

001134

cop.1

(CANADIAN LEGISLATORS
and the
INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM
1935-1965)

by (King G. McShane)

Thesis presented to the Department of
Political Science of the Faculty of
Social Sciences of the University of
Ottawa as partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master
of Arts.

*Thèse soumise avec succès
le mercredi 5 octobre, 1966
André Larand*

Ottawa, Canada, 1966



LIBRARIES

UMI Number: EC55832

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC55832
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the supervision of Professor Marcel Roussin, Ph. D. of the Department of Political Science of the University of Ottawa.

The writer is indebted to Professor Louis Sabourin, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa, for advice in respect to the initial selection of the thesis subject. Special thanks must be given to Professor Roussin for his suggestions, reading many drafts, and for the benefit of his knowledge of the subject which was invaluable in the preparation of this thesis.

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

King G. McShane was born August 16, 1916 in Rollingdam, New Brunswick. He graduated from the Provincial Normal School in 1934. He received the Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, in 1939 and the degree of Bachelor of Civil Law from the same University in 1941. As a serving officer in the Canadian Armed Forces he graduated from the Canadian Army Staff College in 1948.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	page
INTRODUCTION	i
I.- THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM	1
II.- PRELUDE TO WAR	13
III.- THE WAR YEARS	29
IV.- THE POST-WAR DECADE	49
V.- THE CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT.	68
VI.- A MINORITY LIBERAL GOVERNMENT	103
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	135
ADDENDUM	149
BIBLIOGRAPHY	152

Appendix

1. <u>ABSTRACT OF Canadian Legislators and the Inter-American System 1935 - 1965.</u>	154a
---	------

LIST OF TABLES

Table	page
I.- Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with P.A.U. 1935 - 1939	28
II.- Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with P.A.U. 1940 - 1946	48
III.- Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with O.A.S. 1947 - 1957	67
IV.- Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with O.A.S. 1957 - 1963	102
V.- Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with O.A.S. 1963 - 1965	134

INTRODUCTION

"In the storeroom of a magnificent white marble building in Washington there's a chair with Canada's name on it. The building which has an open air tropical garden which can be covered in winter with a glass roof, is the House of the Americas, headquarters of the Organization of American States. The chair, will within the next few months be moved from the storeroom to the council chamber - a chamber in which twenty-one republics of the Western Hemisphere have been settling their differences for years". Thus wrote the late Ian Sclanders, a distinguished Canadian newspaper correspondent, in Maclean's magazine on September 10, 1960. Today, almost six years later Canada seems no closer and in fact perhaps not as close to joining the Organization of American States as then despite numerous favourable gestures in that direction by Canadian government leaders during the interval.

The question of whether Canada should become a member of the Pan American Union, now the Organization of American States has been for many years a favourite topic for college debates and has received a fair share of attention by political scientists in Canada and elsewhere. However it would be misleading to say that the general public in Canada has shown any appreciable interest in this subject.

In fact, a Gallup poll taken in 1943 showed that seventy-two percent of the adult population did not know what the Pan American Union was and the percentage had changed only slightly in a similar poll taken in 1947. On the other hand there have been certain peak periods of interest such as during the latter years of World War II and during the period 1959-61 when the Honourable Howard Green was Secretary of State for External Affairs in the Diefenbaker government.

The suggestion of Canadian membership in the inter-American system is not something new. Approaches along these lines were made to the Canadian government at least as far back as 1909 when Sir Wilfrid Laurier was Prime Minister. There may have been certain legal and technical reasons why Canada could not have become a member during the early years of the Pan American Union but it is felt that those obstacles could have been overcome had Canada wanted to join. However there have been periods when the United States and some Latin American countries would not have welcomed Canadian membership. Today no legal barriers to membership exist and the United States and all Latin American countries have expressed a desire to see Canada a member of the Organization of American States.

This study examines the speeches, statements and questions concerning the inter-American system made by federal legislators in the Canadian Parliament during the thirty year

period 1935-1965. Although the initial setting for a speech or a particular remark may have been outside Parliament they were all referred to later in the House of Commons or Senate. Official debates of the House of Commons and the Senate together with reports of the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on External Affairs and the Standing Committee of the Senate on Foreign Affairs have been thoroughly examined for material relating to this study. An attempt will be made to present this material against the background of a running commentary on the contemporary international relations of Canada insofar as those relations relate to the study.

A short description of the inter-American system has been included in this thesis with the view to providing the reader not so much with a detail knowledge of the Organization of American States but as background to the references to various meetings, conferences, and agencies mentioned in succeeding chapters of the study.

The subject is examined chronologically with the chapters being based in time on World War II e. g. pre-war, war and post-war periods and on the tenure of office of political parties e. g. the periods of Conservative government and a minority-Liberal administration.

This study analyzes the age, racial origin, religion, occupation, political party, and geographical representation

of the legislators interested in the inter-American system with the view to determining any particular patterns or groupings which may exist. Two recommendations are made for further study in relation to the problem.

The main object of this paper is an attempt to build up the record and bring together the rather widely scattered references to this subject by Canadian legislators. No attempt will be made to produce arguments pro or con Canadian membership in the Organization of American States except insofar as they may emerge as a by-product of the primary aim.

CHAPTER I
THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM

Early History

The origin of the inter-American System can be traced to negotiations preceding the Panama Congress called by Simon Bolivar in 1826. Developing hesitantly along non-military and non-political lines during the rise of Pan Americanism at the end of the last century, the system took shape and acquired significance in the security and political areas during the 1930s and 1940s.

Bolivar's hope for unity ran counter to the strong pride of independence of the new republics and it was not possible to organize a league of American states in his lifetime. Nonetheless, there was a recognition of common ties and interests, and during the nineteenth century further meetings took place between representatives of certain of the Latin American republics.

What is considered as the first International Conference of American States was held in 1889, and led to the establishment of the International Union of the American Republics. This association had no written constitution or charter, and its chief purpose was to promote cordial relations among the American republics through trade relations and the collection and publication of information concerning commerce and industry. The Union acted through a bureau called the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, which was renamed in 1902 the International Bureau of American Republics. In

1910, at the Fourth International Conference of American States, the official title of the association was changed to Union of American Republics, and that of the Bureau to Pan-American Union.

The early conferences were concerned with such matters as the machinery for the arbitration of disputes between members states and the furtherance of commercial, social, and cultural relations. The conference also authorized a large number of special conferences on legal, scientific, and technical matters, the majority of them being arranged for by the Pan-American Union. Political and military matters were seldom discussed and this was particularly on the insistence of the United States. At the Seventh Conference held in Montevideo in Dec 1933, the growing resentment of Latin America against the assumed superiority of the United States came to a head in a resolution debated and finally adopted that "No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another".¹ However, the inauguration of the "good neighbor" policy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 gave a new impetus to inter-American co-operation. The United States made clear its intention to work with the Republics of Latin America in a spirit of friendship and equality. This policy laid the ground work for closer co-operation in the face of the threat

¹ Wallace Thompson, "Pan-American Conferences", in The Encyclopedia Britannica, 10th Ed., Vol. 17, 1942, p. 178.

The O.A.S.

The Organization of American States came into formal being at the Ninth International Conference of American States in Bogota, Colombia, April 14-30, 1948. Earlier at the San Francisco Conference (1945), all 21 members of the Pan American Union were represented among the total of 50 nations attending. The American states were justly proud of, and had great confidence in, the ideals and principles of the inter-American system. For this reason they were particularly interested in the adoption of Articles 51 and 52 of the United Nations Charter. These articles allow individual or collective measures for self-defence and recognize regional arrangements under the authority of the United Nations. The Organization of American States thus became the first regional arrangement under the authority of these articles.

At the Bogota Conference the inter-American system was structurally overhauled and endowed with many of its significant attributes. Today its activities cover the whole range of economic, social, technical, cultural, and political problems. The Organization of American States operates within the triangle of three major agreements; the Rio Treaty of 1947, the Charter of the organization, 1948, and the Pact of Bogota, 1948.

The Charter of the Organization of American States establishes the purposes of the O.A.S. as the maintenance of peace and security in the continent, the pacific settlement

of disputes, the provision of common action in the event of aggression, and the promotion of economic cultural and social development. The Charter attempts to consolidate and bring together the many resolutions, understandings, and practices of equality, non-intervention and consultation upon which the organization had been operating down until 1948. It was hoped that it would be a comprehensive constitution covering all aspects of the system, but it was found impracticable to include in the Charter either the Rio Treaty on collective security or a consolidated instrument on the settlement of disputes. Accordingly, the Charter merely incorporates by reference the fundamental provisions of the Rio Treaty, and leaves dispute settlement to the Pact of Bogota.

The structural framework of the Organization of American States is outlined in the Charter. The three principal agencies of the Organization are:

1. the Inter-American Conference,
2. the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, and
3. the Council.

The Inter-American Conference is the Organization's supreme organ. It is a diplomatic assembly which is supposed to meet every five years. It decides general action and policy,

is roughly equivalent to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and has no real legislative power. Most of its conclusions take the form of recommendations which call for co-operation but do not entail legal obligations. All member states have the right to be represented at these conferences.

The Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs is the Organization's second main agency. This is an emergency gathering of all members which meets irregularly on decision of a majority of the members. The Meeting has a double function: under the first part of Article 39 of the Charter it considers problems of an urgent nature and of common interest to the American States, under the second part of Article 39, and under Articles 3 and 6 of the Rio Treaty, it serves as the Organ of Consultation to maintain peace and security. When the first function is involved, any member may request the Council of the Organization to convoke a Meeting of Consultation. When the second function is involved, any member likewise may request a Meeting provided that member is a party to the Rio Treaty. In either case, the request is made to the Council, which decides by an absolute majority whether the Meeting is to be called. In the case of an armed attack, however, no request is necessary because the Chairman of the Council is obliged to convoke both the Meeting and the Council without delay.

The Council is the third principal agency of the Organ-

ization. It is the permanent governing body of the O.A.S. replacing the Governing Board of the Pan American Union. It comprises one representative from each member state, and it is the only O.A.S. body continually in session at its headquarters in Washington. Though formally subordinate to the Inter-American Conferences and to the Meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, it has become the centralizing organ of the whole system. Its competence stems from the Rio Treaty, the Charter, the Pact of Bogota, and from resolutions adopted at the Bogota Conference independently of the Charter. Typically important powers of the Council are: to elect the Secretary General and the Assistant Secretary General; to supervise the general secretariat; to arrange for specialized conferences and organizations, and to establish the basis for fixing the quotas of contributions. The Council's political responsibilities under the Charter fall into two parts: first, it has special responsibilities for maintaining peace and security under the Rio Treaty and, secondly, it has responsibility for any matter referred to it by the Inter-American Conference or the Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, a very wide and potentially important role indeed. There is no veto in the O.A.S. and no privileged group of great powers in the Council. Each state is a member, and this means, as Professor Whitaker

points out,² that in the field of collective security the organization gives greater equality to small states than does the United Nations.

The Organization's principal security obligations are contained in the Rio Treaty, described by Senator Vandenberg, its sponsor in the United States Senate, as "the greatest advance ever made in the business of collective peace"³. This document created a permanent defensive alliance, though the machinery for carrying it out was not completed until the Bogota Conference of 1948. It defines a Western hemisphere defence zone and provides in Article 3, that any armed attack within the zone by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all, and that each party to the treaty will assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Pending a consultative decision, each party must render the attacked member such assistance as it deems appropriate under its obligation of reciprocal defence. The measures that should be taken collectively are decided upon by the Organ of Consultation (Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs), which is required to meet without delay. The specific measures on which the Organ of Consultation may agree,

2 A. P. Whitaker, Development of American Regionalism, p. 469, quoted by R. St.J. Macdonald, "The Organization of American States in Action" in University of Toronto Law Journal Vol. 25, No. 2, 1964, p. 362.

3 Ibid, p. 363.

under Article 8, include the breaking of diplomatic relations, partial or complete interruption of economic relations or rail, sea, air, and telephonic communications, and the use of armed forces. The Organ of Consultation can be likened, in this context, to the Security Council; but there is no veto and no distinction between permanent and non-permanent members.

The Rio Treaty further provides - more ambiguously - for assistance in cases not involving armed attacks. Article 6 stipulates that if the inviolability of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by (I) an aggression which is not an armed attack or (II) an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict or (III) any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately to agree upon the measures that must be taken, in the case of aggression, to assist the victim of aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defence. There are no obligations for prior action by individual states here because, there being no armed attack, there is less urgency than under Article 3. The parties' main obligation under Article 6 is to consult. Decisions of the Organ under Articles 3 and 6 are made by a two-thirds vote of the states which have ratified the treaty, and are binding on all signatories, except that, though bound in respect of all other

sanctions in the treaty, no state is required to use armed force without its consent.

While the Treaty of Rio deals with collective security the Pact of Bogota is concerned with the settlement of disputes. In addition to setting forth general principles the Pact directs that signatories submit disputes to mediation, conciliation or arbitration before referring them to the United Nations. In addition reference to the International Court of Justice is recognized as compulsory for certain cases. However, significant reservations to the provisions of the Pact were attached by the signatories of several countries.

Additional improvements in structure, not specifically provided for in the Charter, were made to the security apparatus of the O.A.S. during and after the Bogota Conference. The Inter-American Defence Board was continued on in permanent session in Washington as an integral part of the organization. The conference charged it with the task of preparing for collective self-defence against aggression. It is supposed to coordinate measures of common defence of the continent, but in fact it is somewhat ineffective, as indeed are the Military Defence Assistance Pacts between the United States and twelve Latin-American governments. There are no provisions for collaboration among the Latin-American armies themselves in the event of an emergency, and it is clear that

the whole defence question needs to be reviewed in the light of present-day requirements and weaponry. This requirement was brought to the fore early in the Dominican crisis in 1965.

Much more adequate, however, is the Inter-American Peace Committee. This body, created under another name at Havana in 1940, was installed in 1948 and given a new statute in 1956. The committee's object is to ensure, insofar as possible, that states between which there exists or might exist any dispute, of any nature whatsoever, will solve it quickly and peacefully. The committee can examine any case brought to its attention but it "shall take up the case only with the prior consent of the Parties and when no other procedure for its pacific settlement is in progress". Its function is merely that of suggesting to the parties the methods that it believes will lead to a solution. However, it has frequently demonstrated its usefulness as a mechanism for prompt action in cases where more formal means of pacific settlement presented procedural or other difficulties, and the fact is that it has become increasingly significant in the hemisphere's security system. It fills an important gap between collective and bilateral procedures. The committee is in permanent session in Washington, and its five members designated by the governments are elected by the Council to serve for a five year period.

Inter-Government Bodies

Inter-American cooperation has extended to many technical fields and over the years a large number of specialized inter-governmental organizations have grown up. The creation of the O.A.S. made it possible to consolidate many of these organizations and they now function under the charter as specialized organizations. The charter of the Organization of American States provides for three technical organs which operate under the Council:- the Inter-American Economic and Social Council; the Inter-American Council of Jurists; and the Inter-American Cultural Council. In addition, there are a large number of non-governmental inter-American bodies in such fields as architecture, medicine, law, and sports, with which the secretariat of the organization maintains informal liaison. In some cases the specialized organizations of the O.A.S. work in close co-operation with the corresponding specialized agencies of the United Nations. The Pan-American Health Organization, for example, also function as a regional office of the World Health Organization in the Americas.

Canada and the O.A.S.

Canada is not a member of the O.A.S. but participates in certain of its specialized agencies and technical organizations. It belongs to the Inter-American Statistical Institute, the Inter-American Radio Office and the Pan American Institute

of Geography and History. Canada is also a member of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, which does not come under the O.A.S. since it is open to States not members of the Organization. Canadian observers have been present at meetings of a large number of specialized organizations including the Pan-American Health Organization, the Inter-American Nuclear Energy Commission and the Inter-American Conference on Agriculture. Canadian observers also attended the Extraordinary Meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in Rio de Janeiro in 1954, the Economic Meeting of the O.A.S. in Buenos Aires in 1957, the Inter-American Conference in 1961, and the Meeting of Inter-American Ministers of Labour in 1963. In January, 1965, a Technical Conference on special maps was held in Ottawa under the auspices of the Canadian National Committee of the Pan-American Institute of Geography and History.

CHAPTER II
PRELUDE TO WAR

Pan Americanism has had a special meaning for French Canada. This has been something more than the concept of inter-American relations and continental solidarity. It is not so much political as sentimental with emphasis on cultural ties between Quebec and Latin America and on the reinforcement to be found therein of the French Canadian way of life against an overwhelming Anglo-Saxon environment. It is therefore not surprising to find that one of the earliest proponents in Canada of closer association with Latin America was Mr. Henri Bourassa, nationalist leader and publisher of *Le Devoir*.

As early as 1915, Mr. Bourassa viewed the French language as a tool by which French Canadians might further commercial relations between Canada and the southern continent.¹ Speaking in the Canadian House of Commons in 1935 he expressed the opinion "that there is no great problem of policy, internal or external which we can solve in Canada without regard to the policy of the United States". Mr. Bourassa then went on:

¹ Henri Bourassa, "La Langue française au Canada, ses droits, sa nécessité, ses avantages", Montreal 1915, p. 47, quoted by Iris S. Podea, "Pan American Sentiment in French Canada", International Journal, Autumn 1948, p. 335.

In order to accomplish that why not join the Pan American union in which we would be far more at home than in the League of Nations. There we would meet the representatives of all those states of South America which in some respects are in close understanding with the United States but in others, have the same feelings of difference we have and which are natural in small or weak nations towards a very large one dominating the continent. We would go there on the one hand as friend of the United States, and on the other, as allied to that galaxy of young and gallant Latin American nations whose influence we would strengthen and who also would strengthen our hand by exercising their influence in the sense of making peace a reality, at least in America.²

Mr. Bourassa's newspaper, an important French Canadian nationalist organ and champion of Canadian independence has consistently followed the policy of its founder. Every important inter-American conference in which Canada did not participate provided the occasion to ask "Why is Canada not represented? "Is the statute of Westminster so meaningless that such time-worn excuses can be repeated that as Canada is not a republic or has not been invited to join the Pan-American Union? It is time for Canada to assert her independence."³

Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) speaking in the House of Commons on April 1, 1935 agreed with Mr. Bourassa in emphasizing that the fact that Canada exists on the North American continent must be a

COY

2 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1935, p. 2287.

3 Le Devoir, Montreal, August 12, 1942, p. 1, 10, and March 13, 1944, p. 1 quoted by Iris S. Podea, "Pan-American Sentiment in French Canada", International Journal, Toronto, Autumn 1948, p. 336.

determining factor in our foreign policy. To him war with the United States was unthinkable and he went on to suggest that "the work of the International Joint Commission might very well be extended to include the administration of an "all in" arbitration treaty between Canada and the United States."⁴

The Hon. Hugh Guthrie, Minister of National Defence who spoke in the House on the same day, April 1, 1935, referred to Mr. Bourassa's statement that the United States was the predominant power in regard to Canada's internal and external affairs as "rubbish". He tended to refute Mr. Bourassa by pointing to the Canadian attitude in 1914 and Canada's participation in the Great War and of Canada's attitude in Paris at the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. He said Canadians are not looking to Washington yet for our defence however he did believe that "the second great influence in the world for peace and disarmament will be found in the United States."⁵

In the Canadian House of Commons, on March 17, 1936, Mr. Thomas Reid (New Westminster) referred to a press despatch indicating that President Roosevelt had called a conference for June 1936 to discuss economic trade, and monetary questions affecting all the members of the North and South American continents. He asked the Prime Minister if Canada had received

4 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1935, p. 2293.

