committee meetings for a great many years and some have learned a great deal about external affairs. They are therefore in a position to make worth-while contributions in the debates in this house.

I think also of those hon. members who have participated in various conferences, for example, at the United Nations. Quite a large number of hon. members have taken part as delegates, alternates or observers, and there will be more going to New York in September. We plan to have observers, for example, from the two opposition parties in the usual way. There have been others taking part in NATO conferences. In fact, whenever I notice an empty desk in this chamber on the government side I wonder if the occupant who should be there is not in Paris, London, Ankara or somewhere else abroad attending a NATO conference.

I am sure these conferences are very enjoyable, but in addition to that they are beneficial to Canada and qualify the members

who attend to give worth-while opinions here on the floor of the house. Just a week or two ago we had the interparliamentary conference attended by representatives from the United States congress and from our own parliament. The hon. members who took part in that conference are also in a position to make a contribution here today, and I hope some will do so.

I would prefer to be able to speak today without notes or with very scanty notes. However—and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will confirm my findings in this regard—this seems to be a heinous offence from the point of view of the officials of the department, and they are most insistent that one's remarks should be very carefully weighed and that extensive notes should be used. I must admit that I have lost out in this battle and appear here today with a few notes from which I propose to read. I hope hon. members will bear with me, because I know just as well as they do that it is extremely difficult to read remarks and keep people awake. Perhaps, however, we will be able to do a little better in that regard this morning.

The first subject I plan to discuss is the Geneva conference. I am aware, as you are, Mr. Chairman, 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, as 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 peace-

ful use of outer space as examples—on which progress could be made by high level discussions. At this stage, I think as few preconditions 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.

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.

It is natural enough, Mr. Chairman, 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 internal 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.

It will be appropriate, I think, if I should 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 programs 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 of 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 program 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 program 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 Viet Nam, out of which has emerged a program that will absorb about \$2 million of the Colombo plan appropriation voted by parliament for 1958-59, the last fiscal year. This program 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 program 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 on 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 could 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 program 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 program, which is expected to extend over a 10-year period. The Canadian government agreed in principle to participate in the program 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.

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 aus-

pices 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.

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 opening my 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 consequence 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 hydroelectric 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 face 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.

**The Chairman:** I regret to interrupt the minister, but I must inform him that his time has expired. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the minister be allowed to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Green:** Once again, Mr. Chairman, may I express appreciation for the kindness of hon. members in giving me further time.

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.

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 Viet Nameese 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—I am not sure of my pronunciation, Mr. Chairman—to accept terms for 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 north Viet Nam. 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 right hon. 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 Viet Nam, the tension between south and north has not abated, unfortunately, and the Viet Nam 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 Viet Nam 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 at some length by the late Hon. Sidney Smith last February, and I do not intend to restate it here. Hon. members will find that statement commencing at page 1405 of this 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 that respect will improve.

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 fall-out. 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 programs 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 force 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 right hon. 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 programs, 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.

CANADA

---

# House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

---

SPEECH

of

HOWARD GREEN

Member for Vancouver Quadra

and

Secretary of State for External Affairs

on

Canada's Foreign Policy

---

Made in the House of Commons on February 10, 1960

---

*(These reprints were paid for by Howard Green)*

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REFERENCE OF ESTIMATES OF DEPARTMENT TO  
STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Howard C. Green (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved:

That items numbered 75 to 106 inclusive, as listed in the main estimates 1960-1961, relating to the Department of External Affairs, be withdrawn from the committee of supply and referred to the standing committee on external affairs, saving always the powers of the committee of supply in relation to the voting of public moneys.

He said: Mr. Speaker, first may I thank the members of all parties for the very encouraging reception they have given me as I rise to lead off in my first full-dress debate on external affairs. It reminded me of the very fine start they gave me just eight months ago. These acts of kindness mean a great deal and reflect so clearly how much good will there is in this house, even though sometimes one wonders if it has not vanished out through all the doors at once.

The time during which I have been minister of this department has been very interesting. There has been a great deal to learn, and I am afraid I have only begun to scratch the surface as yet. In this connection I should like to commence by expressing appreciation to the officers and staff of the Department of External Affairs. They have been extremely patient with a new minister. I think they must have prepared at least 1,000 memoranda so that he might be up to date on the various questions. The only sad part about it is that there are still several thousand more that will be needed in the months that lie ahead.

I was particularly pleased, as I am sure any member of parliament holding this portfolio would have been, by the conference I attended last October in Paris. There we had 28 ambassadors and high commissioners representing Canada in various European capitals and in the Middle East. It made one very proud of Canada's representation abroad to sit and listen to the discussions of that group for four days. I believe the men and women who have gone into the Department of External Affairs have entered that work in order to make a career of service to Canada rather than for the monetary rewards they might get. It is very important, I think, for those of us who are here in Canada, particularly those who are in the House of Commons, to realize just what a fine contribution these men and women are making.

Today I have escaped from the bonds of the department, in that I am not reading a speech. I am rather speaking from notes, so if a third world war should start tomorrow as a result the department will not be to blame. I am doing this for several

reasons, and one is that I am hoping the debate on external affairs this year will come down out of the clouds; that we will get as many speeches by members from as many different parts of the country as possible, rather than having a series of written speeches, which are all very good but inevitably put the listeners to sleep. I believe they do not mean as much to parliament or to the country as would be the case if we had a wide open, free-swinging debate with members speaking more or less off the cuff.

By the way, this is one reason we have allocated two days instead of one for the debate. There should be an opportunity tomorrow for 25 or 30 speeches, provided they are not too long. However, no one is supposed to follow my example in this regard, because my speech may be for an hour or even more, so I am not practising what I am preaching.

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

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

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

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

For this situation, too, we owe a great deal to those distinguished representatives from

abroad who have come here to man the embassies and the high commissioner's offices. They keep us informed of the views of their respective countries, and they go home at the end of their term, or to another post, friends of Canada. They have played through the years a very important part in spreading good will for Canada throughout the world. I should like to pay that tribute to them today, and to thank the members of the present diplomatic corps who have been of great help to me in these last eight months.

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

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

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

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

May I just outline something of the background. For many years there have been attempts to work out some system of disarmament both in the United Nations and outside. Canada, I think, has participated in every committee or commission on disarmament since these efforts began and has made a splendid contribution. But this work has been discouraging, and to a degree disillusioning. During the summer of 1959 the position was that in the United Nations there was a disarmament commission whose function was supposed to be to work out some method of disarmament. As I understand it, the attempt had been made earlier to have a fairly small committee deal with the subject but it had been unsuccessful, so this United Nations disarmament commission was set up, consisting of every one of the 82 member states. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, how difficult it would be for a commission of that size to get results, and of course there were no results obtained.

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

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

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

The four big nations which had decided to set up the committee so reported to the United Nations in September because, after all, here was the disarmament commission

of the United Nations supposedly dealing with this question of disarmament, and it was essential that there should be some arrangement worked out between the 10-member committee and the large United Nations disarmament commission. The four big powers asked that the United Nations disarmament commission be convened to hear formally of the creation of the new committee of ten. These four powers, moreover, made it clear that the United Nations would be kept informed of progress in the deliberations of the committee, because it was essential to keep the United Nations in the picture. After all, the only way in which a world-wide disarmament plan will be worked out will be under the aegis of the United Nations.

