

CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The object of any Canadian Minister of External Affairs is to protect the security of the country through diplomatic endeavors. While most departments of government may pursue purely partisan policies the Foreign Affairs Department is bound, no matter who the particular minister may be, to follow a policy which will obtain the widest possible support amongst our diverse electorate; otherwise, he and his colleagues would not long remain in office. This means that the conduct of our foreign policy is largely above the controversial level of partisan politics; in Canada, there is no violent disagreement among the major political parties about what our foreign policy should be. The main criticism of the policy of Messrs. King, St. Laurent and Pearson comes from the Labour Progressive Party. However, as that party is only a subversive colonizing agent of Russia its criticism of the Government's foreign policy does not receive much support either in Parliament or in the country. As far as the Conservative Party is concerned, we find that there is no basic difference of opinion between Mr. Drew and Mr. Pearson. Even a Secretary of State for External Affairs appointed by Mr. Coldwell would be unable to break with History and Geopolitics and pursue a simon-pure socialist foreign policy for the simple reason that the policy of any Canadian External Affairs Secretary must contain the same fundamental ingredients. The basic factors which mould and shape the foreign policy of His Majesty's Government in right of the Dominion of Canada remain the same, regardless of which of the major political parties controls the parliamentary majority. What then are the foundation stones on which Canada has built and will build its external policy?

Pre-eminent among the cardinal aims of Canadian foreign policy is the desire to co-operate, freely and without loss of autonomy, with the member-nations of the Commonwealth. Our attachment to the Commonwealth is based on tradition, sentiment and self-interest. Canada does not want the Commonwealth to be an exclusive league or to be directed against any state or any group of states. Canadians conceive of the Commonwealth as being bound together "by ties as light as air and as strong as links of iron." In peace, the peculiar ad hoc arrangements between Great Britain and the Dominions have been found to be of inestimable value; for instance, the Ottawa system of preferential tariffs helped to cushion all Commonwealth countries against the depressing impacts of the worldwide slump of the "thirties." In war, it is to the credit of the

member-states of the Commonwealth that they stood together and alone, during the blackest days of the late war, and bore the shock of the fascist gangsters. Most Canadians treasure the principle of co-operation with Great Britain and the other Dominions. Even the French-speaking Canadians, always lukewarm about the country's British connections, now see the value of informal co-operation on equal terms with the other members of the Commonwealth. But, to say all this is not to admit that any closer association with Great Britain or the other Dominions is desired. As far as Canada was concerned, Bevin's proposal for a Commonwealth Customs Union fell on uninterested ears. Moreover, the political co-operation of Canada and Great Britain will, no doubt, be lessened if Britain entangles herself with any bloc of western European states. Economically, there is no reason why the formation of a Western Union containing Great Britain should prevent the making of bilateral trade agreements, like the wheat contract of 1947, which help to stabilize the commodity markets of each economy. Indeed, economic integration, in so far as the complementary exchange of commodities like wheat, pulp and paper products, metal products and consumers' goods, between Canada, on the one hand, and the countries of western Europe, on the other hand, could be greatly increased.

During the first quarter of the twentieth century, Canada grew from colonial status to Dominion status. During the second quarter of this century, Canada has become a middle power, that is to say, the gap that has to be closed before Canada can count herself as a great power, like the U.S.A., is smaller than the gap which exists between her and the small powers, like Poland or Chile. To express our country's rise in stature in another way:—the Colonial Laws Validity Act was invalidated by the Statute of Westminster which was, in turn, superseded by the post-war Canadian loan to Britain. Her newfound importance is shown by the following statistics: there were one million Canadians under arms during the last war out of a total population of about 12 millions; between 1943 and 1945, Canada "lent" over two billion dollars to her allies; during the war she achieved the position of being fourth in productive capacity among the United Nations; in the year 1945 she contributed 101 million dollars to U.N.R.R.A. Moreover, Canada fronts on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic Ocean; she could be classed as one of the Pacific powers. Although Canada is vitally interested in European conditions she is not Europe-centric and is becoming more and more concerned with what takes place in the Pacific region and in the Far East. In view of her position as a middle power possessing a creditor,

surplus-economy vis-a-vis Europe, Canada has the right to ask for a voice in world affairs equivalent to its position as a near-great power.

In more ways than one, the existence on the North American continent of the colossus-state, the U.S.A., has hampered and frustrated Canadian development. In the past there has been a steady drainage of population to the United States. At the present time, Canada is suffering, but not to the same extent as the United Kingdom, a famine of American dollars. As the United States has drifted towards war with Russia she has considered Canada as one of her principal allies. Inevitably, as much as one would dislike to chose, Canada would be at the side of its powerful southern neighbor in the event of a major conflict. Notwithstanding the fact that Canadians and Americans are good friends and close acquaintances we have often checked American designs on the territory north of the 49th parallel; the development of our transcontinental transportation system is evidence of this fact. Furthermore, American financiers and industrialists have more capital invested in Canada than in all of the European countries combined. Undoubtedly, the forces of Canadian nationalism will contrive to expel from Canada this form of Dollar-Imperialism because Canada did not shake off the control of Downing Street in order to fall under the domination of Wall Street.