5 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1935, p. 2301.

an invitation to this conference and whether the government intended to participate. Mr. MacKenzie King replied that the President had invited the governments of Latin America to take part in a conference in Buenos Aires to discuss "how the maintenance of peace among the American Republics can best be safeguarded. The conference will not include economic or monetary questions and is confined to the American republics belonging to the Pan-American Union."⁶

In retrospect, one of the most interesting speeches, not so much for its content as for the speaker himself, was made in the House of Commons on June 18, 1936. On that date Mr. Paul Martin (Essex East) in his maiden speech in the House suggested consideration be given to Canada's participation in some way with the Pan-American Union. Mr. Martin's close association with Canada's foreign affairs during the succeeding thirty years makes his words at that time all the more interesting. He said:

Having in mind the policy of the good neighbour as enunciated by Mr. Roosevelt is it not worth while for Canada now to consider taking part in a negative way that is thereby provided in the Pan-American Union. Is our region not North American as well as European? Have we not definite interests in the union of states on this continent, if alone for commercial reasons? I would suggest while I see great difficulties in determining where the terminals of Great Britain's region would be and while I am not all anxious to disturb our relations with her because that would be anything but a peaceful pursuit, but the government might well consider

6 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1936, p. 1152.

the advisability of taking part in the purely advisory conferences of the Pan-American Union. One cannot go through the deliberations of the Montevideo conference where problems such as immigration, and detailed problems of commerce were considered without feeling the wisdom in this kind of suggestion. At any rate it is one that I think, is deserving of consideration."⁷

The drums of war had been heard in Ethiopia and China when on August 14, 1936, President Franklin Roosevelt gave his first public pledge of defence assistance to Canada. Speaking at Chautaugua, New York, he said "Our closest neighbours are good neighbours. If there are remoter regions that wish us not good but ill, they know that we are strong; they know that we can and will defend ourselves and defend our neighbours."⁸

Miss Agnes McPhail (Gray-Bruce) suggested that Canada should participate in neighbourhood conferences and could see no reason why Canada should not have participated in the neighbourhood conference of American republics at Buenos Aires in December 1936. Mr. MacKenzie King interpreted that "we were not invited" whereupon Miss MacPhail said she would not be surprised if the Canadian government had not made it known that it didn't want to be invited. Miss MacPhail went on to point out that this was a conference of the Americas called to consider the protection of the Americas and that she could see nothing illogical or disloyal in Canada's participation. She thought that by now Canada was over

7 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1936, p. 3870.

8 F.H. Soward et al., Canada in World Affairs, The Pre-War Years Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1941, p. 107.

9 Ibid, p. 107.

its adolescent stage and could go to Buenos Aires "without incurring any sort of condemnation either here or any other part of the British Commonwealth of Nations."¹⁰

On January 27, 1937, Mr. A.A. Heaps (Winnipeg-North) moved a resolution in the House of Commons, requesting: "The Government of Canada suggest to the President of the United States the desirability of convening a world conference for the securing and maintenance of peace." Speaking during the course of the debate on this resolution, Hon. C.H. Cahan (St. Lawrence-St. George) made one of the longest speeches in the House of Commons concerning Canada's position in respect to the Latin American countries and also one of the strongest speeches by a member of Parliament against Canada's participation in the Pan-American Union.

Mr. Cahan, who had lived for seven or eight years in Mexico and had travelled extensively in Central and South America, was convinced that "one of the most unfortunate political manoeuvres which could be adopted by the Government of Canada would be to enter as a participating member in any Pan-American conference of union." "Canada," he said, "has few interest in common with these states and union with them would add nothing to our economic and very little to our intellectual or cultural strength." Mr. Cahan reviewed the origin and racial backgrounds of the Latin American countries and pointed out "there is not one democratic

¹⁰ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1937, p. 256.

state among them all. They are all ruled largely by military dictatorships which all change from time to time by force of arms."¹¹ He felt that the respect which Canada enjoys in those states is due to the fact that Canada is not attempting to assert control or sovereignty in any degree over their political policies or their future - an entirely different feeling to that which exists between those countries and the United States. In concluding he expressed the hope that before any government of Canada enters into membership in the Pan-American Union, the Parliament of Canada would have an opportunity to discuss all phases of the matter.

Mr. Wilfred Lacroix, (Quebec-Montmorency) who was opposed to participation by Canada in any European military manoeuvres, while speaking on February 18, 1937 during the National Defence debate, again supported Canadian membership in the Pan-American Union when he said "I think there is only one logical course for us to follow; That is to occupy as soon as possible a seat at the Pan-American Conference (...). We would thus be proving to all nations our desire to remain what we^{are} actually and essentially, an American nation."¹³

The only reference to inter-American affairs in the Senate

11 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1937, p. 328.

12 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1937, p. 329.

13 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1937, p. 1023 - 1024.

during this period came from Senator A.K. Hugessen during the debate on the Speech from the Throne on January 19, 1937. He referred to satisfactory relations with the nations of the North American continent and the expected visit of the President of the United States to Canada during the summer of 1937. He expressed the view that these relations were improved still further as a result of the recent Pan-American Conference and by the visit of President Roosevelt to that conference, and that "Canada stands behind the sentiments expressed in the speech by the President to the conference in defence of the democratic regime and of the rights of free speech".¹⁴

During the 1937 session, the Senate passed the Canada-Uruguay Trade Assistance Bill. One would have expected that this would have been an occasion for some remarks on Canadian-Latin American relations but there was no debate or discussion whatsoever at any reading of the bill.

Canadian literature during 1937 and 1938 contained many provocative and thought provoking articles relating to national defence and foreign affairs, the majority suggesting that Canada should take stock of her position in post-league world affairs. Many of these suggested closer inter-American relations. A series of panel discussions on the CBC radio brought forth criticisms from T.L. Church (Broadview) on three occasions in the House of

⁵
14 Canada, Senate Debates, 1937, p. 8.

Commons during April and May 1938. He asked the government in view of the state of world affairs to prohibit the use of the publicly owned radio system as an instrument for promoting pan-Americanism. He objected to this linking us up with pan-American propaganda on such controversial subjects as defence and foreign affairs. "It is not in the interests of the United Empire. We are not dependent upon the Munro doctrine and Pan-Americanism."¹⁵

The President of the United States visited Canada during the summer of 1938. Almost two years to the day of his Chautaugua speech, President Roosevelt gave an even stronger pledge of assistance to Canada in case of aggression. On August 18 while speaking at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario where he received an honorary degree, he said: "The Dominion of Canada is part of the sisterhood of the British Empire. I give you assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire."¹⁶ These words brought instant and appreciate response from the press and people of Canada. It is reported that this promise was not in the original draft of the speech prepared by the United States Department of State but inserted by the President himself.¹⁷

Speaking at Woodridge, Ontario two days later Prime Minister King expressed what he believed to be the Canadian attitude:

15 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1938, p. 2773.

16 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1939, p. 2419.

17 Cordell Hull, The Memoirs of Cordell Hull, New York, Macmillan, 1948, p. 587.

We know that these are words of a friendly people, our neighbour, and are glad that our common affairs have been so managed and our mutual confidence so established that such words can be punctually spoken and received without reserve. The Canadian people know they have their own responsibility for maintaining their soil as a homeland for free men in the western hemisphere. They will recognize that there is no room today for shirking these responsibilities. Indeed the times being what they are, they will be quick to see that the assurance given by the President has if anything, increased rather than lessened our responsibilities. We too have our obligations as a good friendly neighbour. We want to see that at our own instance our country is made as immune from attack or possible invasion as we can reasonably be expected to make it and that should the occasion ever arise, enemy forces should not be able to pursue their way either by land or sea or air to the United States across Canadian territory.¹⁸

Three other actions taken by the Canadian government during the summer of 1938 tended to lead to closer inter-American relations. During his speech at Woodbridge in August the Prime Minister stated he intended to ask the Ontario government to re-open negotiations with the State of New York on the development of the St. Lawrence waterway. (President Roosevelt had always been a strong supporter of this project). In September the Prime Minister agreed to set up a commission to investigate with the United States the feasibility of a highway from the State of Washington to Alaska through the Province of British Columbia. Also in September, the government announced acceptance of an invitation to take part in May 1939

¹⁸ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1939, p. 2420.

in an Inter-American Travel Conference sponsored by the Pan-American Union. This was the first time that the Canadian government had ever agreed to participate in such an inter-American activity.

Canada's foreign policy was discussed at greater length than for many years during the 1939 session of Parliament. Speaking

the supply debate during the discussions of the estimates for the Department of External Affairs on March 30, 1939 the Prime Minister outlined Canada's foreign policy. He referred to President Roosevelt's speech at Kingston and repeated in the House a greater portion of his own speech at Woodbridge. However, he took pains to emphasize that these closer relations with the United States in no way lessened the intimacy of Canada's relations with the United Kingdom and illustrated the paralleling of interests by pointing to the Canada-United States trade agreement and the Canada-United Kingdom trade agreement.

The Prime Minister then dealt at considerable length with Canada's relations with the countries of South America and other members of the Pan-American Union. He assured the House that the government was aware of the importance of Canada's relations with those countries and on geographical grounds alone we could not be uninterested¹ in their development, welfare and security. The government, he said, was aware of the suggestion from many quarters that Canada should be represented at the 8th International Conference of American republics in December 1938.¹⁹ He pointed out Canada is not a member of the Pan-American Union and therefore under present rules could not be invited. Canada could not

¹⁹ In reply to a question in the House of Commons on February 3, 1939 by Mr. H.F. Brunelle (Champlain) as to whether Canada had been invited to the PAU Conference in Lima, Peru, the Prime Minister replied that Canada was not invited.

become a member of the PAU without an amendment to the constitution of that body since it is now open only to American republics. As to the suggestion that Canada send an official observer, the Prime Minister recalled that the question of official observers was raised at the Montevideo conference in 1933. The governing board referring to the fact that since the Havana conference in 1928 both plenary and committee sessions have been open to the public concluded that there seems to be no reason for establishing a category of "official observers".²⁰

The Prime Minister felt it would be possible to have some country propose an amendment to the constitution of the Pan-American Union which would make Canadian membership possible. While public opinion for some such action had increased in recent years he did not consider that "it has yet become sufficiently wide-spread or sufficiently informed and mature to warrant immediate steps in that direction." He considered it a possibility which should be given consideration in the future along with trade and other governmental measures which are bringing Canada and these countries closer together.²¹

Two other members of the House, Hon. J.E. Lawson (York South) and Mr. W.A. Walsh (Mount Royal) speaking after the Prime Minister, expressed reservation in respect to American

20 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1939, p. 2420.

21 Ibid, 2421.

guarantees of protection. They both pointed out that the Munro doctrine and President Roosevelt's Kingston declaration had never been ratified by congress and as such did not constitute any guarantee to Canada. United States support would be given Canada only if American interests are threatened. In the words of Mr. Lawson:

Our hope and our only safety is that first we protect ourselves to the greatest extend possible and our resources, and secondly that we bear in mind always that if the United Kingdom is attacked what Canada's position may be in the event of the United Kingdom's failing to succeed in any such war or engagement.²²

Members of Parliament were summoned to a special session on September 7, 1939, and the Government let it be known that the adoption of the Address in reply from the Speech from the Throne would be considered as approving the Government's policy of immediate participation in war against Germany. The debate ended on the evening of September 9, the Address being adopted without a division. Only four members had spoken against the Government's policy of declaring war. Speaking against participation Mr. M. Raymond (Beauharnois-Laprairie) was critical of the theory that "we must help the Empire because the Empire protects us". He pointed out that the Empire had not created the oceans which surround Canada and provide protection from attack. "We cannot credit the Empire for the Declaration of

22 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1939, p. 2514

Lima and Roosevelt's assurance of protection".²³ Mr. T.L. Church (Broadview) on the other hand criticized members of the CCF and others who "for the last three or four years have been urging that we do not need an army or air force and that we could rely on Pan America". He said the results of such arguments in Great Britain to please the fascists scrapped the finest Navy, Army and Air Force in the world.²⁴

On September 10, 1939, the king gave his approval to a proclamation declaring that a state of war with the German Reich existed in Canada as of and from that date. Thus, Canada for the second time in a generation went to war with Germany.

23 Canada, House of Commons Debates 1939, p. 60.

24 Ibid, p. 175.

PRELUDE TO WAR
Summary

27.

The following Members of Parliament referred to the Pan-American Union in speeches made during the period 1935-1939:

<u>Supporting Canadian Membership in P.A.U.</u>			<u>Against Canadian Membership in P.A.U.</u>		
Bourassa	I.	Que.	Cahan	C.	Que.
Lacroix	L.	Que.	Church	C.	Ont.
Martin	L.	Ont.	Cutherie	C.	Ont.
MacPhail	U.F.O.	Ont.	Lawson	C.	Ont.
Raymond	L.	Que.	Walsh	C.	Que.
Woodsworth	C.C.F.	Man			
	<u>Uncommitted</u>			<u>Questions</u>	
Hugessen	L.	Que.(Sen)	Brunelle	L.	Que.
King	L.	Sask.	Reid	L.	B.C.

Except for the Prime Minister, Mr. King, who represented a Saskatchewan riding, and Mr. Woodsworth from Manitoba, all other M.P.'s participating in debates were from Ontario or Quebec.

The five speakers who were against Canadian membership in the P.A.U. were all Conservative M.P.'s, English Canadian and Protestant.

M.P.'s supporting closer association with the P.A.U. were from most parties except Conservative and Social Credit, and the majority were French Canadian and Roman Catholic.

Age and occupation appeared to have no bearing on the stand taken by the various speakers. While the majority of speakers were lawyers, this was not significant in view of the high percentage of M.P.'s who were of the legal profession.

Table I. - Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators
Concerned with P.A.U. 1935 - 1939

Name		D.O.B.	R.O.	Rel.	Prof.	Pol.P.	Prov.
Bourassa, H.	S.	1896	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Editor	I.	P.Q.
Brunelle, H.E.	Q.	1891	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	P. Q.
Cahan, C.H.	A.	1861	Eng.Cdn.	Presby.	Lawyer	C.	P.Q.
Church, T.L.	A		Irish	Ang.	Lawyer	C.	Ont.
Guthrie, H.	A.	1886	Sc. Cdn.	Presby.	Lawyer	C.	Ont.
Hugessen, A.K.(S)	U.	1891	Eng.	Ang.	Lawyer	L.	P.Q.
King, W.L.M.	U.	1874	Sc. Cdn.	Presby.	Lawyer	L.	Sask.
Lacroix, W.	S.	1891	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Archit.	L.	P.Q.
Lawson, J.E.	A.	1891	Sc. Cdn.	U.C.ofC	Lawyer	C.	Ont.
Martin, P.	S.	1903	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	Ont.
MacPhail, A.	S.	1890	Scot.	L.D.S.	Teacher	U.F.O./Lab.	Ont.
Raymond, M.	S.	1883	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	B.C.
Reid, T.	Q.		Scot	Presby.	Manager	L.	B.C.
Walsh, W.A.	A.	1887	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.ofC	Teacher	C.	P.Q.
Woodsworth, J.S.	S.	1874	Eng. Cdn.	Ang.	Lawyer	L.	P.Q.

S. - Supporting Membership.

U. - Uncommitted.

A. - Against Membership

Q. - Asked questions only.

(S.)-Senator

CHAPTER III
THE WAR YEARS

The second meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries comprising the Pan-American Union was held at Havana, Cuba July 21 to 30, 1940. This was an emergency meeting called as a result of the situation of World War II, following the fall of France. On July 15, 1940, Mr. T.L. Church (Broadview) asked in the House of Commons whether the government had received an invitation to this conference. The Prime Minister replied in the negative and stated one of the reasons for not being invited was that Canada was at war. Mr. M.J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar) thought this was all the more reason why Canada should be invited and tried to suggest the main reason why Canada did not receive an invitation was that Canada did not want to be invited. Mr. Coldwell pointed out that this conference was to consider ^{such} subjects as the administration of foreign possessions in this hemisphere, provisions for economic surpluses, the application of the Munro doctrine and collective action against the fifth column - all matters of direct concern to this country.¹

Mr. Coldwell was supported in his views by Mr. Fulford (Leeds) who considered Canada should take her place immediately in the Pan-American Union and by Mr. A.R. Adamson (York West) who however felt Canada should beat the Germans first, otherwise it might be construed as running for cover. J.F. Pouliot

¹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1940, p. 379.

(Temisquata) agreed with Mr. Fulford and in addition felt that even as good neighbours there should be a binding treaty between Canada and United States guaranteeing that one would come to the defence of the other in case of attack.² In replying to these suggestions the Prime Minister reiterated what he had said on a number of previous occasions, i.e. that the Pan-American Union was an association of republics; that Canada was at war while the United States and other members of the Union were neutral and that at that period of the war he believed an application for Canadian membership would be embarrassing both for Canada as well as for the United States and the countries of Latin America. In addition it could create misunderstanding in some other countries. In replying to a question from Mr. Howard Green (Vancouver South) Mr. King indicated that the government was considering the opening of legations in one or two South American countries and that communications had been received from a number of South American republics expressing a desire for a representative in Canada.³

In the Senate, the question of Canadian representation at the Havana Conference was raised by Senator J.J. Hughes (King's-Souris) on July 17, 1940. He stated that he thought Canada should be represented and he also wanted to know whether

2 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1940, p. 2538, 2539

3 Ibid, p. 2540

Canada would become a member of the P.A.U. in the near future. To the first question, Senator Dandurand, Government Leader, replied "No" and to the second this is "not a matter to be considered at this time".⁴ A few months later, Senator William Duff (Lunenburg) spoke of the need in the near future for "hemisphere solidarity" and referring back to the Havana Conference said he "could not understand why somebody from Canada could not have sat in".^{4a}

From the point of view of Canada and the whole British Commonwealth two very significant developments in international affairs took place during August 1940. The first inkling of developments already underway was given to the public by the President of the United States on August 16th when he announced:

"The United States Government is holding conversations with the government of the British Empire with regard to acquisition of naval and air bases for the defence of the western hemisphere and especially the Panama canal. The United States government is carrying on conversations with the Canadian government on the defence of the western hemisphere".^{4b}

During the next thirty-six hours there was an informal

⁴ Canada, Senate Debates, 1940, p. 228

^{4a} Canada, Senate Debates, 1941, p. 37

^{4b} Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1940, p. 54.

meeting on a private train in the Ogdensburg, New York, railway yards between the Canadian Prime Minister and the US President. It concluded with a proclamation on August 18th, 1940 of what came to be known as the Ogdensburg Agreement. This was a simple brief joint communique stating that the "two" leaders had agreed to set up a permanent joint board of defence of the northern half of the Western Hemisphere.

The leaders talked of many other things - the proposed gift of overage destroyers to Britain and the lease of British bases in Newfoundland and the Caribbean to the United States, and the problems of coastal defence. However these were not mentioned publicly until November 12, 1940 when Mr. King speaking in the House of Commons during the Throne debate reviewed the Ogdensburg Agreement and described his various discussions on common defence problems with the President of the United States from 1937 on. During his speech the Prime Minister pointed out that the agreement made clear that "the board which was being established to make studies and recommendations was not being formed for a single occasion to meet a particular situation, but was intended to deal with a continuing problem. The board on Joint Defence was therefore declared to be permanent.⁵ The board which was immediately set up played an important part throughout the Second World War and post war period and continues today carrying out

⁵ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1940, p. 58.

certain important functions.

While the Ogdensburg agreement was received with general approval in the House it was given little attention by the members during their speeches and it was not until two sessions later that one member, Paul Martin, associated the agreement with the countries of the Pan-American Union. (see below).

The third Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries comprising the P.A.U. was held at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, January 15 to 28, 1942. Once again the question as to whether Canada was officially represented was raised in the House of Commons by Mr. E.G. Hansell (McLeod) and once again the Prime Minister replied "No".⁶

A Pan-American economic conference was held in Washington during the summer of 1942. The announcement of this conference provided Mr. Angus McInnis (Vancouver East) with an opportunity of querrying the government's position in respect to membership in the P.A.U. "Both from the economic and political point of view" he said "connections and associations with the South American States as well as with the United States would become of increasing importance to Canada." On earlier occasions the Prime Minister had stated that no invitation had been received by Canada to become a member of the P.A.U. and on others he pointed to technical difficulties i. e. American states were all republic, but this time Mr. King told Parliament:

⁶ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1942, p. 925.