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

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

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

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

The Canadian government realized from the start the vital role Canada could play in these disarmament deliberations, hence the appointment of Lieutenant-General E. L. M. Burns as Canada's representative at these discussions. I do not need to tell anyone in this house of the wonderful record of General Burns in two wars, as deputy minister of veterans affairs, then as chairman of the truce supervision body in Palestine and, finally, as commander of the United Nations emergency force. He is a man respected not only from coast to coast in Canada but by delegates from every member state in the United Nations. We were able to persuade Mr. Hammarskjold, the secretary-general of the United Nations, to release General Burns from his important command in the Middle East because the secretary-general felt—and so did General Burns—that he could make an even greater contribution as a member of this disarmament committee.

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

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Was it in April or May?

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

As I said, Canada insisted from the start that there should be no delay in getting busy on this disarmament question. In Paris last December when we were attending the NATO meetings, the foreign ministers of the five western members of the disarmament committee were called together at the Quai d'Orsay and there we decided to invite the five eastern members to commence the sittings of the disarmament committee on March

15. As hon. members know, that invitation was accepted and the 10-member committee is to start its work on or about March 15, I believe, in Geneva. In addition we set January 18 as the date for the first meeting of representatives of the five western members of this 10-nation committee. These meetings commenced in Washington on January 18 and have been continuing ever since.

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

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

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

There is a series of studies being made under the direction of the five-nation group and the whole situation is really hopeful. We believe that the general objective on this question of disarmament must be to achieve a maximum of disarmament and reduction of military forces which could be verified and controlled and which is compatible with the maintenance of adequate security against aggression. However, no one should underestimate the difficulties that lie ahead nor look for universal panaceas in the near future.

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

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

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

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

The NATO alliance is a great deal stronger than one would believe from the criticism one hears in parts of Canada and even sometimes in this house. I remember that a few days ago the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) accused me of being a hopeless optimist, as if that were a crime now in Canada. Of course, I can understand why



people in opposition like to say these things and indeed I used to say them myself just a few short years ago. In my judgment, however, NATO is an exceedingly strong alliance.

There is in that organization a spirit of comradeship built up over the last ten years which is very strong. These fifteen nations understand each other's viewpoint. There have been friendships made which will last for a lifetime. The leaders of all these countries are on the very best of terms and fundamentally the foundations of NATO go very deep. I do not believe there is any chance of the NATO alliance breaking up. Most of the European members of that alliance have made an outstanding economic recovery. They are in a very strong position; for example, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium. Some, of course, are not in such a good position. Naturally there are problems. We have problems, in getting 15 Progressive Conservatives around the table to agree, and the 15 Liberals would present just as many problems while the eight members of the C.C.F. might present a whole lot more.

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

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

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

One direct result was that when the western summit meeting was held in Paris in December there were consultations in the NATO council before that was held and there were also consultations after. The foreign ministers of the four came together and reported to the NATO council. The report was not treated in a perfunctory way. It had quite a going over at that meeting of the council which followed the meeting of the four.

The same plan is to be followed this year. There is to be a meeting of the foreign ministers of the four western powers, I think in April—I am not sure of the date—but in any event there are to be consultations with the NATO council at each stage.

France, of course, has a special problem in Algeria. Hon. members have read criticisms of that great nation. After the events of the last 10 days or two weeks I am sure the Canadian people will have a far clearer realization of the very difficult problems France has been facing and still faces in Algeria. She has an outstanding foreign minister in Mr. Couve de Murville. He speaks with great logic and great friendliness. He is very well liked in the NATO council. I suggest that Canada must at all times have the deepest understanding for France and for her problems. She, of course, is one of our mother countries, and one feels that when he goes to her shores. I am of Anglo-Saxon descent, and yet when I went to Paris, in fact the minute I stepped off the plane, I felt that I was at home with members of the family. We were treated in just that way on both occasions that I had the privilege of visiting France. I repeat, so far as NATO is concerned, that in my judgment there certainly is no sign of any impending break-up. I hope there will be no more talk in Canada about possible break-up.

I should like to explain in a word or two the position of NATO in relation to European trade problems. This is not my field, of course; it comes under the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Churchill) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fleming). I had thought that NATO would be a forum for settling the difficulties about European trade, but when you remember that six of the NATO countries are in the common market—they are the inner six—and that only four of the European free trade areas known as the outer seven are in NATO, and that there are two from North America, Canada and the United States, and three, Greece, Turkey and Iceland, which are not in the six or the seven; and when you think that Sweden, Switzerland and Austria are not in NATO; when you look at this picture, you realize that NATO is not the place to work out the problems of trade

in Europe. Hence the solution of these problems has been left to other organizations and including the possibility of a new organization being set up. Hon. members know that negotiations are under way at the present time, but the will to help is certainly in NATO. Every one of the NATO countries is very anxious to do whatever it can to solve those difficult trading problems.

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

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

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

Another reason why great value is placed on membership is that the commonwealth is steadily growing and growing in a way that sets an example to all the rest of the world. On October 1 of this year Nigeria is to become a free nation and of its own free will a member of the commonwealth of nations. Nigeria is one of the leading countries in Africa with over 30 million people, the most populous country on that continent, and I believe it has the stability and the organization to make a splendid contribution, not

only in the commonwealth but also in the United Nations and in world affairs generally. This nation is one more that is being launched as an independent nation under the leadership of the United Kingdom and the other members of the commonwealth.

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

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

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

There is one other aspect of commonwealth relations which is very important to us at the present time and that is the plan for commonwealth scholarships. It was in 1953 at a conference in Montreal that arrangements were made to set up a commonwealth scholarship plan and that plan is now about to function. Last summer a commonwealth conference on education was held in England which took further steps toward implementing the scholarship plan. It approved a Canadian proposal for an exchange of high level academic scholarships

between different parts of the commonwealth. It was agreed that a total of 1,000 scholarships should be exchanged between the nations of the commonwealth, and Canada undertook to place 250 students from other parts of the commonwealth in Canadian universities and other educational institutions at a cost of about \$1 million per year.

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

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

**Mr. Chevrier:** May I ask the minister a question? Under the plan how many Canadian students are entitled to scholarships in other commonwealth countries?

**Mr. Green:** I cannot give the hon. member that information at the moment. I will get it before the end of the debate. Eventually there will be 250 coming here.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I want to know how many Canadians are going to other commonwealth countries.

**Mr. Green:** Yes. Lists have been made up and recommendations have already gone forward as to eligible Canadians but I do not remember the actual number.

The fourth subject is Canada-United States relations. One might make a very long speech on this subject but today I merely wish to say that relations with the United States also are excellent. They are on a personal basis between our own Prime Minister and the President of the United States, between the secretary of state and myself and between various other ministers of the two governments. This is true also at the ambassadorial level. Canada is extremely well served in Washington by our ambassador there, Arnold Heeney. He is very

well liked in Washington and I think he is doing a splendid job. Similarly, the United States ambassador in Ottawa, the Hon. Mr. Wigglesworth, is giving splendid representation here. The relationship between the two countries at every level could not be better.