All in all, the sometimes hysterical influence of American newspapers, magazines, film and radio, of taftian politicians, of the American-brand of trade unionism and of materialistic babbity, make it most difficult for Canada to pursue an independent line in the field of foreign affairs. To say the least, the impact of external socio-political ideas makes it almost impossible for our foreign policy to be independent in content and application. If Canadians do in fact desire full autonomy they will remain on the watch to ensure that our votes in U. N. O. do not lie at the disposal of the American State Department.

Prior to World War II, Canada was protected from overseas invasion by the British fleet. Moreover, our pre-war security arrangements were made in the sure knowledge that we could also count on the U.S. Navy. Canadians did not worry about defence: they thought in terms of an offensive on the Rhine and the maintenance of a European balance of power favorable to Great Britain. The unfortified frontier between Canada and the United States—stretching as it does from the Atlantic to the Pacific over a length of 3,898 miles—besides being a great triumph of voluntary reciprocal disarmament on

the part of two nations with a common land frontier, was standing evidence that Canada feared no attack from the south. Before the last war Canada was one of the best secured countries in the world. In 1924, in a world in which moral responsibility did not much matter, the Canadian delegate to the League of Nations could say, with some truth, that Canadians "lived in a fire-proof house" protected by the broad Atlantic from the danger of a European conflagration. This security has utterly vanished. Today, the transcendental factor for Canada, as for the world, is the airborne atomic bomb. Moreover, we see the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. fighting a future war in the wide stretches of the Canadian north and west; Canada would be the Belgium of another war. This is the spectre which is now haunting the minds of the more serious Canadian politicians.

Suspicion and mistrust have gone far to evaporate the goodwill and mutual respect which was established during the last world war between Canada and its northern neighbor, the U.S.S.R. Many leading Canadians have tried, in vain, to cement Canadian-Soviet friendship. However, the Russian policy of multiplying spies, misery and terror has frustrated all of these efforts. Now, there seems to be no limit to the greedy appetite of communist conquest and of Russian imperialism. It was not so very long ago that many Canadian leaders were advising that successive Canadian Governments should devote themselves to the conciliation of Soviet-American differences. Canada, they said, should attempt the role of mediator as between Washington and Moscow. Undoubtedly, if Russia's post-war intentions had been peaceful Canada might have achieved considerable success in building a bridge of understanding and tolerance between the Soviet Union and the West. However, this hope has come to nothing. The great tragedy of our time is that Russian aggression has aborted all attempts to unite the western democracies with the diverse nationalities of the Soviet Union for the purpose of world reconstruction; in many parts of the world the freedom in men's souls is being snuffed out, ruthlessly and relentlessly, by communist tyranny. The materialistic menace of communism—so closely allied to fascism—is on the march. Again are we faced with that grim and hateful question—"Will there be war?"

While it is beyond the power of any one individual to give a correct answer to that direct and awful query, we all must recognize the fact that the danger of a war, which would directly and immediately involve our country, has never been greater. While the present Government of Canada may refuse to take part in the gigantic gamble that is being played out in Berlin, no Canadian Government could stand aloof from an

actual "hot" war in which Russia and the United States would be opposing each other; if the Americans didn't help to defend Canada, then the Russians would invade because our northern territory is regarded by both sides as a potential base of operations—a most unpleasant prospect for Canadians. In view of the possibility of war, we Canadians would be well advised to follow General Crerar's advice and "to gather our strength." It is doubtful whether the Conservative Party or the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation are disposed to criticize the Government's decision to participate in the North Atlantic Defence Pact, even though the exact method of Canada's support of that security system may be criticized. But above all else, Canada must send her surplus food to Europe, for, as a German friend of mine has written, the will and the desire of the Europeans to defend themselves and to resist communism will last only so long as their democratic systems give them not only greater personal freedom but a standard of living which is above subsistence; in other words, the people of western Europe want freedom but they want bread too. Canada is challenged to use a part of its great wealth to help bolster the European economy.

Today, the nations of Western Europe stand at the threshold of a tremendous opportunity. By their economic union, and by that alone, the countries west of the "iron curtain" can create a viable European economy. The establishment of a sound economic system in Western Europe will be the very basis of defence against Russo-Communist aggression. Western Union is the only way by which the democratic nations can redress the world balance of power which has shifted so sharply in Russia's favour since the ending of World War II. The immediate and urgent task of Canadian foreign policy is, then, to guarantee and underwrite Western Union so that Democracy can confront Totalitarianism with a preponderant force of armed might. It is bitterly disappointing to contemplate the outbreak of another conflict. Nevertheless, the time has come to meet the challenge to our way of life and to prevent war by being prepared for it.

U. N. B. Law School Debaters scored a win over the U. N. B. "Hillmen" in the first debate of this season, held in November. Douglas Rice and Vernon Copp of the Law School successfully opposed the resolution: "Resolved that Canada embark on a large scale programme of controlled immigration," against Ed. McKinnie and Bob Stevenson of Up The Hill.