There have been times quite recently when we might have expected invitations but were given reasons why it would not be advisable to have an invitation extended. That position still exists to a certain extent, for reasons which I cannot explain publicly...During this period of war there are special reasons for the South American republics and the United States that wish to discuss certain economic and other problems without representation present from any member of the British Commonwealth of Nations.⁷

In January 1942, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, The Hon. James A. MacKinnon and a small group of MPs made a 15,000 mile tour of South American countries and came back with trade agreements with Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay and a commercial modus vivendi with Ecuador. In introducing the trade agreements in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister mentioned that while at that time the trade value of these treaties may not be very great there is great value in the fact the treaties themselves serve to express friendship and goodwill between these particular republics and the Dominion of Canada. He went on to refer to the establishing of diplomatic relations with these countries suggesting that when the "war is over the way will already have been paved for the immediate development of trade on as large a scale as possible"⁸

The Hon. Mr. MacKinnon speaking in the debate described the travels of the trade mission in detail and spoke of the warm welcome received in all countries visited. The Hon. R.B. Hanson (York-Sunbury), Leader of the Opposition and Mr. J.H. Blackmore (Lethbridge) of the Social Credit Party endorsed the trade agreements. It is apparent however that none of these three gentlemen had in mind any closer political association with Latin America such as membership

⁷ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1942, p. 5147

⁸ Ibid, p. 894.

in the P.A.U.

Mr. Paul Martin (Essex East) also participated in the debate on the trade agreements. This was one of the longest speeches in the House of Commons to that date made in support of Pan-American relations. He criticized a speech made in the House in 1937 by Hon. C.H. Cahan, in which he characterized Latin Americans as "people who are hardly civilized, as people with whom we should not try to further any relations." This is the impression which many Canadians have of Latin Americans and "perhaps the Latin Americans have somewhat the same impression of us." Mr. Martin referred to the Ogdensburg Agreement and the Permanent Joint Board on Defence whose terms of reference relate to the northern half of the western hemisphere. This area includes besides Canada and the United States, Mexico and the Central American republics, the republics and colonies in the Caribbean, and Columbia, Venezuela, the Guianas, and parts of Brazil and Ecuador in South America. Thus using the broad interpretation the majority of the member states of the Pan-American Union fall within the scope of the Board. While not trying to read into these agreements something that was not contemplated nor belittling, the economic value of the new trade agreements, Mr. Martin was of the opinion that there now lies an opportunity of recognizing that in Latin America exists the only contemporary collectivity of nations outside the British

Commonwealth whereby there can be some guarantee of peaceful relations between states."⁹ He went on to point out that while there is some denial in Pan-American countries of the democratic process and of the principles of due process of law, there is general sympathy with the democratic method, a recognition of racial equality and a respect for religious beliefs.

The only other speaker in this debate who advocated Canadian membership in the Pan-American Union was Mr. M.J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar). Although British born, he could see no reason why Canada should not realize its geographical, economical and commercial position and enter into the closest relationship possible with our neighbours across the line and our neighbours rather more remote in South America, which in turn would tend to bring about still better relationships between the Anglo-Saxon and Latin American peoples.¹⁰

One of the few champions of better inter-American relations to be found in the Senate at this time was Senator L.M. Gouin (de Salaberry). On July 15, 1942, he moved that the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs be directed to conduct an inquiry into "the best means of promoting cooperation in the spheres of economic, legal, social, and cultural relations between the Dominion of Canada and the other nations of the American continents". This motion remained on the order paper

9 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1942, p. 914.

10 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1942, p. 916.

for some time without being debated and was later withdrawn by Senator Gouin who indicated he would reintroduce the motion for debate during the next session of Parliament. However, for some unknown reason it was never reintroduced by the Senator.¹¹

The first member to raise the question of Canadian P participation in the P.A.U. during 1943 was Mr. Fraser the Member for Peterborough who, on March 1, asked the Prime Minister if Canada had been asked to join the Pan-American Union or if there were any negotiations underway between Canada and any other country regarding the Pan-American Union. To both these questions the Prime Minister replied "No".¹²

On June 28, 1943 the Prime Minister, Mr. King tabled in the House of Commons copies of the Inter-American radio agreement signed in Santiago, January 26, 1940 and adhered to by Canada on May 8, 1943. This agreement superceded the Inter-American radio agreement signed in Havana, December 13, 1937 which Canada approved on December 22, 1938. This agreement was an undertaking of a technical nature relating to frequency allocation for the different services on the North American continent.

Speaking a few days later (July 9, 1943) in the supply debate, Mr. Howard Green (Vancouver-South) ridiculed Canada's position in relation to the other nations of the western hemis-
here

11 Canada, Senate Debates, 1942-1943, p. 219.

12 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1943, p. 762.

phere wherein we ratify a treaty signed three years earlier and where Canada was not present at the negotiations. He stated Canada should be an active member of the P.A.U., it being understood of course that such action would not be weakening our association with the British Commonwealth.¹³

Similar views were expressed by Mr. Brooke Claxton (St. Lawrence-St. George) parliamentary assistant to the Prime Minister and by Mr. M.J. Coldwell who in calling for Canadian participation in the P.A.U. pointed out the earlier fears which the United States held (1928) that colonies or dominions whose foreign relations are controlled by European states would not be free to follow an independent policy. He was of the opinion that these fears no longer existed especially since the Statute of Westminster.¹⁴

Primarily as part of the programme for increased post-war trade with South America, Canada opened legations in Argentina, Brazil and Chile in 1941 and subsequently in Mexico, Peru and Cuba. At the same time trade commissioner posts were established in several other Latin American countries. During 1942 and 1943 the Canadian government was host to various heads of state and cabinet ministers from South and Central America and visiting newspapermen, students and business men from those countries were treated in a manner certain to contribute to mutual understanding of good will. The government lent its support to the inauguration in Buenos Aires, in June 1942 to an Argentine-Canadian Cultural Institute which planned to exchange

13 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1943, p. 4566.

14 Ibid, p. 4570.

journalists, professors, students and artists. On the other hand in Quebec such organizations as L'Union des Latins d'Amerique, the Pan-American League of Canada and the Canadian Inter-American Association actively promoted educational, cultural and economic relations. The expansion of our diplomatic missions in Latin America and public interest in this area were mentioned by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons during the debate on External Affairs estimates on July 12, 1943. He said, "It is thus a matter of significance and a sound cause of satisfaction that we have grossly increasing evidence of the growth of mutual knowledge, mutual respect and mutual goodwill among the nations of this hemisphere".¹⁵

The war years witnessed a marked increase of interest by French Canadians in Latin America. Ardent nationalist publications in Quebec such as LeDevoir, LeBloc, L'Oerl and La Brussole emphasized ideas of race and "Latinite" in propounding a cultural affinity between French Canadians and Latin America.¹⁶ During 1942 and 1943 the majority of influential Canadian dailies began advocating either membership for Canada in the Pan-American Union or the institution of conversations to that end.¹⁷ However, despite this increased attention, a public opinion poll

15 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1943, p. 4664.

16 Podea, Iris C. "Pan-American Sentiment in French Canada", International Journal, Vol. 3, No 4 (Autumn 1948) p.334-48.

17 Miller, Eugene H. "Canada and The Pan-American Union", International Journal, Vol. 3 No 1 (Winter 1947-48) p. 24-38

in January 1944 revealed that 72 per cent of adult Canadians had never heard of the Pan-American Union nor had any knowledge what it was. The Prime Minister made reference to this poll during his review of foreign affairs in the House of Commons in August 1944, and went on to say " I am convinced that Canadian participation in such an organization could be based only upon a wide general appreciation in this country of the purposes and responsibilities of the Pan-American Union." Mr. King did not believe that such an appreciation existed and suggested that those who favoured membership could best serve their cause by "creating a wider understanding of this subject among the people of Canada." He also pointed out that because of the war there had been no formal meeting of the P.A.U. since 1938, and that it would not be unreasonable therefore for Canada to postpone active consideration of the subject until the war was over. (Presumably he was referring to the International Conference of American States which should have met in 1943 but which did not meet until 1948). Canada would then consider its position "in the light of post war developments in the realm of international organization."¹⁸ The only members commenting on the Prime Minister's remarks at that time were Mr. Howard Green (Vancouver South) who suggested that the government was surely the appropriate agency for telling the Canadian people what membership in the P.A.U. might entail, and Mr. M.J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggan) who

18 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1944, p. 5912.

restated his belief that we should join the P.A.U. when the opportunity occurs.¹⁹ Mr. T.L. Church (Broadview) pointed out that while the United States has been a member of the P.A.U. for over 50 years there has been a reservation in that membership. "Washington has said that the United States is not bound to carry out by force what may be proposed by some small nations of this Union, that she does not surrender any sovereignty and makes no commitments through her membership whatsoever."²⁰

The Inter-American Conference on the Problems of War and Peace was held in Mexico City in February 1945. During the proceedings the delegate from Chile suggested that Canada should become a member of the Pan-American Union. His proposal was altered by the conference to a "tribute of admiration to Canada for its great effort in defence of the American continent" and an expression of the conference that Canada's collaboration with the Pan-American system might become closer and closer.²¹ In acknowledging these sentiments the Prime Minister said "We are proud to share in the defence of freedom of this continent as in Europe and Asia. We are convinced that the increasing solidarity of the peace-loving peoples of this hemisphere will contribute materially in the post war period to both regional

19 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1944, p. 5913, 5929

20 Ibid, p. 5940.

21 Soward, F.H. Canada in World Affairs 1944-46, Oxford, London, Toronto, New York, 1950, p. 228.

and world security. We greatly welcome increased collaboration in all matters of mutual interest and concern with our neighbours of the Americas."²²

This cautious approach to the Pan-American Union was not criticized except in some French Canadian quarters where complaints were voiced that the colonial spirit was keeping Canada from playing her true part in the western hemisphere. On the other hand, Mr. T.L. Church (Broadview) considered Canadian membership in the P.A.U. would be a total mistake and a retrograde step which might lead to the dissolution of the British Empire. He was also sorry to see the San Francisco conference being held at that time and felt a greater need for "The closest **and** most absolute cooperation and collaboration and understanding" between Canada, the rest of the British Empire and the United States.²³ Support for the Act of Chapultepec and full participation in Inter-American affairs came from two members of the House during the same debate, Mr. Fred Rose (Cartier) (convicted for espionage in 1947) and Mrs. Therese W. Neilson (North Battleford).²⁴

The first session of Canada's 20th Parliament lasted from September 6 to December 18, 1945. No specific reference to the Pan-American Union or Inter-American system was made by any member during this session. The Foreign Affairs debate related

22 Copies of messages tabled by Prime Minister in House of Commons, March 20, 1945.

23 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1945, p. 89, 90.

24 Ibid, p. 98. 99 110

primarily to the San Francisco conference and approval of Canadian membership in the United Nations organization.

On May 6, 1946 President Truman submitted to Congress an Inter-American Military Cooperation Act. This would authorize a programme of military cooperation between the United States and other American republics. Canada was included by the President in his plan. The announcement of this proposed measure brought forth a question in the House of Commons by Mr. John Bracken, (Neepawa) Leader of the Opposition on May 7th as to whether there had been any previous consultation between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States on this subject and whether the legislation in any way prescribes our diplomatic freedom in dealing with the various South American republics. The Secretary of State for External Affairs pointed out that this was domestic legislation enabling the government of the United States to make defence arrangements with governments of other American states and in no way inhibits Canada's diplomatic freedom with other American republics. A similar question was asked by Mr. T.L. Church (Broadview) on May 9, 1946 to which he received the same reply from the Prime Minister.²⁵

The only other reference to inter-American relations made in the House of Commons during the 1946 session of Parliament

²⁵ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1946, p. 1272, 1273, 1347.

was made by Mr. L.J. Raymond (Wright) speaking during the Throne debate. Pointing out that while international cooperation is essential first and foremost with the United States we cannot ignore the other republics south of the United States. He thought that "we should develop commercial and cultural relations with them to a far greater extent than ever before", however he made no clear cut suggestion that Canada should become a member of the P.A.U.²⁶

26 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1946, p. 68, 69.

Summary

The following members of Parliament referred to the Pan-American Union in speeches or asked questions on this subject during the period 1940-1946.

Supporting Canadian Membership
in P.A.U.

Adamson	C	Ont
Claxton	L	PQ
Coldwell	CCF	Sask
Duff (S)	L	N.S.
Fulford	L	Ont
Gouin (S)	L	Que
Green	C	B.C.
Hughes (S)	L	PEI
Martin	L	Ont
McInnis	CCF	B.C.
Neilsen	UP	Sask
Pouliot	L	Que
Rose	L.P.	Que

(S) - Senator

Uncommitted

Blackmore	S.C.	Alta
Hanson	C	N.B.
King	L	Sask
MacKinnon	L	Alta
Raymond	L	Que

Against Canadian Membership
in P.A.U.

Church	C	Ont
--------	---	-----

Questions

Bracken	C.	Man
Church	C	Ont
Fraser	C	Ont
Green	C	B.C.
Hansell	S.C.	Alta

Popular support of Pan Americanism throughout Canada was at its height during the latter war years. While this feeling was manifest in the press, by numerous associations and through cultural exchange this spirit was not as prevalent in Parliament gauged by the number of speeches and references to the subject especially by representatives of the Province of Quebec where it was generally believed that this movement had its greatest support.

With the exception of a lone Conservative, T.L. Church, an ardent Imperialist, no member of Parliament publicly opposed closer relations with Latin America. Many members of Parliament, including the Prime Minister, and the leaders of the Conservative and Social Credit Parties were uncommittal. While all seemed to favour the expansion of diplomatic and economic missions in Latin America their primary concern was for an expansion of trade in these countries and development of contacts on a bi-lateral basis rather than closer political association in a Pan-American Union.

Advocates of membership in the P.A.U. were from all parties, except Social Credit, and included M.J. Coldwell, leader of the CCF. While they were representative of all sections of Canada no strong voice was heard from Quebec and it is noted that the only open supporters from the Maritime Provinces were in the Senate rather than the House of Commons.

Age and occupation of the legislators concerned with this subject had no bearing and while not considered significant, seventy-five per cent of those advocating closer ties with the Pan American Union were Anglicans or Roman Catholics.

Table II. - Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with the P.A.U. 1940-1946

Name		D.O.B.	R.O.	Rel.	Prof.	Pol. P.	Prov.
Adamson, A. R.	S.	1901	Eng. Cdn.	Ang.	Min.Engr.	C.	Ont.
Blackmore, J.H.	U.	1890	Sco. Cdn.	C. of J.C. L.D.S.	Teacher	(N.D.)SC	Alta.
Bracken, J.	Q.	1883	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Prof.	C.	Man.
Church, T.L.	A		Irish	Ang.	Lawyer	C.	Ont.
Claxton, B.	S.	1898	Eng. Cdn.	Ang.	Lawyer	L.	P.Q.
Coldwell, M.J.	S.	1888	Eng.	Ang.	Teacher	C.C.F.	Sask.
Duff, W.	(S) S.	1872	Sco. Cdn.	Presb.	Merchant	L.	N.S.
Fraser, G.K.	Q.	1891	Sco. Cdn.	Presb.	Director	C.	Ont.
Fulford, G.T.	S.	1902	Am. Cdn.	Ang.	Manuf.	L.	Ont.
Gouin, L.M.	(S) S.	1891	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	P.Q.
Green, H.	S.	1895	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Lawyer	C.	B.C.
Hansell, E.G.	Q.	1895	Eng.	Christ C.	Minister	S.C.	Alta.
Hanson, R.B.	U.	1879	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Lawyer	C.	N.B.
Hughes, J.J.	(S) S.	1856	Sco. Cdn.	R.C.	Merchant	L.	P.E.I.
King, W.L.M.	U.	1874	Sco. Cdn.	Presb.	Lawyer	L.	Sask.
MacKinnon, J.A.	U.	1881	Sco. Cdn.	Presb.	Man. Dir.	L.	Alta
Martin, P.	S.	1903	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	Ont.
MacInnis, A.	S.	1884	Sco. Cdn.		Motorman	C.C.F.	B.C.
Neilsen, D.W.	S.	1902	Eng.	Ang.	Teacher	U. Prog.	Sask.
Pouliot, J.F.	S.	1890	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	P.Q.
Raymond, M.	U.	1901	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Notary	L.	P.A.
Rose, F.	S.	1907	Pol.	Jewish	Electrician	L.P.	P.Q.

S. - Supporting Membership in P.A.U.

(S) - Senator

A. - Against Membership in P.A.U.

U. - Uncommitted

Q. - Asked Questions Only

D.O.B. - Date of Birth

R.O. - Racial Origin

CHAPTER IV
THE POST-WAR DECADE

The encouragement which advocates of Pan-Americanism had reason to feel during 1943-1945 was short-lived. The cessation of hostilities and post-war developments brought a marked change in the outlook for Canadian participation. Although a public opinion poll in 1947 indicated a slight increase in the number of persons with some knowledge of the Pan-American Union (30 per cent as compared to 28 per cent in 1944) and approximately the same percentage of informed persons in favour of it (22 per cent) there was clearly not the "wide general appreciation" of its purpose and responsibilities which in 1944 had been suggested by Prime Minister Mackenzie King as necessary for Canadian participation. It was apparent that the attitude of those who help mould Canadian policy and opinion - political leaders, career diplomats, pressure groups and the press - were becoming increasingly cool towards the idea. The rising tide in favour had receded with unexpected suddenness.¹

The conclusion of the Treaty of Rio in 1947 and the unofficial statements of two prominent Americans gave fresh

1. Eugene H. Miller, "Canada and the Pan-American Union", in the International Journal, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Winter 1947-48) p. 34.

impetus to the debate in Canada. On April 14, in a Pan-American Day address, Senator Vandenburg, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, expressed the wish that the "continental fellowship" would be rounded out through Canada's association "on some appropriate basis".² His views were warmly endorsed editorially by several leading United States newspapers and by Mr. Sumner Wells, former Under Secretary of State who visited Canada as the first lecturer of the Dafoe Foundation.³

Editorial comment in Canadian papers on these proposals were neither widespread nor sustained. Several papers, both French and English which had formerly advocated membership had now altered their views and opposed closer ties.⁴ An important defection from the cause was the CCF Party, which now took the view that Canada outside the Union might be "a greater source of strength and of more value to the world than Canada as part of the Pan-American Union". This attitude was probably inspired by a sense of the over-riding importance of the United Nations, by disillusioning experience with Latin American bloc techniques at international conferences; and by

2 New York Times, February 13, 1947 quoted in Spencer, RC, Canada in World Affairs - 1946-1949, Oxford, Toronto 1959, p. 350.

3 Soward, F.H. and Macaulay, A.M., Canada and the Pan-American System, Toronto, 1948, p. 32.

4 Miller, Eugene H., "Canada and the Pan-American Union", in the International Journal, Vol. 3, No. 1, (Winter 1947-1948), p. 34.

suspicions about American hemisphere defence policies.⁵

On April 23, 1947, Mr. T.L. Church (Broadview) asked the government whether there had been any change "regarding Canada joining the so-called Pan-American Union" and whether Canada could join such a union without the consent of Great Britain and the other dominions. Mr. St. Laurent, Minister of External Affairs replied "No" to the first question and "Yes" to the latter.⁶ These questions were the only specific reference to the P.A.U. in the House of Commons during the 1947 session.

One of the most effective and comprehensive arguments against membership in the Pan-American Union was made in 1947 by a distinguished Canadian, although not a Member of Parliament. The Right Honourable Vincent Massey, former Minister at Washington and High Commissioner to London and later Governor General of Canada, in a vigorous speech in Calgary and later in a written article in Maclean's magazine pointed to the less resolute action of Latin America in the Second World War, argued that trade with Latin America, which must always remain a tiny fraction of Canada's total, was unlikely to be influenced by political ties, and suggested that the only real defence of the Americas lay not in hemisphere solidarity but in an effective system of world security.

⁵ Spencer, R.A., Canada in World Affairs, 1946-1949, Oxford, Toronto, 1959, p. 331.