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

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

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

We are having a similar experience with regard to the Passamaquoddy project in the maritimes. The international joint commission has been making studies of that project, and I hope eventually it will be possible for some workable scheme to be devised which will be of benefit to the citizens of both the New England states and our own maritime provinces.

We have the same type of relationship with regard to another body of water in which the hon. member for Laurier (Mr.

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

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

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

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

It is our intention to pay special attention to Latin America. I am hoping it will be possible to get away for a visit to the Argen-

tine in May when they are celebrating 150 years of independence, and also that it will be possible to visit some other Latin American countries, as well as to hold consultations with our eleven ambassadors in Latin America. This is an area in which I believe a good deal more can be done than has been done by Canada in the past.

The next subject is Canada and the Pacific. I realize that many Canadians are not clearly aware of the fact there is such a place as the Pacific ocean. However, for those of us who happen to represent British Columbia ridings the Pacific is a very important area. Today I plan to say a few words about Canada's relationships with the different countries around the rim of the Pacific.

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

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

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

We were also involved in this area because with several other countries we are participating in an aerial survey of the Mekong river. This is the key river through

that part of Asia just as the St. Lawrence is the key river in this part of Canada. We have people out there now taking part in this survey which will be very beneficial to all of the nations in that particular area.

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

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

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

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

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

There is another very good reason which I think should be emphasized in this house. One of the main difficulties in any approach to the problem is the fact that, given the attitude of Peking, recognition on the part of Canada, unless accompanied by explicit

acceptance of Peking's claims to the exclusive right to represent China in the United Nations and to occupy Taiwan—Formosa—would, in all probability, serve to bring about only a worsening of our relations with communist China. Evidence of this is a matter of record. The communist prime minister Mr. Chou En-Lai, at the last session of the national people's congress held in Peking last April, said unequivocally—and here I am quoting the Chinese prime minister:

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

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

Now a word about the Middle East.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, might I ask the minister, before he leaves Asia, whether he can give us an indication of his views with regard to the collective security organizations in that part of the world? I am thinking of SEATO and ANZUS.

**Mr. Green:** Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, Canada is not a member of SEATO and is not directly concerned with what is done in the SEATO organization. We are, of course, in close contact with most of the nations which belong to SEATO. Our dealings with them are as nations rather than with SEATO as an organization. The same thing might be said concerning the ANZUS treaty.

The Middle East continues to be a very sensitive area. Canada has embassies in the United Arab Republic, Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, Iran and I hope before long will have some representation in Iraq. Our relations with all of these countries are good, even though they do not all agree among themselves. We are, of course, at all times doing what we can to help bring about a settlement of these very difficult problems in that area.

We are also involved directly because of Canada's participation in the United Nations emergency force. We had there in that force 945 men as of December 31. That was the second largest of the seven national units in the emergency force.

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

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

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

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

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

One is also struck by the work done by the permanent mission to the United Nations. In effect, this is Canada's embassy at the United Nations, and so much is done there under pressure—resolutions and amendments and difficult problems come up so fast and so frequently—that decisions have to be made in a hurry, various people have to be consulted in a hurry, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me when I say there is very little spare time during a meeting of the general assembly. Throughout the whole period the Canadians had a very busy time and made a worth-while contribution.

We had as our main initiative this year a resolution to provide for more effective collection of information on radiation and fallout, and also a more effective method of distributing such information. We had a great deal of difficulty in getting that resolution through. The vice-chairman of the delegation, my parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), did a wonderful job in carrying out these negotiations. He has become one of the outstanding representatives at the United Nations. With any luck at all he will play a very significant part for Canada in foreign affairs.

These negotiations on this resolution took a long time, in fact they took many weeks. We had to convince the big powers that the resolution should go through, and we had to convince the eastern powers that we were not trying to deceive them. Finally we got ten

co-sponsors—Argentina, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Ireland, Japan, Ghana, Norway, New Zealand and Mexico. None of these were big powers; we got the middle powers and received unanimous support from the general assembly. I hope that resolution will be of considerable help in meeting the problems of radiation.

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

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

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

We have been criticized in some places in Canada for our vote on the resolution on apartheid. Here again was another very difficult question. The previous government, just as the present government, had been against the policy of apartheid. No one in

Canada believes in an apartheid policy. Yet the previous government had seen fit throughout to abstain in so far as paragraphs in resolutions directly condemning South Africa were concerned and in certain cases saw fit to abstain on the whole question. I think in no case did they vote against South Africa.

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

Last fall South Africa was elected one of the vice presidents of the United Nations and her foreign minister Mr. Loeuv made an excellent contribution to the work of the assembly. In addition to this South Africa has had a long record of worth while accomplishments which it would not do any harm for the Canadian people to recall.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



CANADA

---

# House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

---

SPEECH

of

HOWARD GREEN

Member for Vancouver Quadra

and

Secretary of State for External Affairs

on

Canada In Today's World

---

Made in the House of Commons on April 26, 1961

## EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REFERENCE OF ESTIMATES OF DEPARTMENT TO  
STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Howard C. Green (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved:

That items numbered 76 to 110 inclusive, and item numbered 481, as listed in the main estimates 1961-62, relating to the Department of External Affairs, be withdrawn from the committee of supply and referred to the standing committee on external affairs, saving always the powers of the committee of supply in relation to the voting of public moneys.

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

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

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

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

and House of Representatives. A few months ago Canadian members of parliament also attended meetings of the interparliamentary union. There is no good excuse for many members of this house if they fail to participate in this debate on the ground that they know nothing about external affairs. Any who have attended at least one of these meetings to which I have referred should have sufficient knowledge to be able to speak for perhaps ten minutes. The day has long since passed when the members of the Canadian House of Commons should take the attitude that foreign affairs problems are for someone else and not their particular concern.

The department last year, and I take full responsibility, was late in getting out the annual report. Mind you, we get out our report for the calendar year. We do not wait for a year from the end of the previous fiscal year to do so. Today we have available the report of the Department of External Affairs for the calendar year 1960, and I believe it will be of some help to those members who wish to participate in the debate. The members of the department are quite proud of this report. We believe it has a new look, and that it will not be as dry reading as some of the reports of past years have been.

Mr. Nowlan: It is unfortunately printed between red covers.

Mr. Green: I hear a remark made by my colleague the Minister of National Revenue to the effect that the report is printed within covers of a bad colour, but I point out that they are really not red but a sort of salmon pink.

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

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

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

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

Just within the last week there was a serious crisis over the financing of the United Nations effort in the Congo. For a few hours that situation looked very serious; in fact one key resolution failed to carry during the last night of the sitting. If things had rested there the result might have been that the United Nations would have been forced to recall its troops from the Congo. But good judgment prevailed; consideration of the subject was adjourned for an hour or so and delegates went out into the lounge. Perhaps they went into the bar, I do not know; I would not be there, but perhaps some were. In any event, the resolution was voted on again and carried.

**Mr. Argue:** Something helped.

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

Another feature of the world situation today is the large number of new nations emerging on the scene. You know, I think it is a good thing for Canadians to see some of the bright sides of the world picture and not be concentrating only on the scare headlines. Today we have self government spreading in the

world at a rate which was never even imagined a few years ago. I was looking at a map of Africa this morning and counting up the sovereign states in that key continent. I think the number is 28. I may be out one or two because the maps are not always kept up to date, but a new nation is emerging at midnight tonight, namely Sierra Leone. It will not be very long until there are other new nations taking their place in the world from that continent of Africa.