⁶ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1947, p. 2328.

He insisted that for Canadians, inter-American questions meant largely Canadian-American questions and that Canada's prestige would suffer by being assimilated to the position of one of the twenty Latin American republics. He concluded that the slogan "hemispheric solidarity" had been overworked, and that traditional links to the Commonwealth and Europe made the Western hemisphere "mean less to us than the Northern hemisphere". He suggested that in this case water unites and land separates.⁷ Some of the arguments used by Mr. Massey would not hold today in light of the changed international situation but his opinion did have a considerable impact on public opinion at the time and perhaps more so within the Liberal party of which Mr. Massey was a supporter.

The actual signing of the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro by the United States and eighteen other Latin American republics took place on September 2, 1947. No specific provision was made for Canada in the Treaty, but the security zone which it defined consisted of a gigantic irregular ellipse, which included Canada and Greenland, and the phrase in Article 22 permitting adherence by an "American State" (not "American Republic") was clearly drafted with Canada in mind. The signing of the Treaty again

⁷ Massey, Vincent, "Should Canada Join the Pan-American Union?", in Maclean's Magazine, August 15, 1947, p. 22, 44-47.

brought forth limited discussion in the Canadian press but in Ottawa the government preserved a discreet silence, and the reaction to questions by correspondents was variously described as "embarrassed silence" or "keen but non-committal interest".⁸

Mr. John Foster Dulles, the United States Republican Party's expert on foreign affairs addressed the Canadian Club of Toronto on March 8, 1948. With characteristic bluntness he urged Canada to take a fuller part in the expression of solidarity of the Americas. This speech brought forth an angry reply on the following day in the House of Commons by Mr. T.L. Church, (Broadview) who said:

I think the doctrine of Pan-Americanism that he was advocating is dangerous. Some of these Latin Republics in South America have not been friendly to Britain and it was Britain who gave the Americas the protection they had at sea, as the Munro doctrine was the supremacy of the British fleet. I am surprised at Canadian Clubs having speakers like that. I do not belong to them because at times some of them are not any more Canadian than some of the Empire clubs are Imperial. It was a great mistake to have a speaker like that at that time. There should be no attempt to trifle with the question of Pan-Americanism. These Latin republics will lead us into a war if we join and follow them.⁹

It was expected that the most embarrassing and difficult time for the Canadian government would come in the spring of

⁸ Spencer, R.A., Canada in World Affairs, 1946-1949, Toronto, 1959, p. 334.

⁹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1948, p. 2016.

1948 when the Ninth Inter-American Conference met at Bogota to draft the charter for the Organization of American States. The desire of the American republics to include Canada in their union is seen in the use of the term "American States" instead of "American Republics" and in leaving the Charter open for signature indefinitely. However, the Bogota Conference passed almost unnoticed in Canada and Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East) during a lengthy review of international affairs in the House of Commons on April 29, 1948, made no reference whatsoever to Latin America or this important conference in Colombia. Likewise, the 1949 session of Parliament passed without any questions being asked or any reference in debate to Latin America or the Organization of American States. All energies now seemed to be directed along more traditional paths towards the creation of a North Atlantic Treaty.

On his first visit to Washington after assuming the office of Prime Minister, Mr. St. Laurent summed up Canada's position in respect to Latin America during a press conference on February 12, 1949:

Our government has been given thought to the Pan-American Union over a great many years and our relations with members of the Pan-American Union have always been most satisfactory. The angle from which this has been examined is as to whether our active participation in the Pan-American Union would be productive of any real advantage for any of its members. Our cultural, our trade relations, with other members of the Pan-American Union have always been very good and they will improve constantly. So far, it

has not appeared to us that there would be any decided advantage in a formal membership in the Pan-American Union.¹⁰

The general election of June, 1949 returned Mr. St. Laurent and the Liberal party to power. That there was to be no change in the attitude of the Canadian government towards Latin America became clear when the Hon. Lester Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs appeared before the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on External Affairs on November 18, 1949. When questioned by members of the Committee concerning Canadian membership in the Pan-American Union, Mr. Pearson said that the evidence indicated that there was relatively very little interest in Canada one way or another. While he did not think there was much opposition to Canada joining the P.A.U., there was certainly no widespread desire that we should. He said that the Northern hemisphere is a little more important to Canada than the Western hemisphere and that all our lines of contact are across the North Atlantic. He could "see no particular necessity for other than normal friendly contacts with the countries of South America", although he conceded that these contacts were increasingly important and that Canada had developed an important trade with that area.¹¹

¹⁰ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1953, p. 3341.

¹¹ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings, No. 1, November 18, 1949, p. 20, 21.

Mr. Pearson did not know of any important disadvantages for Canada in joining the P.A.U. He thought that if the Latin American countries wanted Canada in the P.A.U. they would approach us in which case Canada would have to give serious consideration to the matter. He concluded by saying that "we do not want to take the initiative at this time". Canada, he said, was already a member of a number of international clubs and involved in too many other things. Mr. Pearson was asked his opinion on Mr. Vincent Massey's book "On Being a Canadian" wherein in one chapter he warns of the dangers of Canadian membership in the Pan-American Union. Mr. Pearson replied that "with due respect to my old chief, I doubt that the disadvantages would be as great as he expects".¹²

Foreign affairs debates during 1950 and 1951 sessions of Parliament were concerned primarily with the strengthening of NATO and the Korean war. During a session of the House of Commons Standing Committee on External Affairs on May 22, 1951, Mr. Stick (Trinity-Conception) raised the question of Canada's participation in the O.A.S. The Secretary of State for External Affairs read into the record what Prime Minister St. Laurent had said on the subject in 1949 (see above) and stated "It remains our policy".¹³

12 House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings, No. 1, November 18, 1949, p. 20, 21.

13 Ibid, May 22, 1951, p. 18.

During the 1952 session, Mr. A. Phileas Cote (Matapedia-Matane) moved a motion in the House of Commons that the government take the necessary steps so that this country can be called the Kingdom of Canada. He argued that one of the reasons why Canada had never been able to get accepted into the Pan-American union was that the Americans think it would mean the destruction of the Munro doctrine. They regard Canada as an annex of Great Britain. "If that change could be brought about," he said, "I believe we would be welcome at the Pan-American Union, and that is most important".¹⁴

The expansion of Canadian diplomatic and consular missions and trade commissioner posts in Latin America has been more for economic than political reasons and it has been no secret that the main objective in this region was an increase in trade. However, many Canadian staple products are complementary to South American products and Canadian manufactured goods compete with those of America, Britain and Germany. Consequently Canadian trade with Latin American republics has never really flowered. In an attempt to expand sales in Latin America, Hon. C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, headed a trade delegation comprised of government officials and business men which visited nine countries (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Cuba and Mexico) between January 5 and February 10, 1953. This

14 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1952, p. 1462

visit was given tremendous play by both the Canadian press and the press of the Latin American republics. Mr. Howe and his delegation were wined and dined everywhere in a most lavish fashion; innumerable speeches were made by the Canadians and South Americans. "A great feeling of friendship and solidarity was engendered. Canadian exports to Latin American countries were little affected".¹⁵

Mr. Howe reported on the tour in the House of Commons on February 26, 1953. He described the warmth of the reception in Latin America and hoped "that we shall continue to work together in our programmes for the expansion of our economies".¹⁶ He made no reference, however, to closer political ties or the Pan-American Union. Earlier in the session, on February 11, 1953, Hon. Lester Pearson, Minister of External Affairs, speaking during the estimates debate for his department, referred to "our relations with Latin America which are growing in importance both politically and culturally". "It was the policy of this government," he said "to foster that growth and to strengthen our relations with this increasingly important part of the world". He pointed out that South America was the third largest trading area for Canada, our total trade with it having risen from \$33 million dollars in 1938 to over \$500 million in 1952,

¹⁵ Keirstead, B.S. Canada in World Affairs, 1951-1953, Toronto, 1956, p. 227.

¹⁶ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1953, p. 2419

almost equally divided between exports and imports. While our trade with Latin America averages only about six percent of our commerce with the world in general, it accounts for about one-quarter of our trade with all other countries other than the U.S. and U.K.¹⁷

Certain Canadian newspapers carried a report on March 26, 1953 concerning a press conference given by Mr. Edmond Turcotte, Canadian Ambassador to Colombia, during which the Ambassador was reported to have said that Canada eventually might join the Pan-American Union if the Union tendered such an invitation. The following day, in the House of Commons, Mr. Gordon Graydon (Peel) questioned the Prime Minister whether any steps in this direction were contemplated and whether the statement accurately reflected government policy. The Prime Minister replied that the government policy on the subject had not changed since he last referred to the matter during a press conference in Washington on February 12, 1949 (see pages 54 and 55 above). The Prime Minister later reported to the House that on basis of information received from Mr. Turcotte, it was evident that he had been misquoted in the Canadian press, since the South American paper had carried correct versions of his statement which was to the effect that there existed no constitutional or juridical impediment to Canada joining the

17 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1953, p. 1850.

O.A.S. since Canada as an independent nation is free to determine its own policy regarding membership in any international or regional organization.¹⁸

The convening of the Inter-American Conference in Caracas on March 1, 1954 resulted in three questions being asked in the House of Commons. Mr. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert) asked the Minister of External Affairs whether Canada had received an invitation and whether Canada had observers there. The reply was "No".¹⁹ To Mr. P.E. Gagnon's (Chicoutimi) question as to whether Canada has any intention of becoming a member of the Inter-American system, the Minister's reply was simply that "the necessity for making such a decision had not arisen since we have not received such an invitation".²⁰ Mr. A. Holowach (Edmonton East), in addition to asking practically the same questions, wanted to know the reasons for Canada not becoming a member. Mr. R. Pinard, replying on behalf of the Minister of External Affairs, stated that Canada's position on this subject was given by the Prime Minister in his speech to the House on March 27, 1953.²¹

18 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1953, p. 3341, 3448

19 Ibid, p. 1954, p. 2527.

20 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1954, p. 2748

21 Ibid, p. 3280 - 3282.

When Mr. Pearson appeared before the Commons Standing Committee on External Affairs on April 13, 1954, he was asked by Mr. Richard (Ottawa East) "are we being invited any more to join the O.A.S.?" and "is the Government still considering the matter?" Mr. Pearson replied that "the matter is not under active consideration". He mentioned that at the Inter-American Conference in Caracas in March, 1954, the General Secretary of the O.A.S. in his opening remarks, deplored the absence of Canada, but that there had been no other reference to Canada during the meetings. Mr. Richard thought that "Canada might be more popular and welcome than some other countries in the P.A.U."²²

Two years later, on April 12, 1956, in the External Affairs Committee, Mr. Richard (Ottawa East) again asked the Minister "Have we been invited recently to join the O.A.S.?" Mr. Pearson replied "No", but went on to say our relations with Latin American states are growing in importance and intimacy. He pointed out that we have diplomatic contacts in nearly all these states and that "we have given increasing emphasis to our contacts with Latin America though we have not yet formally joined that particular club".²³

²² House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 3, April 13, 1954, p. 69 - 70.

²³ Ibid, Evidence No. 1, April 12, 1956, p. 27.

The most outspoken champion of Canadian participation in Inter-American affairs during this period was Mr. Georges Villeneuve (Roberval), who for three years running raised the subject in the House of Commons. In a strong speech on March 30, 1954, he argued that Canada should have been represented at the Caracas conference where our voice would have been listened to more so than that of the United States since we have had no special interest in those countries. He pointed out that the conference had decided to establish an Institute of Inter-American Economic Cooperation and of three universities requested to send delegates (one of whom would become director), two were Canadian, Laval and St. Francis Xavier, thereby indicating recognition of our management achievements and the success of the cooperative movement in Canada. He added that through joining the Pan-American Union, we would render assistance to our neighbours thereby demonstrating our faith in Pan-Americanism, consolidate our trading efforts in that area, and in view of Latin American culture being of similar origin to our French culture, we would enhance the prestige of our bilingual and bicultural character.²⁴

In his second speech on May 2, 1955, he pointed out that while Canada has held aloof officially from the great Pan-American movement, she had often taken part in the proceedings of the specialized agencies from the first medical

²⁴ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1954, p. 3513.

conferences held in Washington in 1893 up to the economic conference held in Rio de Janeiro in November 1954.²⁵

On August 1, 1956, Mr. Villeneuve made one of the longest and probably the most elaborate speech ever heard in the House on this subject.²⁶ He began by describing a visit he had made to the headquarters building of the P.A.U. in Washington.

Upon entering the large room called the hall of the Americas, I had a strange feeling of incompleteness, a sensation of false solidarity. It was incomplete and false because, quite evidently, in this salon des Amériques, Canada was absent. Nevertheless, when we and other tourists visit the older building of the Pan-American union, the guide usually calls attention to the coat of arms of Canada, which, with those of the other American countries, adorns the exotic patio.

Our surprise was even greater when, amongst the other flags waving in the spring breeze we saw the Canadian red ensign flying with pride and prestige amongst those of the other members of the Pan-American coffee bureau. The presence of these two symbolic emblems of our country made the absence of Canada all the more singular.

Mr. Villeneuve then described in considerable detail the principles of the charter of the Organization of American States, the organization of the O.A.S., and mentioned the many specialized agencies of the organization. He then proceeded to rebutt the old arguments against Canadian participation, and suggested economic, cultural, military and political

25 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1955, p. 3375

26 Roussin, M., LeCanada et le Systeme inter-american, Ottawa, 1959, p. 235

reasons in support of Canadian membership. He said the O.A.S. has an outstanding record of peaceful and useful years. By joining the O.A.S. Canada would complete the continental unity within the framework of the UN's Article 51, whose charter recommends wherever possible the setting up of regional organizations. He concluded by saying:

There is no doubt that through adherence to the Organization of American States, Canada would not only complete the continental solidarity, but would at last contribute to the American community of nations her prestige, her experience, her objective approach to world affairs, and in so doing, we would enlarge our own horizons in the international field and increase our influence among the other nations of the world. 27, 28

Later the same day, August 1, 1956, Mr. W.B. Nesbitt, (Oxford) pressed the Minister of External Affairs for a direct reply as to whether the government was contemplating joining the O.A.S. Mr. Pearson replied "I do not think it would be true for me to say that there is any immediate likelihood of our going into the O.A.S., but it is something which we should keep under consideration". This was the last official statement on the subject made by the Minister of External Affairs, or in fact, by any member of the government prior to the Liberal defeat in the election of June 1957.

27 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1956, p. 6612, 6613 6614, 6615.

28 The author of this thesis discovered that Mr. Villeneuve obtained background information and technical advice in preparation of this speech from Dr. M. Roussin of the University of Ottawa, an outstanding Canadian authority on inter-American affairs.

Summary

The following Members of Parliament referred to the O.A.S. in speeches made during the period 1947-1957:

<u>Supporting Canadian Membership in the O.A.S.</u>			<u>Against Canadian Membership in the O.A.S.</u>		
Cote	L	Ont	Church	C	Ont
Richard, J.T.	L	Ont		<u>Questions</u>	
Villeneuve	L	Que	Church	C	Ont
	<u>No Advantage</u>		Diefenbaker	C	Sask
Howe	L	Ont	Gagnon	I	Que
Pearson	L	Ont	Graydon	C	Ont
St Laurent	L	Que	Holowach	SC	Alta
			Nesbitt	C	Ont
			Stick	L	Nfld

This period saw the transformation of the Pan-American Union into the Organization of American States and the removal of legal and technical barriers to Canadian membership in the Organization. In spite of this and the apparent desire on the part of both the United States and Latin American countries to see Canada a member of the Organization there was almost a complete lack of interest on the part of Canadian legislators in the O.A.S. during the period 1947-57.

Both the Liberal Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs could see no particular advantage for Canada as a member of the O.A.S. The only active spokesman

Summary

for closer political ties with Latin America and full scale membership in the O.A.S. was Mr. Georges Villeneuve, a Liberal, French Canadian M.P. from Quebec. He had the support of two other Liberal French Canadians - one from Quebec and one from Ontario.

The interests of Canadians including their legislators were once again directed along traditional lines. As a result of the Cold War all efforts in the field of international affairs were concentrated on the strengthening of NATO and support of the United Nations in Korea.

Table III. - Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with O.A.S. 1947-1957

Name		D.O.B.	R.O.	Rel.	Prof.	Pol. P.	Prov.
Church, T.L.	A		Irish	Ang.	Lawyer	P.C.	Ont.
Cote, A.P.	S	1903	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Journ. Lawyer	L.	P.Q.
Diefenbaker, J.G.	Q	1895	Eng. Cdn.	Bap.	Lawyer	P.C.	Sask
Gagnon, P.E.	Q	1909	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Merchant	I.	P.Q.
Graydon, G.	Q	1896	Ir. Cdn.	U.C.	Lawyer	P.C.	Ont.
Holowach, A.	Q.	1914	Uk/Cdn	Uk. C.	Business	S.C.	Alta.
Howe, C.D.	N	1886	Am. Cdn.	Ang.	Consult. Engineer	L.	Ont.
Nesbitt, W.B.	Q	1918	Sco. Cdn.	C.ofE.	Lawyer	P.C.	Ont.
Pearson, L.B.	N	1897	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Diplomat	L.	Ont.
Richard, J.T.	S	1907	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	Ont.
Stick, L.T.	Q	1892	Br/Cdn.	Ang.	Manager	L.	Nfld.
St.Laurent, L.	N	1882	Fr.Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	P.Q.
Villeneuve, G.	S.	1922	Fr.Cdn.	R.C.	Notary	L.	P.Q.

S. - Supporting Membership

A. - Against Membership

D.O.B. - Date of Birth

N. - Sees no advantage in membership

Q. - Asked Questions Only

R.O. - Racial Origin

CHAPTER V

THE CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENT

The election of June 1957 brought to a close almost twenty-two years of Liberal administration in Canada. The Conservative Prime Minister, Mr. John Diefenbaker initially held the portfolio of External Affairs, but very soon invited Mr. Sidney Smith, then President of the University of Toronto, to assume the position. Mr. Smith accepted and in due course was elected as the M.P. for the riding of Hastings-Frontenac.

During his first speech in the House of Commons on November 26, 1957 Mr. Smith had high praise for the representatives of the Latin American republics whom he had met during his first official visit to the U.N. He spoke of the contribution in men and equipment which Brazil and Colombia were making to the UNEF and of the increased exchange of personnel, visitors and business between Canada and Latin America which has taken place since 1945. It was his hope that the cordial relations which now exist with those twenty nations will be enhanced and increased.¹

The President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, visited Ottawa on July 9, 1958 and addressed a combined meeting of the Senate and House of Commons. He spoke, in particular of Canadian-United States relations, of trade between the two

1 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1957, p. 1517.

countries and other countries, of NATO and NORAD, but there was no mention of inter-American affairs or relations with other states of the Western hemisphere.

The Hon. Sidney Smith, Secretary of State for External Affairs appeared before the House of Commons Standing Committee on External Affairs on August 4, 1958. During the questioning Mr. Richard (Ottawa East) asked the Minister whether, since his taking office, Canada had been asked to join any organization or alliance or economic programme in order to counter the communist interests which are active at this time in South America. Mr. Smith replied that no such approaches had been made since he assumed office nor had Canada been invited to join the Organization of American States.