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

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

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

Another dark spot in the world picture is that at the present time, the age in which we live, there is overwhelming destructive power. When you recall that the Soviet can hurl a missile with an atomic warhead 7,000 or 8,000 miles and land that missile within a mile of the target, and when you recall at the same time that there are now at sea Polaris submarines of the United States, each with many times the destructive power contained in all the bombs dropped in the second world war—when you realize these facts you understand that mankind today is in a position to destroy our whole civilization. Here again is another fact which Canadians in particular would do well not to forget, because we just happen to lie between the two great nuclear powers of the world, each of which has the capacity to destroy the other in a matter of hours; it does not need a very fertile imagination for a Canadian to realize

what would happen to his country if there should be a catastrophe of that kind.

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

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

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

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

This is a day when Canada in world affairs can urge cool-headed action. It is so easy to become excited about some of these questions and start condemning some other nation, start saying things that will hurt the people of another nation, saying things which may have a far-reaching effect that is not for the good of Canada or of mankind. I suggest that we must always urge cool-headed action in dealing with world problems. We have a far wider influence in the world than most Canadians realize. I do not take any credit for that myself or on behalf of the government of which I am a member. I do not say that we are doing more than

previous governments did but Canada has a very wide influence in world affairs.

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

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

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

From the start Canada has participated in disarmament negotiations commencing as far back as 1946 or 1947. Our most recent efforts in the negotiating field, were as a member of the ten-nation disarmament committee which was set up by the foreign ministers of

the United Kingdom, the United States, France and the Soviet union at Geneva in the summer of 1959.

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

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

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

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

Eventually, the United States and the Soviet union, with a good deal of assistance and a good deal of prompting from other nations—I am not being immodest when I say Canada took a prominent part in this prompting and in these negotiations—decided that they would get together and try to arrange for the resumption of disarmament negotiations at about the end of July of this

year. After all, these two nations are the key nations in any disarmament negotiations. They brought in a joint resolution before the general assembly which was passed unanimously. They were unable to agree on the composition of the negotiating group. One side had suggested that there should be an impartial chairman and vice chairman. The other side wanted five uncommitted countries added to the five eastern and the five western countries. Agreement was not finally reached, but I believe that in these intervening weeks that question can be worked out.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Another field to which Canadian efforts have been directed is in the United Nations itself. Here, Mr. Speaker, may I say a word of praise for my parliamentary secretary, for the members of parliament, Senator Blois and other Canadians who have represented Canada during this last session. At the United Nations the work is hard. I would never admit that fact to the delegation when I am in New York but, now that they are all safely home, I must admit that they work very much harder there than we do here in Ottawa. The hours are long. Constantly coming up for consideration are resolutions and amendments. There are other delegations to canvass and there are receptions to attend, and they are also quite a hazard. This is a full-time job for anybody who represents Canada at the United Nations, not only as a delegate but also as an observer. There our people

have worked as a team. There are no differences between the parties. We are all there as a Canadian team. This is the main reason why the Canadian delegation has been so successful during this last session.

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

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

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

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

As you know, Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of the session last September he has been under terrific attacks, and very unfair attacks they have been. Sometimes I wonder why any human being would feel obliged to take all the abuse that has been handed out to Mr. Hammarskjöld in these last six or seven months. However, he is a great world statesman who is there doing a job for humanity.

I suppose the realization of this fact has been what has enabled him to withstand these attacks and to carry on in such a calm and efficient manner. Canada has felt that there should be no qualifications to our support for the secretary general while he was under attacks of this kind.

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

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

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

In addition, the Canadian delegation tabled a draft resolution in the fifth committee which called for a thorough discussion at the sixteenth session, that is, the next one, of the administrative and budgetary procedures of the organization with a view to their improvement and to meeting the peace-keeping costs of the United Nations. Our draft resolution also provided for the appointment of a working group to study these procedures with particular reference to the establishment of a peace and security fund and a peace and security scale of assessments. It was put forward when it became evident that the sentiment at the resumed session was in favour of continuing to deal with the costs of the Congo operation on an ad hoc basis. Our object was to ensure that this approach

would not be continued indefinitely and that serious consideration would be given to more permanent solutions to the organization's financial difficulties at the sixteenth session. We believe these expenses should be considered as part of the regular United Nations budget.

In committee this Canadian resolution was amended to take cut the main feature. Our delegation found itself obliged to vote against its own resolution as altered by these unacceptable amendments. However, when the resolution came before the plenary body the objectionable amendments failed to get the two-thirds vote required, so they went out and our own resolution as it had been originally drawn, with minor changes, got the two-thirds vote necessary. Thus we finally succeeded in getting our way on this particular question.

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

I turn now to another field to which Canadian efforts have been directed. I have mentioned the commonwealth. I have already said something about the prime ministers' conference and about the effects of decisions made there on our daily contacts with Asian

and African nations. The addition of new members to this community continues. Sierra Leone will become a full-fledged member tomorrow and Tanganyika is to get its independence on December 28 of this year. Next year it is hoped the West Indies Federation will join the commonwealth family, and so the story unfolds. Various other countries will be coming into the commonwealth in the years that lie ahead.

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

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

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

In this connection there has been a very interesting development in that the province of Manitoba has decided to share in this work. In May of last year, Premier Roblin expressed a desire to co-operate with the federal government in providing teachers for under-developed commonwealth countries. We

welcomed his offer, and a project in Ceylon was suggested as a pilot scheme. Three instructors are required for an institute of technology in Ceylon and an arrangement has now been worked out with the province of Manitoba under which it will recruit three teachers and pay their regular salaries amounting to \$30,000 and the federal government will provide transportation, overseas bonuses and living allowances, costing from \$20,000 to \$25,000 per year. This federal government share will be part of our regular Colombo plan technical assistance program. We believe this is a very helpful development and we will be interested in entering into similar schemes with any of the other provincial governments.

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With regard to NATO, I realize that my hon. friend from Assiniboia and his fellow members of the C.C.F. party are of the opinion that Canada should withdraw from this alliance. As he knows, the government does not agree with that suggestion. We feel it would be a great mistake for Canada to take a step of that kind. I merely point out to him that we have very worth-while support in the Canadian Labour Congress. I am just wondering how he is going to square his policy with the policy of the Canadian Labour Congress and of the so-called New party when it gets formed.

**Mr. Herridge:** You will be surprised.

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

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

The brief goes on:

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

I would be very interested to hear the hon. member for Assiniboia or the hon. member for Kootenay West square these declarations of the Canadian Labour Congress with the statements of policy which have been made on behalf of the C.C.F. party on the question of whether or not Canada should give up her membership in the NATO organization.

**Mr. Argue:** I am not tied to the C.L.C., neither is this party.

**Mr. Herridge:** The British Columbia trade unions voted against our remaining in NATO.

**Mr. Green:** I really did not raise this subject to start an argument, but I see it got under somebody's skin.

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

As hon. members know, we were successful in negotiating a treaty with the United States concerning the Columbia river. This was done after a great deal of time and effort had been expended. Now, of course, we are in a position where questions are being raised by the province of British Columbia which, of necessity, is involved in this whole transaction. This is not the place to go into that in any great detail; I merely point out these

facts, Mr. Speaker. A deputy minister of the government of British Columbia sat in as one of the four Canadian negotiators. There was a joint ministerial committee consisting of ministers of the federal government and of the provincial government of British Columbia, engineers and lawyers and all types of officials who were required for work of this kind. Every word of the treaty was gone over with a magnifying glass and everybody was agreed. Before the treaty was signed British Columbia was satisfied that it was a good treaty. There was no question of any doubts.

Since the signing of the treaty many different road blocks have been thrown in the way. When I was last at the coast two or three weeks ago I even heard that the federal government was now on the spot; that it must go ahead and do this because we signed a treaty. Well, we are under no obligation until the treaty is passed in parliament. Until it is duly ratified we are under no obligation to go further, and the people who will suffer if this great co-operative scheme does not go through will not be the federal government. The people who will pay the piper will be those citizens of British Columbia who will not get the cheap power they would have got under the scheme or the developments that would have taken place if the installations were constructed. This could be the greatest work-producing project that there has ever been in western Canada, and all I wish to do is to make it perfectly clear that the fault for the failure of the project to materialize will not rest here at Ottawa but will be with our brethren in the provincial government in Victoria.

I should like to say a word about Latin America. As hon. members know, we have been very anxious to build up our relationship with the 20 republics of Latin America and we have met with considerable success in this regard. We now have diplomatic relations with all but two of the Latin American countries. Of course, in some cases there is double accreditation. For example, we are establishing a new embassy in Costa Rica and the ambassador to that country will also represent Canada in Nicaragua, Honduras and Panama. As I have said, we have diplomatic relations with all but two of the Latin American countries and in one of those two we have a trade mission.

There have been serious problems in connection with Cuba. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Canada has continued to maintain normal diplomatic and commercial relations with Cuba through these recent troubled months. In doing so, Canada has acted in a manner consistent with common international practice. No country except the United States has placed a comprehensive ban on trade with

Cuba and Canada has not had the same grounds as the United States for taking such action.

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

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

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

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

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Before the Secretary of State for External Affairs leaves this portion of his address, may I ask him whether he has anything to say about the new affirmation of the Monroe doctrine in view of the recent declaration by President Kennedy in this context?

**Mr. Green:** I thought the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue) was asking me a question about that statement yesterday and I gave an answer to the effect that I was quite sure that the statement made by President Kennedy was not intended to apply to Canada. The relationship between Canada and the United States is covered by our obligations under NATO and in my opinion

there is no question of this particular statement being made applicable to Canada.

I should like also to say a word about Chile. About a year ago, when the brave people of that country were suffering so terribly as a result of earthquakes, we had the opportunity to give them some help by supplying foodstuffs and air transportation, and in other ways. I think that these actions on our part have resulted in the building up of a very fine relationship between our two countries. Canada, of course, was doing only what any humane country would do. We were delighted to be able to help them. But they have shown great gratitude. Recently our ambassador to Chile had the opportunity to travel throughout the stricken area of southern Chile and there he was shown records of the distribution of Canadian flour to hundreds of needy persons. He found the most kindly feeling toward our country.

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

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

I do suggest to hon. members that they give this whole question deep thought, and that they discuss it with their constituents. It

would be a big step in Canadian foreign policy if we were to join this western hemisphere organization. I think the decision should be taken only when it is fairly clear that the majority of the Canadian people are in favour of this being done.

The final field of activity toward which we are directing our attention is in the Pacific. Yesterday I announced that a call for a cease fire had been issued by the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. as co-chairmen of the Geneva conference of 1954. They had invited India, as chairman of the truce supervisory commission, to call the commission together in New Delhi. In addition, they called for a conference of 14 nations to be held in Geneva on May 12. If hon. members read these letters, they will observe that the first job of the commission, which is Canada's main concern, will be to discuss the question of the tasks and functions which should be allotted to the commission if there is a cease fire in Laos.

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

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

Yesterday the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) made some noises which rather impressed me as indicating that he was going to have something to say about the commission in Laos having been deactivated in 1958. At that time the request was made by Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, who is the key man in the picture today. He requested that the commission get out of Laos. The majority of the members, India and Canada, voted accordingly and the commission did get out of that country. The belief at the time was, of course, that a stable government had

been established and that there would be no further need for that commission. I was very pleased to find that both the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) and the hon. member for Essex East had approved of that course. I have the extract from *Hansard* right here to prove it if they dare to attack me on the subject this afternoon.

**Mr. Pearson:** What is this, intimidation?

**Mr. Green:** Perhaps this is a species of intimidation, but it is very helpful in the circumstances. This is an issue on which I am sure all members of the house are united, and I am hoping that Canada can make a worth-while contribution.

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

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

May I say, too, that the world does not stand still. Changes keep occurring everywhere, and certainly the question of red China is one of the most interesting and important questions now under consideration by the external affairs department. Everyone knows the policy we have adopted, and if and when there is a change in that policy it will be announced in the ordinary manner. One fact Canadians should remember is that there are a great many people living on Formosa who are native Formosans. No one is anxious to have them turned over to red

China. I think this would be a disastrous move to make, yet red China is not interested in recognition or entry into the United Nations unless her right to take over Formosa is accepted. This, of course, has been one of the very big obstacles in the way of taking steps to change the present situation. Eventually, the wishes of the people of Formosa will have to be an important factor. In considering this whole question I suggest that it would be wise for Canadians not to forget the important factor of Formosa in the whole picture.

I think I have never made such a long speech, Mr. Speaker, in my parliamentary career and I hope never to do it again. However, in conclusion may I say this. As hon. members know and as they will have found from this sketchy review of problems arising in all parts of the world, Canada is involved everywhere. In practically every part of the world Canada is involved in one way or another, to an extent and in such a manner that she can do something about every one of these problems. I suggest that

this is a great challenge to the Canadian people. Whether we accept that challenge, whether we play our full part in world affairs—the part which is there to be played by Canada—will, of course, depend on the will of the Canadian people to participate, the idealism and optimism of the Canadian people and the sacrifices they are prepared to make.

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

CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

SPEECH

of

HOWARD GREEN

Member for Vancouver Quadra

and

Secretary of State for External Affairs

on

**The Crisis Arising Over Nuclear Tests and Berlin**

(Opening Discussion of the Estimates of the Department  
of External Affairs)

---

Made in the House of Commons on Sept. 7, 1961

*(These reprints were paid for by Howard Green)*

Hon. Howard C. Green (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Chairman, today we meet in the Canadian House of Commons at a time of deep crisis. As hon. members know, for some weeks tension has been increasing steadily over Berlin, and within the last week the premier of the Soviet union has announced a resumption of nuclear tests. In addition to that, he has stated that his country can develop a nuclear bomb with the power of 100 million tons of t.n.t., and that such a bomb could then be hurled by rocket to any target in the world.

It was very interesting to read the first reports of this shocking statement. No doubt hon. members have seen them. I refer in particular to one which is contained in the *Ottawa Journal* of September 2. It is a dispatch from Moscow reporting an interview Premier Khrushchev held with two members of the British Labour party. To them he is reported as having declared that he had decided to resume the testing of nuclear weapons in order to shock the western powers into negotiations on Germany and disarmament. In amplifying that statement he apparently said that by taking a tough line he hoped to make the Atlantic alliance agree to merging the discussions at Geneva on a nuclear test ban treaty with negotiations for general and complete disarmament.