Mr. Pearson (Algoma East) mentioned that there had been talk of holding a conference of the heads of government of American states with the view to studying this whole question of communist expansion and asked if we are to conclude from the remarks of the Minister "that Canada had not been invited to participate in this conference?" Mr. Smith replied that recently several South American countries had made proposals concerning a meeting of inter-American states (but not under the aegis of the O.A.S.) at the chief of state level, to discuss political and economic problems of our hemisphere. He said similar proposals had been made by Brazil and Colombia and also by the Rockefeller Foundation

which had recently published a report on the subject. The United States Senate had also been debating a resolution proposing a conference of this nature. Mr. Smith pointed out, however, that no conference had yet been called so there had been no official discussion of Canadian participation. "If we receive an invitation our decision will depend on the agenda and of our probable contribution to its success".²

On March 5, 1959 Hon. Sidney E. Smith appeared again before the External Affairs Committee of the House of Commons. Mr. Smith devoted practically the entire meeting to a discussion of the pros and cons of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. It was the longest single dissertation by a Minister on the subject. He introduced the subject by reference to his trip to Latin America in November 1958 when he spent two weeks in Brazil, two days in Lima, Peru, and five days in Mexico during the installation of a new president of that republic. Mr. Smith said he learned not only some geography but some psychology during his trip. "It seems", he said, "that the Latin Americans do not think of the American hemisphere as being divided into two continents. They start with the concept that it is a continental whole including South America and North America". He pointed out that there were two factors

² House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 3," August 4, 1958, p. 29, 30.

raised in his discussions with the Latin Americans, one economic. They would like to get help from Canada. The other field is political. They feel that if Canada would join the Americas it would present an unbroken front vis-a-vis the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Smith pointed out that in view of the revised terms of the charter of the O.A.S. all Canada need do would be to ratify the charter and she would automatically be a member. However Canada would not do that without being assured that she was welcome in the Organization. On the other hand, the Latin Americans would not want to extend an invitation to Canada to join unless they had satisfied themselves through "preliminary soundings - and that is what is being done now" - as to whether Canada would be prepared to accept a formal invitation.

The Minister then went on to discuss the various obligations which would be involved in joining the O.A.S. He thought that if Canada were a member she would be morally bound to sign the Rio Treaty of reciprocal assistance. This would involve participation of our military planners and possibly other collaboration in that field. Membership would also lead to an expansion of our diplomatic representation in all Latin American countries; establishment of a mission to the O.A.S. in Washington; attendance at a large number of meetings and conferences, and the granting of about 40 scholarships per year

to Latin American students. Mr. Smith said that the initial costs of membership was estimated at something in excess of \$1 million a year.

In looking for the advantages which might accrue to Canada through joining the O.A.S., Mr. Smith thought these would be of more subtle nature and some of them would not be realized for some time. In the eyes of Latin Americans there is no better way of showing our interest and friendship equal to joining the O.A.S., "where our absence has been glaring indeed to some of those countries". He was of the opinion that Canada's membership in the O.A.S. "would have the advantage of giving the whole British Commonwealth more intimate contacts with Latin America". There was he said also the possibility of the new West Indies Federation becoming a member of the O.A.S.

Mr. Smith touched on other matters frequently raised in connection with Canadian membership in O.A.S., i.e. Canadian-American relations vs Canadian Latin-American relations, and problems of exchange and credit in respect to trading with Latin American countries. Mr. Smith pointed out the indirect **benefits** to Latin America through Canadian membership in other international organizations such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and N.A.T.O. He stated that he would be greatly concerned that if joining

the O.A.S. would involve us in a situation where we might have to cut down our efforts in these various organizations. During the questioning by members Mr. Smith assured the Committee that there was no present intention on the part of the Government to join the O.A.S.³

In 1954 a professor of political science at Brandon College, Manitoba, Mr. Heath N. Macquarrie published an outstanding article in the Dalhousie Review on pan-Americanism. In this article he traces the complete evolution of pan-Americanism and regrets the lack of interest shown by Canadians on this matter. Mr. Macquarrie was elected to Parliament as the member for Queens, PEI, in 1958 and during the budget debate on April 22, 1959 he raised the subject of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. While there were times when Canada did not control its foreign policy and could not join and in fact would not have been welcome as a member, he said times have changed and that Canada is most heartily welcome at this time. He concluded by saying:

I believe it would be a most valuable step considering the present world conditions, if Canada moved to make complete the hemispheric solidarity in the Western hemisphere and become a member of this very successful international organization, the Organization of American States.

³ Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 1," March 5, 1959, p. 8 - 18.

We have much in common in the diplomatic field with its members and I think our role could be not only a successful one but an important one, indeed perhaps great.⁴

Mr. Howard Green (Vancouver) became Minister of External Affairs following the sudden death of Hon. Sidney Smith in 1959. In his initial speech on foreign affairs after assuming the portfolio during the estimates debate he reviewed the world situation, however he made no reference to Latin America during this speech. Mr. Green appeared before the Commons Standing Committee on External Affairs on March 11, 1960. During the questioning he was queried by Mr. McCleave (Halifax) and Hon. Mr. Martin (Essex East) on the Government's position in respect to the O.A.S. Mr. Green felt we could do a great deal more to strengthen our relationships with Latin America. He spoke of recent visits to Canada of distinguished Latin Americans and mentioned that the Prime Minister was going to Mexico in April 1960 and that he himself planned to visit Argentina, Chile and Peru in May 1960. As to actual membership in the Organization of American States, the Minister said he was "weighing the pros and cons and expect to be in a better position when I have visited those countries".⁵

⁴ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1959, p. 1959, 2844.

⁵ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 4," March 11, 1960, p. 98, 99.

As mentioned by Mr. Green when he appeared before the Standing Committee, this period saw a number of important visitors in Ottawa from Latin America, including Foreign Ministers Dr. Ignacio Luis Arcaya of Venezuela and Dr. Horacio Lafer of Brazil, and the Mexican head of state, President Lopez Mateos, all of whom urged a revision of Canadian policy towards the O.A.S. The occasion of the visit of Dr. Lafer of Brazil on March 16, 1960, sparked a question in the House of Commons by Mr. Hazen Argue (Assiniboia) who asked the Minister of External Affairs whether in view of the growing importance of the Latin American Republics Canada is considering joining the O.A.S. Mr. Green replied that "The whole question of Canada's relationship with our neighbours in Latin America is under consideration."⁶

Many observers thought Mr. Howard Green was convinced that Canada should join the O.A.S. At least he frequently spoke of looking "forward to an intensification of trade and political relations" with Latin America.⁷ In April 1960 Prime Minister Diefenbaker became the first head of government from Canada to visit Mexico. Questioned about the

⁶ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1960, p. 2128, 2129.

⁷ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 4," March 11, 1960, p. 97-99.

possibility of Canada joining the O.A.S. the Prime Minister said that Canada might send an observer to the quinquennial O.A.S. Conference in Quito, Ecuador in May 1961.⁸ This statement was taken by some to be a step towards membership.

On the eve of Mr. Green's departure for a tour of several South American states, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Pearson (Algoma) asked the Minister if he had any comment to make about reports that have emanated from some Latin American quarters that Canada is about to be welcomed into the O.A.S. Mr. Green again stated that no government policy had been decided upon.⁹

Mr. Green reported to the House on his South American tour during the supply debate on July 14, 1960. He had visited Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru and Mexico. When speaking of Chile, he mentioned that country's appreciation for the assistance given by Canada at the time of the serious earthquakes and floods in early 1960. The Minister stated that a Latin American division was being set up within the Department of External Affairs and he hoped it would be possible in the near future to open a Canadian embassy in

8 "The Prime Minister's Visit to Mexico", External Affairs, June 1960, p. 668.

9 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1960, p. 4075.

one of the Central American countries. Mr. Green suggested that Canada "would be wise to develop a western hemisphere outlook to a much greater extent than we have such an outlook at the present time". For many Canadians he said the Western hemisphere consists of Canada and the United States and we do not seem to realize that there are millions of people beyond the Rio Grande who are playing a very important role in world affairs and who are anxious to have closer relations with Canada. He concluded by saying:

Many Western hemisphere problems involve us as we happen to live in the Western hemisphere and we cannot get away from the effects of many of the events which take place on this side of the Atlantic. I suggest it is about time that Canadians realized that fact".¹⁰

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Pearson, speaking on the same day, pressed Mr. Green for a statement on Canadian-Cuban relations and for a definite statement of government policy in respect to Canadian membership in the O.A.S., and in this connection referred to a report in the Vancouver Sun of June 17, 1960 which quoted Mr. Green as saying "Canada should join the Organization of American States if its long term aim is to share in world leadership."¹¹

The same supply debate heard Mr. Health Macquarrie

¹⁰ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1960, p. 6297, 6298.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 6307.

make one of the longest speeches on record in the House of Commons in support of Canadian membership in the Organization of American States. He outlined the history of the O.A.S. going as far back as 1890, and reviewed most of the arguments raised against Canadian membership in that organization. To those who would say we are not ultimately concerned about that part of the world, he would say "In this modern world one cannot rope off any area and say 'In this part we are not interested', and to those who say 'don't get involved', he would say 'we are involved'". He argued that we should not always ask ourselves what will membership mean to Canada in terms of economic gain or increased prestige but rather what contribution can Canada make in the international field. He concluded with:

If the government should decide to play its full part in this organization, I think the people of Canada would welcome the move (...) I hope Canada will be at the conference (Quito) as an observer and that this will open the door to full-fledged participation in this important international body.¹²

Two other Members of Parliament speaking in the supply debate supported Canadian membership in the O.A.S., Mr. Hazen Argue and Mr. L. Pigeon. Both stressed the need to improve economic conditions in Latin American countries

¹² Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1960, p. 6323 - 6327.

and with the spectre of communism especially in Cuba, Mr. Pigeon declared that "continental security will not be fully assured until we have merged into a single unit the Canada-United States international defence commission and the inter-American defence commission".¹³

Later in the same debate, Mr. Green explained that he might have been misunderstood by the press in Vancouver because the words he used were "It might be that the time had come for Canada to join the O.A.S.". He then went on to make the following statement, which indicated either a cooling on Mr. Green's part toward the idea of membership or a misinterpretation by the public of his earlier pronouncements on the matter:

I believe that there is some value in letting the Canadian people do a little thinking about the question of whether they want this nation to join the O.A.S. in order that we may see what the reaction of public opinion will be. As I said, this is quite a step forward or backward, depending on the viewpoint of the person making the speech. I think it would be a step forward but it is of sufficient importance to warrant some time being given for consideration of the matter by the Canadian people.¹⁴

When Canadian assistance to the newly-formed West Indies Federation was being discussed, Mr. Pearson said he considered that the proposal that Canada join the O.A.S. had a bearing on the subject. At that time, Mr. Green asked

13 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1960, p. 6351, 6348.

14 Ibid, p. 6375.

the Leader of the Opposition whether he thought Canada should join the O.A.S. Mr. Pearson hedged in his reply, saying he was hoping for guidance from the Minister of External Affairs, who has decided in his wisdom that public opinion should be allowed to brood a little longer. While not criticizing that, he pointed out one result of joining the O.A.S. would be that we would be considered by those states as a kind of North American contributing partner and we would want to participate in any form of economic assistance that might be agreed to by that organization. He pointed out that the U.S. was doing a great deal of that and it was therefore desirable for Canada to increase its assistance of every kind to this new nation which is within the Commonwealth.¹⁵

On January 20, 1961, Mr. Green announced the establishment of diplomatic relations with Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama and Ecuador, and stated that Canada had formally accepted an invitation to send observers to the 11th inter-American conference to be held in Quito later in 1961. This announcement was welcomed by Mr. Herridge (Kootenay West) on behalf of the N.D.P. On that occasion, Mr. Pearson remarked that while there seemed to be some doubt about government policy in respect to membership

15 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1960, p. 6384.

in the O.A.S. he thought a decision would have to be taken before long, especially in view of our acceptance of an invitation to send observers to the next meeting of the O.A.S.¹⁶

In January, 1961, Mr. Diefenbaker told reporters in Jamaica that Canada could maintain good relations with Latin America by diplomatic means. This was interpreted to mean that Canada would definitely not join the O.A.S.¹⁷ But Mr. Green made it clear in the House on April 26, 1961 that the government was still waiting for an indication of approval for such a step from the majority of Canadians. He said some branches of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs had undertaken to study the question and to let him know the results. He also suggested that MPs discuss the subject with their constituents.¹⁸

Mr. Martin (Essex East) spoke shortly after Mr. Green and suggested that in matters such as these a government must not always wait for the expressed opinion of the people. In foreign affairs "a government must fearlessly assume a position of leadership". He believed the time may have come when Canada should sign the Bogota Charter and join

16 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1961, p. 1255.

17 Preston, Richard A. Canada in World Affairs 1959 to 1961, Toronto, 1965, p. 179.

18 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1961, p. 4027.

the O.A.S.¹⁹

The leader of the Opposition, Mr. Pearson, speaking the following day, supported Mr. Martin's remarks that we should not wait for a report from the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. If we are to recognize the new menace of communist penetration in Latin America and if we feel that it can best be handled through collective action, he was of the opinion that then "perhaps the time has come for Canada to join the O.A.S."²⁰

The Secretary of State for External Affairs appeared before the Commons Standing Committee on May 3, 1961. Mr. Green was questioned by Mr. Martin as to whether he had changed his views in respect to Canadian membership in the O.A.S. After considerable argument as to what the Minister had said previously on the subject, Mr. Green said that "he was still of the view that the Canadian people should be given some time to consider what the best policy for the country would be".²¹

Mr. Martin said it was difficult to understand the government's position on this matter. He referred to the Prime Minister's visit to Mexico, Mr. Green's trip to South

19 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1961, p. 4033.

20 Ibid, p. 4084

21 House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 2", May 3, 1961, p. 65.

America, and various statements by the Minister, all suggesting sympathetic consideration to this problem and now the Minister takes the position that "this is a matter on which the Canadian people must be allowed to express their views". Mr. Martin held that in matters of foreign policy the government should take a firm stand and then take its chances in Parliament. He suggested that this attitude of waiting for a greater expression of opinion could be regarded as dilatory and dangerous, and in the case of foreign affairs, decisions must be taken by the government with its appreciation of all the facts, all of them not being open to public. Mr. Green did not agree on this point and said former prime ministers, and Mr. Mackenzie King was no exception, "have waited some times for a very long time before making a decision on policy".

Mr. Green said that when he attended the United Nations in the fall of 1959 he decided then that we could be on more friendly terms with Latin American countries and that with so many new countries joining the United Nations their friendship was important to us. He spoke of measures being taken in the diplomatic field to improve Canadian relations with Central and South American countries. However as for membership in the P.A.U./O.A.S. he was of the opinion that "the Canadian people have simply not paid much attention to that question down through the years". He said that at

one time we would not have been welcome in the organization, now everyone wants us to join it; the Latin Americans, the United States and the United Kingdom would like to see us join. "I think it merits consideration by the members of Parliament and by the Canadian people (...) and sufficient thought has not been given to the question to make it wise for the government to decide".²²

Mr. Macquarrie remarked that under Mr. Green's leadership that Canada had developed closer and better relations with Latin America than ever before. Mr. Martin challenged this statement and said relations between Canada and Latin America have always been most harmonious and that is the way a historian of Mr. Macquarrie's eminence would want to stay on the record.²³

Mr. Macquarrie asked the Minister if he "sensed in his statement in the last session any expression of Canadian opinion that would lead him to believe that the populace is more kind to this move?" He referred to a gallop poll taken ten years earlier which indicated 80 per cent of the people of Canada did not know what the Pan-American Union was. Mr. Green believed that there was a much greater awareness of the problem now and that had been increased by the troubles

²² House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 2", May 3, 1961, p. 65, 66.

²³ Ibid, p. 67.

in Cuba. The trouble in Cuba he said also had an effect on the question of Canada joining the O.A.S. "some people say it proves that we should not join the O.A.S., that we should have nothing to do with it. Others say it proves that we should get in and help straighten things out". He felt that the Cuban problem had been a complicating factor in the whole question.²⁴

One of the strongest invitations for Canadian membership in the O.A.S. was extended by President John F. Kennedy during his visit to Ottawa in May 1961. Speaking to a combined meeting of the Senate and House of Commons, he said:

The hemisphere is a family into which we were born, and we cannot turn our backs to it in time of trouble, nor can we stand aside from its great adventure of development. I believe that all the free members of the Organization of American States would be both heartened and strengthened by any increase in your hemispheric role. Your skills, your resources, your judicious perception at the counsel table, even when it differs from our own views - are all needed throughout the inter-American community. Your country and mine are partners in North American affairs; can we not become partners in inter-American affairs?²⁵

This invitation caused considerable embarrassment and the propriety of such remarks by a visiting head of state was the subject of considerable discussion at the time. Even if the government of Canada had been seriously considering joining the O.A.S., any immediate action could have been

²⁴ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No.2", May 3, 1961, p. 67, 68.

²⁵ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1961, p. 4964.

construed as Canada taking direction from the United States and accused in some quarters of being an American satellite.

Mr. Diefenbaker, in reporting to the House on his talks with the President, stated that the President would welcome Canadian participation in the Organization of American States. He had assured the President that his views would be the subject of serious consideration but he told the House that "so far as this question is concerned, which has been a continuing one throughout the year for the consideration of the government of Canada, it is still in that category", and ~~if~~ no commitments were made or would be made without Parliament being made aware in advance of such action.²⁶

Mr. Martin (Essex East) was in a somewhat more hesitant mood when he spoke in the House on May 19, 1961, saying that while he had previously indicated that it was his view that the time had come for Canada to join the O.A.S., he was prepared with the Prime Minister to give further consideration to this important matter. While he could see merits in the O.A.S. in dealing with economic matters of the hemisphere, there were some, he said, who would use the O.A.S. to maintain the status quo in certain Latin American countries. and others who would like to see the O.A.S. developed in a military organization which he thought would be a serious

26 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1961, p. 5039.

mistake.²⁷

On July 5, 1961, Mr. Herridge (Kootenay West) questioned the Minister of External Affairs in respect to certain press reports on July 4 which suggested that Canada had decided to defer membership in the O.A.S. but intended to play a greater role in Latin American affairs. The Minister replied that there was no change to the previous position of the government on this matter.²⁸

Canada sent a group of observers to the meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at Punta de Este, Uruguay in August 1961. This group was headed by Mr. Pierre Sevigny, Associate Minister of National Defence. In comments made to the press during the meeting, Mr. Sevigny stated that the Latin American countries regarded Canada as an important link with the United States in finding a solution to their economic problems, that these countries need money, that they need scientific and technical training for their people and he spoke of the necessity of Canada extending economic aid. Mr. Martin (Essex East) drew attention of the House to these remarks and stated that the government could find itself in an embarrassing and contradictory position if it did not follow through by recognition of

27 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1961, p. 5043.

28 Ibid, p. 7550.

Canada's responsibility to those Latin American countries.²⁹

Mr. Sevigny reported to the House on September 7, 1961 on the Punta del Este meeting but made no reference to membership in the O.A.S. He was followed by Mr. Heath Macquarrie who was also an observer at Punta del Este and a strong supporter of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. Once again, he reviewed many of the old arguments both in favour and against membership. Mr. Badanai (Fort William), who was born in South America, joined in the discussion and recommended that Canada join the O.A.S. and Mr. Martin once more advocated membership.³⁰

Mr. Green announced on September 7, 1961 that Canada had decided to apply for membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America. He also mentioned that as a result of President Kennedy's speech to the Canadian Parliament in May 1961, Canadian interest in Latin America was at a higher peak than at any time during the last twenty-five years. The Leader of the Opposition said he had hoped the Minister would announce membership in the O.A.S. and said he detected a cooling on the part of Mr. Green towards membership in that organization.³¹

²⁹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1961, p. 8067.

³⁰ Ibid, p. 8080, 8084, 8113, 8200.

³¹ Ibid, p. 8202, 8203.