There is no doubt that world opinion has been profoundly shocked by the statement and also by the actions which followed so quickly on the heels of the statement. I refer to the conducting of four nuclear tests in the atmosphere, where of course the radiation and fall-out are of the maximum degree. The United States has now decided that in the face of these actions by the Soviet union it must undertake nuclear tests, although they are not of the same type and are reported as being such that they do not produce fall-out. They will be tests in the laboratory and tests underground.

In the meantime a very statesmanlike step was taken by President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan of the United Kingdom when they appealed to the Soviet premier on September 3 in the following words:

The President of the United States of America and Prime Minister of the United Kingdom propose to Chairman Khrushchev that their three governments agree, effective immediately, not to conduct nuclear tests which take place in the atmosphere and produce radioactive fall-out. Their aim in this proposal is to protect mankind from the increasing hazards from atmospheric pollution and to contribute to the reduction of international tensions.

They urge Chairman Khrushchev to cable his immediate acceptance of this offer and his cessation of further atmospheric tests.

They further urge that their representatives at Geneva meet not later than September 9 to record this agreement and report it to the United Nations.

They sincerely hope that the U.S.S.R. will accept this offer, which remains open for the period indicated.

They point out that with regard to atmospheric testing the United States and the United Kingdom are prepared to rely upon existing means of detection, which they believe to be adequate, and are not suggesting additional controls. But they reaffirm their serious desire to conclude a nuclear test ban treaty applicable to other forms of testing as well, and regret that the U.S.S.R. has blocked such an agreement.

As yet there has been no reply to that appeal, and I am sure I speak for all members of the house when I say that we still hope Premier Khrushchev will agree to the proposal which has been made.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the great tragedy of 1961 has been that Soviet leaders have not understood or have ignored the fact that President Kennedy and his top advisers have, from the start of their administration, genuinely desired to bring about a reduction in world tension. We know that for a fact because of our contacts with these United States leaders.

For Canadians it is so important at this time not to add fuel to the flames with the world hovering on the brink of a nuclear war. We must do our utmost to help to reduce tension, and the government has been doing that during the recent very serious weeks. We must not lose our heads but must show Canadian common sense. Common sense is one of the finest qualities in the Canadian character, and now is the time to remember this and to show that common sense in our talk and in our actions.

In addition, we must continue our idealistic approach to world affairs. Because the situation is serious is no excuse for Canadians to abandon the idealistic approach they have had down through their history. These attributes have been shown by Canadians for a long time. Such is our record, and this is what is expected of us now by all nations, including the nations in the communist camp. A few weeks ago in Geneva I had a brief talk with Mr. Gromyko, the foreign minister of the Soviet union. There was, of course, a certain amount of banter but finally he said "I know that Canada stands for peace". That is our reputation in world affairs, and it is a very good reputation to have.

Today I propose to deal with certain material factors in the present world situation. Ordinarily I would go on to cover various other subjects which probably are of equal importance, but I plan today to deal with the facts relative to the present serious situation and later during the discussion of the estimates I shall try to deal with these other subjects.

First of all let me deal with nuclear tests. The tremendous world interest in nuclear tests is because people are rightly afraid of the

effects of radiation and fall-out. They remember what happened at Hiroshima and they know that the damage and destruction would be infinitely greater in a nuclear holocaust with the present hydrogen bombs. They are worried about the effect not only on themselves but on the generations to come.

For this reason, and also in the hope that an agreement to ban nuclear tests would be a long step toward a general disarmament agreement, the three nuclear powers, the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet union, decided nearly three years ago to try to work out a nuclear test ban agreement. France did not participate in that conference and, I think unfortunately, in the intervening period set off certain nuclear blasts, although the other three countries until last week maintained a moratorium on any further testing.

This conference held its 339th meeting this week and it meets again on Saturday, September 9, in Geneva. Up to the end of last year there had been great progress made in these negotiations. Scientists of the three countries had met and reported on various ways of checking tests, and the delegates had agreed to many paragraphs of a test ban treaty. Incidentally, at the United Nations last year there were two resolutions passed dealing with the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. One of them contained this operative paragraph:

Urges the states concerned in these negotiations—

The reference is to the negotiations at Geneva.

—to continue their present voluntary suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons.

That resolution was sponsored by Austria, India and Sweden and was adopted by a vote of 89 in favour, including Canada, none against and four abstentions. Another resolution, sponsored by India and 25 other countries, contained the following operative paragraph:

Urges the states concerned in the Geneva negotiations to continue their present voluntary suspension of the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, and requests other states to refrain from undertaking such tests.

That resolution was adopted by a vote of 83 in favour, including Canada, none opposed and 11 abstentions.

This year for some reason or other—I really do not understand why—the delegate of the Soviet union to the conference in Geneva became intransigent. It was really impossible to make any further progress.

The United States and Great Britain submitted revised proposals meeting many of the objections which had been taken by the Soviet delegate, but these were not even

adequately discussed by the Soviet representative. He was insistent on the troika principle for controlling the test ban under which principle there would be one representative of the U.S.S.R., one representative of the western side and one neutral, and was also insistent that the whole question of nuclear tests should be taken out of the conference and put into a general conference on disarmament. However, the conference still goes on. The western side have refused to take steps to break it off, and I believe have acted very wisely in so doing.

At the United Nations in 1959 Canada sponsored a resolution calling for more adequate reporting on radiation and for additional steps to warn the people of the world about the effects of radiation as well as further action along that line. The resolution was co-sponsored by ten other nations and was finally adopted by unanimous vote on November 21, 1959. We offered to conduct in Canada tests of samples of air, soil, water, food and bone collected in nations which did not have the scientific facilities for carrying out such tests. In the intervening period arrangements have been made with Burma, Malaya, Ghana and Pakistan for Canada to carry out such tests. We have had to build up staff in Canada to do this work. We have extended our facilities and everything has now been prepared with this end in view.

As a result of the resolution, increased attention has been given to radiation problems internationally. For example, 13 other states have offered their facilities in the same way Canada did. These include the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, France, Norway, Belgium, Sweden, Denmark, Japan, Israel, the Soviet union, Argentina and Italy in addition to the international atomic energy agency and the world health organization. There has been a marked increase in the number of member countries supplying the United Nations with data on fall-out levels. I think we can be proud of the results that have followed from the initiative taken in 1959.

In addition we have made it perfectly clear for a long time that the Canadian government is opposed to nuclear tests of any kind. That was done in order that there would be no misunderstanding and that every country would know exactly where we stood. We see no reason for Canada to change that policy.

In the present situation, with the Soviet union conducting these tests in the way it has been, there can be no doubt that the responsibility for this backward step must be placed at their door. The United States has said that it now proposes to carry out tests. I think in fairness every hon. member of the committee



would agree with me that the United States could not sit by indefinitely while the Russians were proceeding with their tests; but naturally we regret that it has been deemed necessary for the United States to announce the resumption of tests at this time. Canada on this problem will endeavour to further an agreement banning tests. That may not be an objective easily reached, but this is the target at which we will be aiming.