Mr. L.J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assumption-Montcalm) speaking in the debate on the speech from the Throne during the 1962 session regretted that Canada had not yet become a member of the O.A.S. He thought that "by belonging to the O.A.S. Canada would be in a much better position to explain to its neighbours of the other Americas and often to the United States, the role of the Commonwealth in the world as an instrument of peace and prosperity". He pointed out that no other country possesses that double British and American nationality nor the advantages of having friends in those two vast regional organizations. But in order to succeed in this "delicate and important mission" of bringing these two organizations together, Canada must fully belong and without second thoughts to the O.A.S.³²

During the spring session of 1962, Parliament voted the sum of \$2,500 for the gift of a totem pole to Mexico to commemorate the sesquicentennial anniversary of the independence of that republic. Mr. Martin suggested during the Supply Debate that the citizens of that country would regard one of the most effective ways for Canada to observe the event would be to join the O.A.S.³³

During these years, the Senate, as usual, tended to ignore the inter-American system and only when Canadian-

32 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1962, p. 115, 116

33 Ibid, p. 1608

United States relations were threatened were a few voices heard. On February 7, 1962, Senator J.W.deB. Farris (Vancouver S.) criticized the government for failing to cooperate with the United States in respect to trade with Cuba and failing to join the O.A.S. or to provide a clear-cut statement of government policy in respect to the latter subject.³⁴ Senator Farris had the support of three other Liberal senators, D.A. Croll (Toronto-Spadina), A.W. Robeuck (Toronto-Trinity) and D. Smith (Queens-Shelburne)³⁵ who were all opposed to the government's trade policy with respect to Cuba. Senator Smith pointed out that the volume of Canadian trade with Cuba was not great and spoke of the harm it was doing to Canadian-United States relations. He was particularly critical of a remark alleged to have been made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Hon. G. Hees, that Cuba "was the best friend an exporter could have". The government stand was reviewed and defended by Senator G. Thorvaldson (Winnipeg-South).³⁶

Although some Canadians objected to the unsolicited advice of President Kennedy, the question of Canada's entry into the O.A.S. did not disturb Canadian-American relations.

34 Canada, Senate Debates, 1962, p. 96.

35 Ibid, p. 205, 209, 255.

36 Ibid, p. 250.

The situation with respect to Cuba was, however, another matter. The course of events following the Castro revolution led to a divergence of opinion in Canada and more extreme disagreement between Canadians and Americans. No official statement in differences between the two governments ever appeared but it was obvious that their views on Cuba were far apart.

The imposition on October 19, 1960 of the American embargo in all trade with Cuba except foodstuffs and medical goods at once raised the question of Canadian policy. Canada would supply much of the machinery and spare parts that the Cubans could not now obtain from the United States. The Americans had talks with the Canadian government before putting the embargo into effect, nevertheless Prime Minister Diefenbaker made it clear that Canada had no intention whatsoever of imposing any embargo on Canadian goods in Cuban trade.³⁷ The Canadian government did take the stand that American goods covered by the embargo should not be allowed to reach Cuba by way of Canada and export regulations were amended accordingly. Canada also applied against Cuba the control over strategic goods that she applied generally and no permits were issued after 1959 for equipment which may be regarded as having strategic significance.³⁸

37 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1960, p. 60.

38 Ibid, p. 60.

There was considerable speculation in Canada about the possibility of increased trade with Cuba and Cuban officials went out of their way to publicize the trading negotiations. This led to the belief in the United States that the Canadians would do anything for a fast buck. In fact there was no increase in trade after the initial rise in November 1960. The Cubans were short of foreign exchange and the balance of trade in Canada's favour drained Cuba of her dollar reserves. A further point, missed in the United States, was the fact that American trade in foodstuffs and medical goods outside the embargo was many times greater than that of Canada.³⁹

Americans were dismayed that Canada did not join readily in the common cause when danger threatened so close to home. But as both Mr. Diefenbaker and the Canadian press suggested, Canadian policy was based on the belief that Castro's drift to Moscow had been at least partially caused by a mistaken American policy. It was thought that maintenance of ~~normal~~ diplomatic and economic relations by **Canada** might help preserve some Cuban ties with the West. Although Canada could not contemplate with ignominy the establishment of a Sino-Soviet base in North America, many Canadians disliked the American assumption that the United

³⁹ Preston, Richard A. Canada in World Affairs 1959 to 1961, Toronto, 1965, p. 181.

States had a duty to overthrow a Communist oriented government of native origin.⁴⁰

During the period 1961-62, many questions were raised in the House of Commons concerning trade with Cuba and especially the registry of Canadian-owned ships delivering goods to Cuba. On October 2, 1962, the Minister of External Affairs in replying to a question from Mr. Martin, explained that the withdrawal of the Canadian commercial counsellor from Cuba did not reflect a change in government policy but the falling off in the amount of goods purchased by Cuba from Canada.⁴¹

The Cuban missile crisis was announced to the world by President Kennedy in his television address on the evening of October 22nd, 1962. The developments of the next seven days caused the world to hold its breath as the Soviet Union and the United States edged close to war. Various aspects of this situation could well be the subject of separate theses and the missile crisis will be considered here only in relation to speeches in the House of Commons and then only insofar as the remarks of the various speakers concerned the O.A.S.

⁴⁰ Preston, Richard A. Canada in World Affairs 1959 to 1961, Toronto, 1965, p. 181.

⁴¹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1962, p. 83.

Speaking in the House of Commons on October 22, 1962, shortly after the President's telecast, the Prime Minister suggested "a group of nations, perhaps the eight nations comprising the unaligned members of the 18-nation disarmament committee be given the opportunity of making an on-the-site inspection in Cuba".⁴² Mr. Pearson, Leader of the Opposition, who spoke after the Prime Minister, thought it proper that the United Nations and O.A.S. should be used for the purpose of verifying what is going on in Cuba. He went on to say:

Perhaps it would be possible for Canada to take part in the discussions which will be held before the Organization of American States because the President referred to them as Western hemisphere discussions. While we are not a member of that Organization, this would be a suitable occasion for Canada to participate in this particular meeting, if that can be done.⁴³

Mr. Robert Thompson, leader of the Social Credit Party, hoped that Canada would be able to make its influence felt in the O.A.S. even though not a member of that organization. He said "this is an appropriate time for us to assure the member countries of this hemisphere that we intend to play our part in this matter".⁴⁴ Mr. Herridge, speaking on behalf of the N.D.P. was very much relieved to know that the President was submitting the issue to the Security Council

⁴² Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1962, p. 805.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 807.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 808

and that the O.A.S. was being consulted.⁴⁵

A special meeting of the Council of the Organization of American States was convened on the evening of October 23, 1962, and the following day, unanimously adopted a resolution stating that Cuba had secretly endangered the peace of the continent by permitting the Sino-Soviet powers to have missiles on its territory capable of carrying nuclear warheads. The resolution recommended that in accordance with Articles 6 and 8 of the Treaty of Rio members take all measures, individually and collectively, including the use of armed force, to ensure that Cuba would not continue to receive military material and related supplies and to prevent Cuban missiles from ever becoming a threat to peace.⁴⁶

The resolution passed at the Special Meeting represented not only the greatest display of unity that the members had ever achieved on the Cuban problem, but also one of the highest levels of solidarity that they have attained on any question since the end of the Second World War.⁴⁷

This unanimity was referred to in the House of Commons by Mr. Pearson and Mr. Thompson during speeches on October 24, 1962, and the latter took the opportunity of suggesting to

⁴⁵ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1962, p. 808.

⁴⁶ MacDonalld R. St J., "The O.A.S. in Action", University of Toronto Law Journal, Toronto, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1964, p. 403.

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 404.

the government that "this is an ideal time for us to take our stand with our neighbours in this hemisphere and become a participating member in that organization".⁴⁸

In reply to a question from Mr. Pearson, the Prime Minister stated that Canada did not have an observer at the Special Meeting of the O.A.S. Later he was asked by Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena) whether any consideration has been given to joining the O.A.S. so that "we may use that forum for our activities". To this, the Prime Minister replied that he had nothing further to add to that which had been said on previous occasions and that Canadian membership or non-membership in the O.A.S. at this time "neither would contribute or detract from contributing to the desirable end all of us have in mind".⁴⁹

Two other members, Mr. L.P. Kelly (York West) on October 29, 1962 and Mr. Gerard Chapdelaine (Sherbrooke) on November 5, 1962 questioned the Prime Minister, if in view of the Cuban missile crisis, does Canada intend to become a member of the Organization of American States. To these questions, Mr. Diefenbaker gave the usual reply: "the matter has been under continuing review over a period of years, and when a decision is made, the House will be made aware thereof".⁵⁰

⁴⁸ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1962, p. 916.

⁴⁹ Ibid, p. 882.

⁵⁰ Ibid, p. 1030, 1280.

Post-Cuban Period

An article in the Ottawa Citizen on December 17, 1962 referred to the report produced by a four-man working group of the legal committee of the O.A.S. which had been directed to study the rules and procedures for admitting new members to the Organization.⁵¹ Referring to this article, Mr. Badani (Fort William) asked the Minister of External Affairs whether Canada is now prepared to join the O.A.S. Mr. Green gave the classic reply "the question has been under consideration for some time; when a decision is made it will be announced in the House in the usual manner".⁵²

Senator J.M. Dessureault (Stadacona), a member of the Canadian delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Conference held in Brasilia October 24 - November 1, 1962, reported to the Senate in a speech on December 21, 1962. During his remarks, he said that all the Latin American delegates with whom he spoke asked why Canada was not a member of the O.A.S. Speaking in a personal capacity, his reply was that he hoped this would come about soon.⁵³

During the discussion of the Estimates of the Department of External Affairs on January 24, 1963, Mr. Martin

51 Best, Jack, "Latin American Link - Canada Closes to Decision", feature in the Ottawa Citizen, December 17, 1962

52 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1962, p. 2758, 2759.

53 Canada, Senate Debates, 1962, p. 429

stated that "the Cuban crisis highlighted once again the need for Canada to take part in the O.A.S.". He referred back to the Minister of External Affairs' tour of South America, of the Prime Minister's visit to Mexico and the special invitation from President Kennedy to Canada to join the O.A.S. He said:

It will be recalled that it was a salutary experience to have ministers of the council of the O.A.S. meeting on the eve of the greatest crisis since World War II to discuss the possibility, indeed the likelihood of nuclear weapons being fired upon North America, and Canada not even being present at the meeting - of course, we have no reason to be there - but I recall the Prime Minister saying Canada, as an interested party might have had an opportunity of sitting at the table.

He concluded by saying "time was never more urgent for us to accept the long-standing invitation of every member of the O.A.S. and to join the Organization".⁵⁴

Mr. Robert Thompson, speaking soon after Mr. Martin, agreed that the need for Canada to join the O.A.S. was more urgent than ever, but chided the Liberals for not taking action when they were in government in view of the long-standing invitation to Canada to become a member. Mr. Thompson spoke of the communist penetration, the soaring population, and the moral and material aid which the Latin American countries are in need of and which could be supplied by Canada

⁵⁴ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1962, p. 3073.

from within the O.A.S. which is basically a non-military organization.⁵⁵

Mr. Health Macquarrie also shared the views of Mr. Martin as to the urgency of Canadian participation in the O.A.S. but wondered why he had not seen that action was being taken along these lines when he was a member of the government. He concluded with "this government has taken us further towards Latin America than his government ever did".⁵⁶

55 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1962, p. 3079, 3092.

56 Ibid, p. 3101.

Summary

The following Members of Parliament referred to the O.A.S. in speeches made during the period 1957-63:

<u>Supporting Canadian Membership in O.A.S.</u>			<u>Against Canadian Membership in O.A.S.</u>		
Argue	CCF	Sask	Nil		
Badani	L	Ont			
Dessureault	(S) L	PQ			
Farris	(S) L	BC			
Herridge	CCF	BC			
Macquarrie	PC	PEI			
Martin	L	Ont			
Pearson	L	Ont			
Pigeon	PC	PQ	<u>Questions:</u>		
Thompson	SC	Alta	Argue	SC	Que
<u>Uncommitted</u>			Badani	L	Ont
Croll	(S) L	Ont	Chapdelaine	SC	Que
Diefenbaker	PC	Sask	Howard	NDP	BC
Green	PC	BC	Herridge	CCF	BC
Roebuck	(S) L	Ont	Kelley	L	Ont
Sevigny	PC	Que	Martin	L	Ont
Smith	(S) L	NS	Pearson	L	Ont
Smith	PC	Man	McCleave	PC	NS
Thorvaldson	(S) PC	Man	Richard	L	Ont

(S) - Senator

During this period, no Member of Parliament openly voiced opposition to Canadian membership in the O.A.S. Support in favour came from the Liberals, particularly, Mr. Pearson, the Leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Martin, the Liberal foreign affairs critic, from the CCF and the Social Credit Party leader, Mr. Thompson. Mr. Heath Macquarrie was the only strong supporter from the Conservative benches.

The Prime Minister and his two Secretaries of State for External Affairs, Mr. Smith and Mr. Green were uncommitted although it was generally considered that Mr. Green was very much in favour, at least up until 1962.

More questions were asked and more speeches made concerning Latin America and the O.A.S. during this period than during any previous period. This applied not only in the House of Commons, but in the Standing Committee on External Affairs where one full session of the Committee was devoted to the merits of Canadian membership in the Organization of American States. While the majority of the speakers and questioners were uncommittal, the majority gave the impression that they were in favour of closer relations with Latin America. While a few Senators did make reference to Latin America and the O.A.S., they were far more concerned with Canada - U.S. than Canada - Latin American relations.

Table IV. - Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with O.A.S. 1957-1963.

Name		D.O.B.	R.O.	Rel.	Prof.	Pol.P	Prov
Argue, H.	S.	1921	Ir.Cdn.	U.C.	Farmer	CCF/Lib	Sask.
Badani, H.	S.	1895	Italian	R.C.	Manager	L.	Ont.
Chapdelaine, G.	Q.		Fr.Cdn.	R.C.		S.C.	P.Q.
Croll, D.	(S) U.	1900	Russ.Jew	Heb.	Lawyer	L.	Ont.
Dessureault, J.M.	(S)S.	1888	Fr.Cdn.	R.C.	Manuf.	L.	P.Q.
Diefenbaker, J.G.	U.	1895	Eng.Cdn.	Bap.	Lawyer	P.C.	Sask.
Farris, J. DeB.	(S)S.	1878	Eng.Cdn.	Bap.	Lawyer	L.	B.C.
Green, H.	U.	1895	Eng.Cdn.	U.C.	Lawyer	P.C.	B.C.
Herridge, H.W.	S.	1895	Eng.	Ang.	Forest Farmer	N.D.P.	B.C.
Howard, F.	Q.	1925	Eng.Cdn		Lab Org	N.D.P.	B.C.
Kelley, L. P.	Q.	1927	Eng.Cdn.	R.C.	Hockey P.	L.	Ont.
Macquarrie, H.	S.	1919	Eng. Cdn	Pres	U. Prof.	P.C.	P.E.I
Martin, P.	S.	1903	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	Ont.
McCleave, R.J.	Q.	1922	Eng. Cdn.	Pres	Lawyer	P.C.	N.S.
Pearson, L.	S.	1897	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Diplomat	L.	Ont.
Pigeon, L.J.	S.	1922	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Agric.	P.C.	P.Q.
Richard, J.T.	Q.	1907	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	Ont.
Roebuck, A.W.	(S) U.	1878	Eng. Cdn.	Ang.	Lawyer	L.	Ont.
Sevigny, P.	U.	1917	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Indust.	P.C.	Ont.
Smith D.	(S) U.	1905	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Dentist	L.	N.S.
Smith, S.	U.	1897	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Univ.Pres.	P.C.	Ont.
Thompson, R.	S.	1914	Eng. Cdn.	Prot.	Chiropracter	S.C.	Alta
Thorvaldson, G.	(S) U.	1901	Icelandic Canadian	U.C.	Lawyer	P.C.	Man.

S. - Supporting Membership

A. - Against Membership

D.O.B. - Date of Birth (S) Senator

U. - Uncommitted

Q. - Questions Asked, only.

R.O. - Racial Origin

CHAPTER VI

A MINORITY LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

A minority Liberal government headed by Prime Minister Lester Pearson assumed office following the general election of April 1963. Both the new Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Paul Martin, had over the years been advocates of Canadian participation in the Organization of American States and had been particularly vocal in this regard during their years in Opposition, especially during the period 1961-63. It was therefore natural for all those interested in Canada's foreign affairs to be watching closely for the stand being taken by the new government on this subject.

Members of Parliament and the public did not have long to wait. One of the first questions to appear on the orders paper of the new House of Commons was an enquiry by Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lake St John) as to whether the present government intended to have Canada join the O.A.S. To this Mr. Martin replied that "the matter was still under active consideration."¹

Three speakers in the Throne debate, Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. Thompson, and Mr. Macquarrie expressed surprise that there was no reference to the O.A.S. in the speech from the

¹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1963, p. 34.

Throne particularly in view of previous speeches by Mr. Pearson and Mr. Martin on the subject. In replying, the Prime Minister said that the previous government "could not make up its mind in five years and now it wants this government to do so in a few days". He disclaimed any pressures from the United States President for Canada to join and went on to point out that new criteria for membership was under consideration and there was also the question of Caribbean countries becoming members of O.A.S., all of which must be considered in reaching a decision on Canadian membership in that organization.²

In June 1963, Mr. A.B. Patterson (Fraser Valley) asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs if there was any basis in fact to a radio report that the Canadian government had made quiet representation with the view to joining the O.A.S. Mr. Martin replied that he knew nothing about the report and that there had been no change since May 20, 1963 when he answered a question in the House from Mr. M. Lessard.³ (mentioned above)

The Chairman of the Council of the O.A.S. visited Ottawa during July 1963 and had discussions with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On July 15 Mr. Robert Thompson referred to a statement in the press attributed to the Chairman that "Canada can now confidently be expected to join the O.A.S.

² Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1963, p. 49, 65, 68, 226.

³ Ibid, p. 578.

in the near future". Mr. Thompson asked the Minister just how near in the future Canada will be joining this organization. In replying Mr. Martin pointed out that "the chairman of the Council of the O.A.S. is also the newly accredited Ambassador to Canada of Costa Rica, resident in Washington and that a number of matters had been discussed during the Ambassador's visit to Ottawa, the subjects and details of which cannot be revealed".⁴

Following the above remarks made by Mr. Martin, the member for Esquimalt-Saanich, Mr. G.L. Chatterton asked the Minister to assure the House that before any decision is taken on Canadian membership in the O.A.S. the matter will be referred to the External Affairs Committee of the House. Mr. Martin stated that he could not assure what course of action would be taken but that the government would take the House into its confidence.⁵

On July 24, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Diefenbaker, referred to an article in the New York Times in which Mr. Martin was reported to have said that Canada could give active consideration to joining the O.A.S. only after the organization had decided to accept Jamaica, Tobago and Trinidad. Mr. Martin stated that there was no basis for this report and that there had been no discussions with the United States Secretary of State on this matter.⁶

⁴ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1963, p. 2179.

⁵ Ibid, p. 2179

⁶ Ibid, p. 2576.

Mr. Martin announced in the House on November 14, 1963 an expansion of Canada's program of economic assistance to the developing nations of the world. In addition to aid to the Colombo plan and a larger program for Africa including the French speaking states he announced a more comprehensive and sizeable Canadian program for the Commonwealth countries of the Caribbean and a further contribution to Latin American development in close cooperation with the inter-American development bank through the availability of new and additional lending resources.⁷

The Social Credit leader Mr. Robert Thompson, expressed pleasure at the announcement and in particular that this assistance will be aimed at further helping the Caribbean area - "an area right on our own doorstep, which is part of a volatile situation that could blow up any time as far as Latin America and the neighbouring area of Central America is concerned". In connection with the aid to Latin America, "of which there is no more needy part of the world" he wondered whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs might be considering tying in this materialist assistance with the moral aid for which the people of Latin America have been looking for a long time, that of Canada becoming a member of the Organization of American States. He said "This is a very important question, and we cannot very

6 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1963, p. 2576.

7 Ibid, p. 4718.

much longer avoid taking a decision on it".⁸

The Hon. Paul Martin, speaking during the discussion of the estimates of his department, on November 28, 1963 gave the House his first full scale report as Minister of External Affairs. In discussing Latin America he mentioned that the House was aware that for many years as a private member he had demonstrated his interest in the question of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. - a development which most Latin American countries attach considerable importance, as do a large number of Canadians. He also referred to the cultural, social and religious affinity which many Canadians have with the Latin American people. Mr. Martin then stated that this is a question "which cannot be settled summarily. There are many facts which the government must take into consideration and which are being carefully weighed." He stated that he had held discussions with the ~~Chairman~~ of the Council of the O.A.S. and with the President of the inter-American Bank. He also mentioned the discussions taking place within the O.A.S. on terms of membership and of the importance of the Caribbean area. All these matters he said were being "actively reviewed" by the government.⁹

Mr. Diefenbaker spoke immediately after Mr. Martin and referred to the many remarks made by the Minister while in

⁸ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1963, p. 4720.

⁹ Ibid, p. 5200.

Opposition especially during 1961 and early 1963 when he talked of the "immediate necessity of joining the O.A.S. But, today I don't think he is so certain". He said it is so easy to solve things when in opposition but a different story when one has responsibility. Mr. Diefenbaker stated that his government had considered this matter very carefully and decided "to expand the number of our trade missions and diplomatic posts in South America". When he visited Central America in 1961 he found widespread suggestion that Canada should join the O.A.S. When he asked for the reasons he was told "so that we will have you with us to stand up to the United States". Mr. Diefenbaker referred to a pamphlet issued by the Canadian-American Committee entitled "Canada and the O.A.S." which summarizes the reasons pro and con for Canadian participation, and then went on to say that "participation in insurrection, revolution, rebellion, and other international difficulty is something which we in Canada should not assume unless there are advantages far outweighing the difficulties." That was the reason, he said, which caused his government to delay taking action and it appeared that the same course was being followed by the Liberal government despite the views expressed by the Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs.¹⁰

¹⁰ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1963, p. 5204, 5213.

Mr. Andrew Brewin speaking in the debate on behalf of the NDP criticized the government for not indicating whether it favours membership in the O.A.S. but did not express a personal or party opinion on the subject. On the other hand, Mr. Robert Thompson, Social Credit, was disappointed that "There was not a more positive intention indicated" by the Minister. He thought that in view of happenings in Central and South America, Canada should be taking a greater interest in that area and that in some respects Canada was in a better position to help than the United States - "in real people". Here he was thinking of French Canadians with their Latin background together with experience of our modern form of government and productive techniques who would be immensely helpful "in making the concept of an Alliance for Progress in the Latin American countries". He concluded by saying the government should take a greater part in development of intercourse with Latin America immediately, not at some time in the future.¹¹

During his appearance before the Commons Standing Committee on External Affairs on December 5, 1963, Hon. Paul Martin mentioned that Canada had observers and in some cases actual participants at five different Latin American bodies.

¹¹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1963, p. 5220, 5225.

He said Canada attended for the first time in June 1963 a meeting of The Latin American labour ministers and had a delegation there in an observer capacity. He mentioned discussions which he had held with the president of the Latin American development bank, and the former president of The Latin American Economic Commission. These discussions he said enable us to establish further and further contact with Latin America. This is an area in which Canada has to take an increasing interest "an interest stimulated not only by potential economic advantages but also because of the fact that Latin America is a very important segment of the world where there are great movements underway that are as vital to the peace of the world as in many other areas". Mr. Martin felt that Canadians generally are unaware of the fruitful results which can flow from increasing contacts with Latin America and because of "the potential linguistic, cultural and spiritual heritage that is ours, we have to take advantage of this community of interest."¹²

During the same meeting of the Standing Committee on December 5, 1963, Mr. Martineau (Pontiac-Timiskaming) referred to the forthcoming talks between President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson. He asked the Minister whether Canada's adhesion to the Organization of American States would be discussed and if the government is in a position to tell the

¹² House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings No. 1, December 5, 1963, p.20.

Committee its attitude towards Canada's admission to the O.A.S.

In respect to the first question, Mr. Martin said that the subjects for discussion had not been decided upon. "The question of the O.A.S. is a matter which would depend on the attitude to be assumed by the United States government itself". He said that when the Prime Minister met the late President Kennedy at Hyannis Port the matter was not raised by the President. Mr. Martin felt that the government of the United States regards this as "a matter that depends on action to be taken by the Canadian government in the light of its consideration of what it should do."¹³

As to the second question posed by Mr. Martineau, the Minister said that his personal views on the subject are well known and that these are views which he has maintained for a quarter of a century in Parliament. He said no decision had been reached on this matter in the field of foreign policy. While there is considerable discussion underway among member states of the O.A.S. on the terms of membership which will be imposed on any new members he did not believe that the new electoral procedures would affect potential Canadian membership. "I am giving this question most careful consideration" Mr. Martin said, "but it has not reached the stage where I am in a position to make any recommendations, one way or another to my colleagues".¹⁴

¹³ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 1", December 5, 1963, p. 22.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 22.

In discussing the problem further, Mr. Martin said some people think that the economic and social conditions of Latin America are so serious that Canada has a moral obligation to assist these underdeveloped areas and this section of our home continent. He himself could not see the connection between membership in the O.A.S. and assistance to Latin America. "If there is a moral obligation, I think it exists whether we are in the organization or not". He emphasized that Canada has to assess its capacity to meet obligations in or out of the organization in light of other considerations and obligations to other areas of the world.¹⁵

Mr. Martin concluded by referring to the special relationship between Canada and the Commonwealth countries of the Caribbean. Some of these countries have been giving consideration to membership in the Organization of American States and "this may well have a very significant bearing on the consideration which is being given to this whole question".¹⁶

The second session of Canada's 26th Parliament lasted from February 18, 1964 to April 3, 1965. Early in the session two Quebec members, Mr. Gilles Gregoire (Lapointe) and Mr. Lucien Plourde (Quebec West) asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs what progress had been made concerning Canada's admission on to the O.A.S. In both cases, Mr. Martin

¹⁵ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 1", December 5, 1963, p. 23.

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 23.

gave the usual reply "the matter is still under consideration."¹⁷

Another Quebec member, Mr. G.C. Lachance (Lafontaine) speaking in the Throne debate when discussing economic conditions expressed the opinion that "if in joining the O.A.S. Canada is able to promote greater economic activity, it should not hesitate to join that organization".¹⁸

Speaking during the External Affairs debate in the Senate on May 7, 1964, Senator G.S. Thorvaldson (Winnipeg South) referred to the O.A.S. He said this is "another problem on which Canada must make a decision sooner or later". He mentioned the pattern which had developed during the last few years wherein a party in power has said "no" to Canadian membership in the O.A.S. and the opposition has said "yes", but when the opposition came to power it said "no" and the other party, "yes". He said Mr. Martin while in opposition said "yes" but today he says "let us not be too hasty".

Senator Thorvaldson did not commit himself and concluded:

I am not saying that I advocate joining the O.A.S. at the present time. I say it is one of the problems facing us and we are being subjected to considerable pressure from south of the border to become a member whether we like it or not.¹⁹

17 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 1284, 1964.

18 Ibid, p. 412.

19 Canada, Senate Debates, 1964, p. 417.

Senator Norman P. Lambert (Ottawa) spoke shortly after Senator Thorvaldson in the External Affairs debate. He deplored the inactivity of the Senate Standing Committee on External Affairs. He said that since its creation this committee tended to confine its deliberations to government legislation particularly assigned to it. In considering means of increasing the activity of the Committee he suggested a number of subjects, one of which was "closer association with the Organization of American States".²⁰

Canada's external aid program was discussed in the House of Commons on May 22, 1964 when the External Affairs estimates were being examined. At that time, Mr. Robert Thompson suggested that there should be an associate minister to look after underdeveloped areas in South America, the Caribbean and Africa. He said:

We hear a lot about it not being advisable for Canada to become too closely related to problems in the Southern hemisphere. How can we expect to be neighbours and convince them the way of life we have in Canada ... is the right way, if we do not reach out to them".

He went on to emphasize the great opportunities open for Canada in the Caribbean as well as in South America.²¹

During the same debate, Mr. Wallace Nesbitt, one of the Chief foreign affairs critics of the Conservative Party

20 Canada, Senate Debates, 1964, p. 420

21 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 3504.

wanted to know whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs had changed his mind about Canada joining the O.A.S. When Mr. Martin replied "no", he then said "apparently some of his colleagues have", to which Mr. Martin replied "wait and see". Mr. Nesbitt then put forth a rather unusual suggestion for one who had been cool towards Canadian participation in the O.A.S. He said that there were a great many arguments pro and con for membership in the O.A.S. but why not have a "trial run" in the form of observer status. This might be something like the United States membership in CENTO - a case where we gave advice but had no vote, although advice from such states is never too popular". To this suggestion, Mr. Martin indicated that the government had been thinking along those lines.²²

On July 21, 1964, Mr. Robert Thompson referred to the forthcoming meeting of the O.A.S. and in view of the fact that the Venezuelan government's suggestion of sanctions against Cuba was likely to receive widespread support at the meeting asked whether the government had been re-evaluating its position in regard to the O.A.S. To this the Minister (Mr. Martin) replied that while the government was re-evaluating its position, this particular meeting of the O.A.S. on sanctions.

²² Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 3497.

against Cuba would have no bearing on that re-evaluation.²³

On at least two occasions during the 1964 session Mr. Diefenbaker took the opportunity to remind Mr. Martin and the Prime Minister that during two election campaigns they had "promised acceptance of Canada as a member of the Organization of American States" and that this was a matter that was going to receive "prompt and effective action". Mr. Diefenbaker suggested that the apparent divergence of opinions between the countries of the O.A.S. and Canada in respect to Cuba indicated care must be taken on the part of Canada in joining the O.A.S. In replying, Mr. Martin denied stating at any time that Canada would join the O.A.S. and claimed that what he did say was "I thought that the time had come when we could review sympathetically Canadian participation in the O.A.S. and I have always personally indicated the view that Canada should be a member of that organization". He emphasized that while those were his personal views, he was now a member of a government and that in "these matters one should take great care". He pointed out that there were now new considerations in respect to this matter such as the possibility of Caribbean-Commonwealth membership in the O.A.S.²⁴

The Ninth Meeting of the Consultative Council of the Foreign Ministers of the O.A.S. countries on July 26, 1964

23 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 5736.

24 Ibid, p. 5737, 5997.

adopted 15 to 4 a resolution calling for the breaking of diplomatic and consular relations between the governments of American states and Cuba, suspension of all trade with Cuba except for foodstuffs, medicines and medical equipment, and the suspension of all sea travel with Cuba. In addition there was a paragraph urging all states, not members of O.A.S. that are animated by the same ideals of the inter-American system to examine the possibility of effectively demonstrating their solidarity in achieving the purpose of the revolution. On the following day, July 27, Mr. Robert Thompson asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the Canadian government had received any direct word from the O.A.S. in relation to Canada's stand on this resolution.

In replying Mr. Martin stated that "there had been no communications whatsoever". He went on to point out that successive Canadian governments in common with most western governments including virtually all members of NATO and OECD have consistently taken the position that diplomatic and trade relations do not signify approval of a particular regime. "This", he said, "continues to be the position of the government at the present time". He also pointed out that the export of arms and strategic materials from Canada to Cuba had been forbidden for several years - "indeed well before the decision to this effect was reached by the O.A.S."²⁵

25 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 5996.

In a speech at Banff on August 24, 1964, Mr. Martin said that membership in the O.A.S. was part of the "ultimate destiny" of Canada.²⁶ In this speech he reviewed the problems associated with Canadian membership in the O.A.S. and stressed that "we can do a great deal (about our hemispheric ties) even without becoming a member". He had in mind greater attention to Latin America by private Canadian organizations, and the universities, and the provision of economic aid by the government. Earlier on July 16, he had told the Commons Committee on External Affairs that a portion of the government's new development loans would be offered to Latin America through the inter-American bank.²⁷

In the House of Commons on November 19, 1964 Mr. R. Caouette (Villeneuve) asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs to comment on a report from Brazil that Canada had asked to join the O.A.S. Mr. Martin replied that the "report had no foundation in fact" and that the matter was "still under consideration".²⁸

Mr. Wallace Nesbitt speaking in the House on November 19, 1964 referred to Mr. Martin's speech at Banff and expressed grave doubts about joining the O.A.S. "One argument for joining has been that geographically we are in the same unit"

26 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 5996

27 Peyton Lyon, "Latin American Flirtation" in Canadian Annual Review for 1964, John Sayell, Toronto, 1965, xviii p. 531.

28 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 10248.

but he thought that while that may have been true in 1492 the jet age has made things rather different so that "geographically our interests today are much closer to Western Europe, Japan and the Soviet Union than Latin America". He pointed out that our present associations with Latin America are very satisfactory. We have diplomatic missions in all Latin American countries and in 1963 Canadian trade with Latin America amounted to \$650 million. At the same time, "we were not caught in the awkward position of being a member of the O.A.S."

We would be expected to pull the United States' chestnuts out of the fire and get our fingers burned. Mr. Nesbitt said the Canadian position in regard to the O.A.S. was similar to what "someone had said about Ireland and the Commonwealth - it is a question of how to be a member without joining".²⁹

In the House on the same day, November 19, 1964, Mr. Wolliams chided the Minister for his declarations on Canadian participation in the O.A.S. especially when sitting on the Opposition side of the House and his failure to take action since becoming Secretary of State for External Affairs. Mr. Wolliams left the impression that he was not in favour of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. He said "had we been a member of the O.A.S. we might have been prevented from opening up our avenues of trade with Cuba and China".³⁰

29 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 10261, 10262.

30 Ibid, p. 10275.

Mr. G. Baldwin (Peace River) also speaking in the House on November 19, 1964 referred to a report in the Christian Science Monitor the previous day which stated that legislators from fifteen Latin American countries were to meet in Lima, Peru December 6 - 11 to discuss the establishment of a continental assembly on the lines of the European Parliament in Brussels. The report indicated representatives would attend from the O.A.S., the inter-American Development Bank, Latin American Economic Commission, Latin American Free Trade Union, Central American Economic Commission, Inter-American Regional Labour Organization, Latin-American University Associations, and others. As to Canadian participation in such a meeting or of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. Mr. Baldwin was of the opinion that "this is a problem about which there is yet not enough known in this country". He then went on to make a very interesting suggestion.

I suggest to the Minister, that he give consideration during the next session to having this matter referred by means of a specific term of reference to the very able and active External Affairs Committee, that a debate might be initiated, the impact of which would be heard and felt throughout the country, so that the people would then be better prepared through knowledge and understanding, to participate in the decisions which will have to be made and will give their support. Because without the support of the people it is obvious that not too much can be done.³¹

Later in the same debate Mr. Martin said that while

³¹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964 p. 10292, 10293.

great emphasis is placed by some on the institutional aspect of inter-American relationships, Canada now belongs to a number of subsidiary organizations of the O.A.S. He pointed out that from our external aid program, of the fifty million dollar soft loan some ten million dollars are being provided Latin-American countries through the inter-American development Bank, for the first time.³²

Hon. Paul Martineau (Pontiac-Temiscomingue) on August 25 referred to Mr. Martin's speech at Banff and inquired whether there was any change in government policy as to Canadian membership in the O.A.S. Mr. Martin replied that there was "no change in policy" but that he took the opportunity to "explain our views and state our reasons".³³

On March 26, 1965 in reply to a question from Mr. Heath Macquarrie, the Secretary of State for External Affairs stated that Canada would send an observer to a conference in Rio de Janeiro dealing with the Alliance for Progress. On April 2, 1965, Mr. Macquarrie expressed his regrets that the Minister and the Prime Minister were unable to carry through their once obvious interests and lead Canada into the O.A.S. He said that under the Conservative ministers Mr. Smith and Mr. Green, great things were done in the Latin-American region.

32 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964 p. 10297.

33 Ibid, p. 7223.

but now felt that the momentum was lost - "particularly in the region which was formerly the British West Indies in which I feel we have a great opportunity and a tremendous obligation".³⁴

The final session of Canada's twenty-sixth Parliament lasted three months, from April 5 to June 30, 1965. The crisis in the Dominican Republic led to a number of questions being asked in the House of Commons and a limited amount of debate. On the 3rd of May, Mr. Diefenbaker asked the Prime Minister for a report on the Dominican situation and wanted to know whether he was in agreement with the President of the United States, that Communist conspirators were endeavouring to turn the Dominican Republic into another communist base. In replying, Mr. Pearson pointed out that the United States had intervened to protect its own citizens as well as those of other countries and while it has been stated that evidence exists indicating intervention in the Dominican Republic with the view to bringing about a Castro-type government, the Canadian government was not in a position to assess the evidence at that time. He also pointed out that "responsibility as stated by President Johnson for restoration of peace, apart from the country itself, is in the hands of the O.A.S. and that organization has a committee of five in that country".³⁵

34 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1964, p. 1289, 13013.

35 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1965, p. 830, 831.

Mr. Diefenbaker then attempted to compare the Dominican situation with the Cuban missile crisis pointing out at that time the Prime Minister (then in Opposition) "thought we ought to tell the United States we were one hundred per cent behind them and that we should join the O.A.S. without delay". Mr. Pearson insisted that the situation was not the same and during the discussion, Mr. Thompson asked the Prime Minister "if he did not think it would be advantageous at this time if Canada were a member of the O.A.S.". The Prime Minister simply replied that "he was interested to receive the Honourable Members opinion on this matter".³⁶

In reply to a question by Mr. Herridge as to whether the United States had the right to violate the sovereign rights of the Dominican Republic by landing marines, Mr. Pearson stated that it is well known in international law - and accepted by the O.A.S. - that a government has the responsibility of protecting its own people in situations of insurrection and disturbance.³⁷

On May 10, 1965 Mr. Wallace Nesbitt criticized the government for the lack of time given to debate on foreign affairs. During the course of his remarks, he said "Canada

36 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1965, p. 831.

37 Ibid, p. 831.

should and can understand better our relationship with Latin American countries but I do not think we should use the vehicle of the O.A.S. to do so"³⁸. He thought a better way would be through individual connections with the various countries and suggested we start with Mexico where we have good relations. He mentioned that members of United States Congress exchange visits with the Mexican Chamber of Deputies and that United States Congressmen and Canadian Parliamentarians exchange visits. He therefore suggested that members of the Canadian Parliamentary Association exchange visits with the elected representatives of the Mexican parliamentary body.

Following the despatch of an ad-hoc inter-American peace force to the Dominican Republic in May 1965, Mr. George Ball, United States Under Secretary of State made a speech calling for the creation of an inter-American peace force which would be maintained on a permanent basis for crises in the Western hemisphere. On May 12, 1965, Mr. Diefenbaker questioned the Prime Minister on the attitude of the Canadian government towards this proposal, whether it would have a detrimental effect on UN peace-keeping operations, and whether there had been any action by the government to participate directly or associate in membership in the O.A.S. Mr. Pearson replied that the government had noted Mr. Ball's speech and was obtaining more information. He stated that he would "generally prefer peace-keeping forces under the United

38 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1965, p. 1108, 1109.

Nations than regional organizations". He added that there had been no approach to the O.A.S. on this subject.³⁹

On May 28, 1965 Mr. Martin opened the debate on the estimates of the Department of External Affairs. In his review of the world situation he touched on the Dominican crisis. He announced that a senior officer of the Department of External Affairs, Mr. Michel Gauvin had been sent to Santo Domingo to support the work of the Canadian mission there. While the landing of United States troops in the Dominican Republic is the subject of controversy the Minister said Canada was grateful for the assistance provided by the United States for the protection and evacuation of Canadian citizens.

Mr. Martin said that while it ~~may~~ was easy to criticize U.S. actions there this criticism "might best be directed at the imperfections in our international organizations". Unilateral action is bound to create anxiety and he said it should be our object to work out arrangements which should make unilateral action unnecessary in the future".⁴⁰

Referring to peace-keeping operations, Mr. Martin emphasized that peace-keeping arrangements by regional organizations should at all times be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The roles

39 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1965, p. 1203, 1204

40 Ibid, p. 1776, 1777

of the O.A.S. and U.N. were complementary. While the Security Council of the United Nations did not specifically endorse the establishment of the Inter-American Peace Force, note of this action was taken by the Council, a cease-fire was ordered and the Secretary General was directed to send a representative to the spot.⁴¹

Mr. Diefenbaker, speaking after the Secretary of State for External Affairs, referred to the views taken by the Prime Minister and Mr. Martin in that Canada should not participate in peace-keeping operations in this hemisphere unless under United Nations control or direction. This, he said, seemed a long step backward from the views held by these Members from 1957 to 1962 when they both stood so firmly for joining the O.A.S. The Leader of the Opposition then went on to state his views on Canadian membership in the O.A.S.:

I confess that I believed we should join being accountry of the Western hemisphere until I met with representatives of South America and of Central America who one after the other told me - and not by collusion or arrangement among themselves - that, if Canada would only join they would have somebody else to stand with them against the United States. That to me did not justify Canada joining the O.A.S.⁴²

Mr. T.C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam) speaking on May 28, 1965 during the same debate said that no one can deny the right of the United States to go into a country to defend its nationals, but he was disturbed over whether the Johnson

⁴¹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1965, p. 1776.