Having dealt with nuclear testing, I turn now to the situation in Berlin and Germany. I am sure all hon. members of the committee and the Canadian people generally will join with me in supporting the clear cut, analytical and statesmanlike speech made by the Prime Minister of Canada in Winnipeg on September 1. I see by the press that the Leader of the Opposition has said he agrees with the attitude adopted in that speech by our Prime Minister. It would be tantamount to gilding the lily for me to attempt today to go over the same ground which was covered by the Prime Minister on that occasion. I merely point out that for many months there have been warnings by the Soviet union that there would be a peace treaty signed with East Germany and there have been various threats, not all confined to one side, incidentally.

Threats do not obtain very good results. Perhaps this is one of the ways in which the Leaders of the Soviet union misunderstand the people on the western side. The Soviet cannot obtain results by threatening the Canadians, the British, the people of the United States or other western nations. We have been threatened before, and have met those threats with the proper action. That is the reason we are in active business in the world today. We do not back down in the face of threats.

There is an election campaign under way in West Germany which tends to add to the confusion with respect to the situation in Berlin. Voting takes place on September 17, ten days from now. The leader of the main opposition party is the mayor of West Berlin. I suppose knowing elections as we do, we might have expected that there would be a great many statements made which might not have been made the day after the election.

I also draw attention to the flood of refugees from East Germany into West Germany. This is a very significant factor. It shows more clearly than a million words could do what the people in East Germany think of the regime in that country. Of course it has had a very damaging effect on the image of communism which is being portrayed to other nations of the world.

Let me say a word also about President Kennedy's stand on Berlin. A few weeks ago

he made a speech, which probably all hon. members heard, in which he set out the position on which the western world would stand. I think it was wise to do that in order that there could be no misunderstandings, no miscalculations, as are supposed to have happened in the case of both the first and second world wars. He went further and said that the United States was willing and anxious to enter into negotiations about this whole question, and that too was very wise. Our own Prime Minister has said the same thing and has stressed the need for negotiations. At one stage or another all parties have said that there must be negotiations in an attempt to iron out this difficult problem.

Our policy today on Berlin and Germany is that an attempt must be made to settle it around the table. There are many channels and methods for exploring with the Soviet union possible grounds of agreement. Partly to this end the foreign ministers of the three major western powers and of West Germany will be meeting in Washington on September 14, one week from today, to discuss further the steps which may be taken to reach a satisfactory agreement with the Soviet union. Similarly, consultations will continue in the North Atlantic council—and there have been many consultations in that council during the last few weeks—about peaceful solutions to this dangerous problem in accordance with the United Nations charter.

Through these discussions with our allies and in negotiations with the Soviet union it is hoped that it will be possible to reach an honourable accommodation with the Soviet. Canada certainly will do everything in her power to help bring about negotiations, and will do her part to see that they are brought to a successful conclusion.

The third material factor with which I wish to deal briefly is the position of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Today I would think there are not very many Canadians who believe that NATO is superfluous, and that it does not have a very important part to play in the world situation. So often it is forgotten that this is a defensive alliance. It was not set up for purposes of aggression. We know that the countries of that alliance do not believe in aggression. It was set up to defend western Europe and the north Atlantic area. It is so important that that organization be kept strong.

**The Deputy Chairman:** May I interrupt the minister. Under the rules, his time has expired. Would the committee give unanimous consent for the minister to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Green:** Mr. Chairman, through you may I thank the members of the committee for giving me this extension.

In recent months discussions in the NATO council have greatly improved, and I am glad to be able to announce that on Monday next we shall have in Canada Mr. Dirk U. Stikker, the distinguished secretary general of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He will be here for a two day conference with Canadian ministers, and this will give us an opportunity to review the whole NATO situation. Mr. Stikker took on this difficult post just a few months ago; he has been making a great success of that work, and we shall welcome him very warmly when he pays his first visit to Canada.

I think Canada must state once again that she believes in the equality of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. There is always the danger of the bigger nations trying to set up a sort of executive or control body. A few months ago there was concern over a possible three nation executive, a three nation triumvirate directing NATO. Now, with the Berlin crisis, West Germany has been taking part in the various discussions on Berlin with the United States, the United Kingdom and France. I think we must take care to see that there is not a four power group assuming executive powers in the organization.

At the last meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty foreign ministers we were very pleased to find that there was practically unanimous opinion that there was no incompatibility in the member nations of NATO taking independent stands in the United Nations, particularly on peace keeping activities of the United Nations and on appeals to world opinion. Canada has never believed that membership in NATO should restrict her activities in the United Nations.

A fourth material factor today is the question of disarmament. As hon. members know, Canada was a member of the ten nation disarmament committee which was torpedoed by the five communist members in June of last year. Two months later, with the United States, we were able to bring the question before the disarmament commission of the United Nations and to obtain a unanimous resolution there that negotiations should be resumed. Subsequently we brought in a resolution at the United Nations general assembly last fall which was designed to help get negotiations under way again. That resolution was co-sponsored by 18 other nations.

During their meeting in London this spring the prime ministers of the commonwealth issued a very significant statement on the question of disarmament. This was particularly helpful because of the membership of the commonwealth. The prime ministers came from practically every continent and they had varying opinions. They did not agree

on all things. But on this statement on disarmament they were unanimous and issued a communique in respect thereof. I think in the days ahead as work proceeds on disarmament this commonwealth resolution will be of great importance.

At the session of the United Nations which ran over into the spring of 1961, it was finally agreed that the problem of disarmament and all pending proposals relating to it, which included the Canadian resolution, would be stood over until the session of the general assembly in the fall of this year. In addition the United States and the Soviet union agreed that they would sit down and try to work out a negotiating group, as well as general principles for negotiations, on the question of disarmament.

Since the spring there have been discussions between the representatives of these two great powers. Canada has throughout warmly approved this attempt to reach agreement on a suitable forum for resuming disarmament negotiations and a satisfactory set of directives to guide the negotiators. We have been kept closely in touch with all that has gone on at each of the meetings, and here again the United States has made a real attempt to devise a satisfactory basis. It has been flexible in its approach during these two-nation discussions.

The talks, of course, have been confidential and it is not possible to reveal the substance of the matters discussed. While they have not achieved their goal, the differences between the two sides have been clarified. Yesterday the United States and the Soviet union, were meeting in New York on this question of disarmament.

The last few days, Mr. Chairman, have seen barely concealed threats which, as I have said, we must meet squarely. This situation, however, does not mean that we should downgrade our efforts to further the cause of disarmament. On the contrary far-reaching measures on disarmament are now more vital than ever if we are to avoid even sharper east-west conflicts in a world which daily sees the development of more frightening weapons. We must recognize clearly that until a realistic basis for negotiation is established, we will continue to run the most dangerous risk of all, the risk of nuclear war.

During the past months Canada has taken an active part in the drafting of a new western disarmament plan. Throughout this period the United States and the other countries which represented the west on the ten-nation committee have been in close consultation. The other members of the western alliance who were not on the committee have also had an opportunity to express their views on the new plan. The contents of this plan cannot be revealed at this time, but it does constitute a

significant improvement over previous western proposals. We have been represented during these discussions by Lieutenant-General E. L. M. Burns who has played a very large part in the field of disarmament for a long time and who, I suggest, has no peer anywhere in the world in this particular field.

Many of our suggestions have been accepted in the working out of this new plan. A great deal of effort has been put into trying to meet the desires expressed at the commonwealth prime ministers conference to ensure the maximum amount of disarmament in the shortest possible time. Full consideration has already been given to the reasonable Soviet proposals.

This new western plan will be put forward for negotiation, and not on a "take it or leave it" basis. The western powers are willing to take into account any further suggestions the Soviet union may have, provided they reflect a genuine willingness to arrive at a realistic and properly safeguarded disarmament program.

At the session of the general assembly which opens on September 19, Canada will work for the endorsement of this new western plan by the widest possible number of states and we will do our best to ensure that any negotiating body which may be agreed upon will have close relationship with the United Nations. We believe that the most important objective in the field of disarmament is to get negotiations started again just as quickly as possible.

Then, I should like to say a few words about the unaligned nations conference which met over the week end in Belgrade. There you had 25 neutral nations, some of whom were not very friendly towards the west if one can judge by their actions in recent years. The representatives of these nations came from various continents to try to work out some plan to help reduce tension in the world. I grant that a good deal of time was spent in attacking the question of colonialism and issues which affected particular nations. I believe that the press reports of the meetings of these unaligned countries have not done justice to the significance of their reaction to the questions of Berlin and the resumption of nuclear testing. The dispatch which came out during that conference after the Soviet announcement that nuclear tests would be resumed is contained in one of our newspapers under this heading: "Neutrals Rap A Testing; Urge Berlin Talks."

It is very important that that should have been the reaction in Belgrade. I think, for example, that the statements made by Prime Minister Nehru have been and will be very helpful in bringing about some solution of these terrible problems. I

learned the hard way at the United Nations, when dealing with our resolution on disarmament last year, that there are a good many countries which will not stand up and be counted for fear of antagonizing the United States. There are a great many others who will not stand up and be counted for fear of antagonizing the Soviet union. As I say, these neutral countries do not like to take a stand if it can possibly be avoided, yet we have witnessed the sharp reaction of these 25 neutral nations to the resumption of testing by the Soviet union and also to the question of Berlin.

Another important factor in the present situation is the attitude of the new nations. We are living in an era in which there has been a greater expansion of freedom, a greater launching of new nations, than at any other time in history. From Asia and in Africa the young leaders of these new nations are coming over to New York, to the United Nations, and are taking their part in the deliberations. They are vitally interested in building up their own countries. They have no use whatever for the cold war because they are so busy and have so many problems of their own. They do not want to be bothered with the cold war. They know that if the cold war ever gets hot they will get little economic assistance from either the western world or the communist world. These new nations have an important part to play in the world today. I believe that their opinion as expressed in the United Nations in the next few weeks may have a good deal to do in bringing about a reduction of tension and in putting pressure behind the great powers for a settlement of these problems.

The new nations are all extremely sensitive on the question of colonialism. They have an emotional reaction when that question is under debate and this reaction is understandable. We would have had the same reaction perhaps a hundred years ago. The Soviet never loses an opportunity to try to play upon and to take advantage of that reaction. Last year they introduced a resolution attacking the so-called colonial powers, demanding that all colonies be freed before the end of 1961, and insisting on target dates being set for each country. I do not doubt that they will be back at that same performance in the next session of the general assembly.

However, this is one field in which the commonwealth does not need to take any advice or any criticism from the Soviet union. Last year our own Prime Minister spiked that attack in the United Nations by his great speech in the opening days of the session when he pointed out the situation in such countries as Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia. I may say that one is amazed at the nerve of the Soviet representatives in coming to New York and

talking about colonialism and the sins of the colonial powers. I marvel that they have the gall to take that position. However, certainly in this particular field the commonwealth in our own time in recent years—and I am thinking of 1961 and 1962—has been and is showing perhaps the greatest statesmanship that has ever been shown by a great power in this world. Tanganyika is being launched on December 9, and the West Indies Federation next year. Shortly after that probably Uganda and Kenya will be launched. These latter two may come in with Tanganyika to form a federation in eastern Africa. Other colonies under the British flag are to get independent government in the same way at the earliest possible date and just as quickly as trained leaders can be provided for those countries. We may have some extremely interesting discussions on this question of colonialism during the coming session of the United Nations.

Finally, may I say this. The special material factor in the world today is the United Nations and in particular the session which commences later this month. I have no doubt that nuclear tests and the question of Berlin will be discussed during that session as well as many other issues with which I shall deal later on in this debate on the estimates. We must never forget that the United Nations is the best place we have in which to focus world opinion. The big question in my mind is this. Have the Soviet union gone so far that they are now prepared to ignore world opinion? Hitherto they have been playing up to other nations and trying to get support from other nations all over the world just as the United States has been doing. In their statement announcing that they were going to have nuclear tests, they actually said this was a great movement to help peace and they appealed to the uncommitted nations on that basis. How they could justify that argument I do not know either. However, if they have decided to ignore world opinion, we are in for extremely serious trouble; there can be no mistake about that fact. Let us hope that the leaders of that great country will be sensitive to world opinion, and that they will not simply ignore it and decide to go their own way seeking world domination.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is more than ever vital that Canada support the United Nations. This is no time for belittling that world organization. Some people say, "Oh, look at the mess it has made in the Congo". May I say this. Without the United Nations in the Congo there would have been blood feuds there and tribal wars, with thousands and thousands of people slaughtered during

the whole of last year. This situation probably would have spread to adjoining areas. The situation would have been disastrous and might well have brought on a world war. The United Nations moved in without any precedent to follow, without trained personnel to do the job. They moved in or recruited a United Nations force and today there is a government in the Congo. They are having many troubles. They do not function as efficiently as does the Canadian government, I admit. Of course, it would be difficult for any other government to do that. However, they have a government and I believe that the problems are going to be worked out as a result of the leadership and the action of the United Nations. I am sure we are all proud that Canada has played such a significant part in the Congo and that we are one of the three European and North Atlantic countries serving on the Congo committee.

The United Nations today is the main hope of mankind. If it grows and succeeds, there will be world order. If it fails, there will be world destruction. That is the choice. I would hope that all Canadians will rally behind the United Nations at this time as they have never done before, although our people have always been supporters of that body.

In conclusion, I repeat what I said at the beginning. This House of Commons is meeting in a time of deep crisis. In times such as these a nation shows its calibre. Canada has done so on more than one occasion. We remember Canada in the first war. We remember Canada in the second war, the June day 21 years ago, when France was falling and when our then minister of defence was killed in a terrible air crash. It looked as though the United Kingdom would be invaded. I do not believe that in my lifetime there has ever been a darker day than that particular Monday. But no Canadian member of parliament had a thought in his head that there was going to be any surrender, that we were not going to face that situation and were going to win through. I know that Canada will show her calibre and her mettle in these present trying times.

The road ahead will be hard. Perhaps we have had enough of the soft life anyway. But the road ahead is certainly going to be hard and there will be tension for a long, long time. We might just as well face that fact. From Canadians courage will be required, both physical and moral, and sacrifice; and I believe above all, a return to our deep abiding fundamental faiths. If we face this challenge we will win through and the result may very well be to make our nation one of the leading nations of the world.