⁴² Ibid, p. 1786.

doctrine had had replaced the Munroe doctrine "namely that the U.S. reserves the right at any time to intervene, unilaterally, whenever a country has a government, the ideology of which is unacceptable to the United States". Mr. Douglas said any O.A.S. peace-keeping force should have the approval of the United Nations. He denied being anti-American but said "I do not believe in dealing with moral issues by looking to see who is on which side".⁴³

The Secretary of State for External Affairs appeared before the Standing Committee on External Affairs of the House of Commons on June 22, 1965. Mr. Martin discussed at length the problems involved in the relationship between the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations and the regional agencies. The Minister had in mind the situation in the Dominican Republic and the use being made of the Organization of American States' Peace Force.

Mr. Martin pointed out that both the United Nations and regional agencies have a role to play in dealing with disputes or threats to the peace (but that enforcement action should not be taken without the approval of the Security Council). Even when a peace-keeping action, authorized and taken by a regional agency, does not constitute enforcement action, he considered it important for regional organizations engaged in any action involving the maintenance of international

⁴³ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1965, p. 1795, 1796.

security to conduct the operation in close association with the United Nations, which retains overall responsibility for preserving international peace and security.⁴⁴

The Minister said in the case of the Dominican Republic, when the O.A.S. sought to give the international umbrella to the peace-keeping operation, in the face of the inability of the United Nations itself to act, there was no decision by the Security Council. There was indeed an expression of opposition to the operation in the Security Council by the Soviet Union. While note was taken of the O.A.S. action by the Security Council, he did not think this could be implied as granting approval.⁴⁵

In the case of the Dominican Republic, certain practical considerations were involved. If a regional force had been proposed in the Security Council it would have been vetoed by one of the great powers. At the same time an effort was being made to maintain the peace and in the words of Mr. Martin "I suppose, it was more important in this stage of progressive development of international organization that there be peace rather than consideration as to what was legalistically desirable".⁴⁶ A similar situation developed in the Congo. There was no threat to the peace by a state operating against the Congo, but two factions within the state engaged in conflict

⁴⁴ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 4," June 22, 1965, p. 173.

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 180.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 182.

with one another in a manner that threatened the peace. However, Mr. Martin conceded that a lot of purists would argue that the United Nations itself would not have any authority to intervene in the Dominican Republic unless one regards the precedent in the Congo.

During the questioning in Committee, Mr. Nesbitt (Oxford) wanted to know how many members have actually paid up their dues in the O.A.S. and if not, as he understood many were in arrears, "who foots the bill?" Mr. Martin promised to obtain the information requested.⁴⁷

Mr. MacEwan (Pictou) then asked the Minister "whether in the existing circumstances the Canadian Government now feels it should be a member of O.A.S.?" Mr. Martin said this is a new subject and one on which he had promised Mr. Nesbitt in the House that he would make a statement. Mr. MacEwan replied that he would be prepared to wait provided the statement could be made at an early date.⁴⁸

Mr. Martin appeared before the Standing Committee again on June 29, 1965 and was prepared to make a statement on the O.A.S. He began his remarks with a review of Canadian aid to underdeveloped countries and referred to assistance to Latin America through the Inter-American Development Bank, but he never did get to speak on the O.A.S. as division bells

⁴⁷ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings No. 4, June 22, 1965, p. 180.

⁴⁸ Ibid, p. 184.

rang summoning Members back to the Commons.⁴⁹ The following day Parliament adjourned for the summer recess to reassemble on September 27 but on September 8 Canada's twenty-sixth Parliament was dissolved and a general election called for November 8, 1965.

In August, 1965 Canada received another invitation to join the Organization of American States. President Castelo Branco of Brazil visited Ottawa and in an interview with the Canadian press he said "I do believe Canada should join the O.A.S. Through its political and cultural organization it could make an important contribution".⁴⁹

During August, Prime Minister Pearson travelled to western Canada. Speaking at Banff he used the words "before long" and "soon" to describe the timing he had in mind for Canada's entry into O.A.S.⁵⁰ However knowledgeable external affairs officials suggested that these statements should be taken at their face value and that "the Prime Minister was employing a historian's - if not a politicians - sense of timing in discussing the subject". In fact, only a few days before, on August 23, 1965, External Affairs Minister Martin spoke with less enthusiasm. Speaking in Kitchener, Ontario, he said membership in O.A.S. itself is not "all important".

⁴⁹ Brenda Large, "Brazil Urging Canada to Enter the O.A.S.", in The Ottawa Journal, August 18, 1965, p. 1.

⁵⁰ The Ottawa Journal, August 28, 1965, p. 1.

He noted Canada has already joined five auxiliary organizations "implying that this step by step stroll into hemispheric affairs is a fast enough pace for the time being".⁵¹

While Canadian voters elected a larger number of Liberals to the House of Commons in November 1965 than in 1963 the result was another minority Liberal government. Following the election, Prime Minister Pearson took a short holiday in the Caribbean. While in that area he found time to pay official visits to Jamaica from November 28 to 30, 1965 and to Trinidad and Tobago from December 14 to 16. The communiques issued following these two visits both stated that the Prime Ministers had discussed the activities of international organizations such as the U.N. and O.A.S.⁵² Prime Minister Pearson even went further and "hinted at a press conference in Jamaica that Canada might act in unison with her less inhibited Commonwealth cousins Jamaica and Trinidad, in the matter of joining the Organization of American States".⁵³ For some time it has been known that several of the newly independent Commonwealth countries of the West Indies have been examining the feasibility of membership in the O.A.S. Their decision could have an important bearing on Canada's entrance to that organization. This, however, has the makings of another chapter in what has become one of the oldest and longest controversies in Canadian foreign affairs.

⁵¹ Canadian Press Report in The Ottawa Journal, Sep. 1, 1965, p. 17.

⁵² "Mr. Pearson Visits Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago" in External Affairs, Canada, Vol. 18, No. 2, issue of Feb. 1966.

⁵³ Lynch, Charles, "The O.A.S. and a Shy Canada", feature in The Ottawa Citizen, issue of Dec. 2, 1965, p. 7, col. 1.

Summary

The following members of Parliament referred to the Organization of American States in speeches made during the period 1963 - 1965

<u>Supporting Canadian Membership in O.A.S.</u>			<u>Against Canadian Membership in O.A.S.</u>		
Lachance	L	P.Q.	Diefenbaker	PC	Sask.
Macquarrie	PC	P.E.I.	Nesbitt	PC	Ont.
Martin	L	Ont.	Wolliams	PC	Sask.
Pearson	L	Ont.			
Thompson	SC	Alta.			
	<u>Uncommitted</u>			<u>Questions</u>	
Baldwin	PC	Alta	Brewin	NDP	Ont.
Douglas	NDP	B.C.	Caouette	Cred	P.Q.
Lambert (S)	L	Ont.	Chatterton	PC	B.C.
Thorvaldson (S)	PC	Man.	Gregoire R	Cred	P.Q.
			Herridge	NDP	B.C.
			Lessard	SC	P.Q.
			Martineau	PC	P.Q.
			MacEwan	PC	N.S.
			McCleave	PC	N.S.
			Patterson	SC	B.C.
			Plourde R	Cred	P.Q.

There was a slight increase in discussion and questions asked in the House of Commons concerning the O.A.S.

during the period 1963 - 1965. This was due in part to the Dominican crisis and the fact that both the Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs had so strongly advocated membership for Canada in the O.A.S. while in Opposition. The sole Conservative supporter continued to be Mr. Heath Macquarrie who was joined by the Leader of the Social Credit Party. Mr. Diefenbaker finally came out against Canadian membership in the O.A.S. and he had the open support of two other members of his party.

Except for one casual comment there were no comments pro or con from Quebec M.P.s although a good percentage of the questions asked were from French Canadians from Quebec.

Table V. - Biographical Data of Canadian Legislators Concerned with O.A.S. 1963-1965.

Name	D.O.B.	R.O.	Rel.	Prof.	Pol.P.	Prov.
Baldwin, G.W.	U. 1907	Eng/N.Z.	Ang.	Lawyer	PC	Alta.
Brewin, A.	Q. 1907	Eng.	ang.	Lawyer	NDP	Ont.
Caouette, R.	Q. 1917	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Salesman	R.deC.	P.Q.
Chatterton, G.L.	Q. 1916	Eng/S.Afr.	Prot.	Agrologist	PC	B.C.
Diefenbaker, J.G.	A. 1895	Eng. Cdn.	Bap.	Lawyer	PC	Sask.
Douglas, T.C.	U. 1904	Scot.	Bap.	Minister	NDP	B.C.
Gregoire, G.	Q. 1926	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	D.of Pub.	R.deC.	P.Q.
Herridge, H.W.	Q. 1895	Eng.	Ang.	Forest F.	NDP	B.C.
Lachance, G.C.	S. 1926	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	P.Q.
Lambert, N.P. (S)	U. 1885	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Business	L.	Ont.
Lessard, M.	Q. 1926	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Foreman	S.C.	P.Q.
MacEwan, H.R.	Q.	Scot. Cdn.	U.C.	Lawyer	P.C.	N.S.
Macquarrie, H.	S. 1919	Eng. Cdn.	Pres.	U. Prof	P.C.	P.E.I.
Martin, P.	S. 1903	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	L.	Ont.
Martineau, P.	Q. 1921	Fr. Cdn.	R.C.	Lawyer	P.C.	P.Q.
McCleave, R.J.	Q. 1922	Eng. Cdn.	Pres.	Lawyer	P.C.	N.S.
Nesbitt, W.B.	A. 1918	Scot. Cdn.	C.ofE.	Lawyer	P.C.	Ont.
Patterson, A.B.	Q. 1916	Scot. Cdn.	C.ofN.	Minister	S.C.	B.C.
Pearson, L.B.	S. 1897	Eng. Cdn.	U.C.	Diplomat	L.	Ont.
Plourde, L.	Q. 1930	Fr. Cdn.	P.C.		R.deC.	P.Q.
Thompson, R.J.	S. 1914	Eng. Cdn.	Prot.	Chiropracter	S.C.	Alta.
Thorvaldson, G.(S)U.	1901	Icelandic Cdn.	U.C.	Lawyer	P.C.	Man.
Wolliams, E.M.	A. 1916	Eng. Cdn.	Ang.	Lawyer	P.C.	Alta.

S. - Supporting Membership

A. - Against Membership

(S) Senator - D.O.B. - Date of Birth

U. Uncommitted

Q. Asked Questions Only

R.O. Racial Origin

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

While various individual party members have been opposed to or supported Canadian membership in the P.A.U./O.A.S. no political party in Canada has taken a public stand on the subject with the exception of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (C.C.F.).

C.C.F. Members of Parliament were the early proponents in the House of Commons of closer relations with Latin America and Canadian membership in the Pan American Union, advocating the attendance of observers at various meetings even if full-scale membership for Canada was not possible. Mr. J.S. Woodsworth, first leader of the C.C.F. Party, his successor Mr. M.J. Coldwell, and Miss Agnes MacPhail (United Farmers of Ontario but who tended to associate and vote with the C.C.F.) were often heard on this subject. This support for the P.A.U., beginning in the late nineteen thirties and strong during the war years took a sudden reversal about 1946. The C.C.F. then took the stand that Canada outside the organization might be a greater source of strength and more value to the world than Canada as a part of the P.A.U. This change in attitude was possibly due to a sense of the overriding importance of the United Nations, disillusioning experiences with Latin American bloc techniques at international conferences, and suspicions about United States hemispheric defence policies.

Since that time there has been no significant support from the C.C.F. or its successor the New Democratic Party (N.D.P.) although since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 and during the 1965 session of Parliament there have been some signs of personal interest in closer association with the O.A.S. on the part of a few N.D.P. members.

Mr. Mackenzie King was Prime Minister of Canada and leader of the Liberal Party for more than one-third of the period reviewed in this thesis. Prior to World War II he fended off suggestions for Canadian membership in the Pan American Union on the grounds that Canada had never been invited to join and that technically the organization was open only to republics. At no time did he ever express a personal or official opinion that Canada should be a member. However with the development of closer Canada - United States relations during the war years and especially after the signing of the Ogdensburg Agreement there was considerable expectancy that Canada would be invited to join. While not publicized at the time it is now known that the United States was opposed to Canada becoming a member as she feared this might provide Great Britain with a means of interfering in Latin American affairs. Had an invitation been extended at that time, in all likelihood Mr. Mackenzie King would have reacted favourably but by the end of the war his interest

had waned. Mr. King's wartime interest and that of members of the Liberal party in expanding diplomatic relations with Latin America were more economic than political. The aim was to pave the way for the development of trade on as large a scale as possible with that part of the world as soon as the war was over.

Hon. Louis St. Laurent who succeeded Mr. King as Prime Minister and leader of the Liberal party could see no decided advantage either for Canada or the Latin American countries through Canada being a formal member of the Organization of American States. This continued to be the policy of the Liberal government until defeated at the polls in 1957. Hon. Lester Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs in the St. Laurent government confirmed this position on several occasions emphasizing that the Government would not take the initiative in respect to membership in the O.A.S. and pointing out that Canada was already too occupied with other international organizations to be interested in joining another.

While in Opposition (1957-1963) both Mr. Pearson and Hon. Paul Martin who became the foreign affairs critic for the Liberal party, clamoured for Canadian membership in the O.A.S. They were particularly vocal in this regard during 1962 and 1963. Despite their stand while in Opposition and as so often happens, once they formed a Government in 1963, a more cautious

attitude was adopted. Both gentlemen continued to report that "the matter is still under consideration" and on occasion have stated that a decision would soon have to be taken. Speaking at Banff, Alberta in August 1964 Mr. Martin said membership in the O.A.S. is part of the ultimate destiny of Canada. On several occasions, Mr. Martin has pointed out that he personally favours Canadian membership in the O.A.S. but that he was not speaking on behalf of the Government of which he is a member.

The number of Liberal private members showing an interest in inter-American affairs remained relatively small over the years and in fact was not much larger than those in other parties. However all Liberal M.P.'s who did speak on the subject tended to favour closer ties with Latin America and Canadian membership in the O.A.S.

Up until 1958 Conservative Members of Parliament tended to be silent concerning the inter-American system. Those who did speak such as Hon. C.H. Cahan and Mr. T.L. Church were strongly opposed to Canada becoming involved, the latter being the strongest opponent of Pan Americanism in the House of Commons during the late nineteen thirties and forties. While Conservative leaders such as R.B. Hanson, John Bracken, and Gordon Graydon were prepared to support any moves which would increase Canadian trade with Latin America they were wary of any suggestions for closer political affiliation with those countries. They gave support to an expansion of trade and

diplomatic missions and bi-lateral agreements in the economic field but even in this they were somewhat hesitant in case any of these moves should tend to weaken Imperial and Commonwealth ties.

The late Sydney Smith spoke highly of Latin American diplomats whom he had met at the United Nations during the short period he served as Secretary of State for External Affairs. He was fully aware of the growing importance of these countries in ~~the~~ world affairs but there was no indication prior to his death that he had reached any conclusion on Canada's membership in the O.A.S. It was not until after Hon. Howard Green took over the External Affairs department following Mr. Smith's death, that the Conservative flirtation with Latin America began. In 1943, Mr. Green, as a private member made the statement in the House of Commons that Canada should be an active member of the Pan American Union provided such membership did not weaken Commonwealth ties. As Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Green, never came out with a definite statement that Canada should join the O.A.S. however his various statements, his travels, and his interest in that part of the world led people to believe that he favoured Canadian membership at least during the period 1959-62. It is difficult to say whether his cooling from then on was due to a change of personal view or as a result of the attitude of Prime Minister Diefenbaker on the subject.

Prior to becoming Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker refrained from discussing Canadian-Latin American relations. During his years as Prime Minister he supported Mr. Green's programme for closer inter-American relations and the expansion of diplomatic missions in Central and South America. In April 1960 Mr. Diefenbaker became the first Canadian Prime Minister to pay an official visit to Mexico. His replies to questions from reporters at that time, led some to believe that he was about to recommend membership for Canada in the O.A.S. However it was not until several years later, in 1965, when he was again Leader of the Opposition that he made his views known. Mr. Diefenbaker claimed that whenever he asked Latin Americans why they wanted Canada in the O.A.S. he always got the same reply which was "if Canada would only join they would have someone else to stand with them against the United States". This, for him was not adequate reason for Canada to join any organization. In light of this attitude by his Chief, Mr. Green's hands were tied, even if he had desired to pursue a closer political role with Latin America.

Despite the feverish activity by the Secretary of State for External Affairs support for his Latin American programme from other members of the Conservative party was conspicuously absent. With the exception of Mr. Heath Macquarrie there was hardly a Conservative voice raised in Parliament on

the subject. While this could not be interpreted that Conservative M.P.'s were not in favour of the Government's activities in this field it certainly indicated a marked lack of interest on the part of both M.P.'s and the public, a situation which had not changed from the end of World War II.

The Social Credit Party tended to remain silent on Canada-Latin American affairs until 1962. During the war years they followed the stand of the Conservatives on the subject. Since Mr. Robert Thompson assumed the leadership of the party he has been most vocal in support of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. It is assumed that he is speaking for the Social Credit Party although they have few M.P.'s and very little has been heard from any other member of the party on this subject. Mr. Thompson has directed a large number of questions to the Government on the subject and has referred to the O.A.S. in many speeches despite the short time he has been a member of the House of Commons. However the majority of these remarks have been general in nature, somewhat platitudinous and without much depth. After the general election of 1963 a number of Quebec members of the Social Credit Party broke from the Party and formed a new political party called Le Ralliement des Creditistes. While some members of this group have asked questions in the House concerning Canadian membership in the O.A.S. neither the Creditistes as a party or as individuals have taken a stand on the subject.

No summary of this nature would be complete without special reference to the three members of the House of Commons who have shown the greatest interest in inter-American affairs -- Paul Martin, George Villeneuve, and Heath Macquarrie. For close to thirty years, ever since his maiden speech to the Commons, Mr. Martin has been a strong advocate of Canadian membership in the P.A.U./O.A.S. Mr. Villeneuve made three major speeches on the subject during the short period he was a Member of Parliament. In his search for background information and in preparation of his speeches he had the assistance of Dr. Marcel Roussin one of the few outstanding Canadian authorities on Latin America. Mr. Heath Macquarrie, a former university professor had been, for a number of years prior to becoming a Member of Parliament in 1957, a strong advocate of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. On entering the House he became the strong and really only voice from the Conservative benches advocating closer ties with the O.A.S. If one were to delete the speeches and remarks of these three gentlemen from Hansard the references to inter-American affairs in the Canadian Parliament would be very shallow and superficial indeed.

Reference to Latin American affairs in the Senate was practically nil during the thirty years under review. A Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs was established in 1939 but did not sit during the war years as the Senators felt

discussion of Canada's foreign affairs might be considered as criticism of the governments' war efforts. Following the war this committee tended to restrict its activities to examination of government legislation specifically referred to it.

On a regional basis support for membership in the P.A.U./O.A.S. came from legislators representing all areas of Canada except the four Maritime provinces. Mr. Heath Macquarrie the ardent supporter of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. who represented Queen's, P.E.I. in the House of Commons was the lone exception. Even when the subject of trade with Central and South America was discussed in the House there was hardly a murmur from Maritime M.P.'s except in respect to West Indies trade. While Anglo-Saxon ties to Britain and the Commonwealth are strong in the Maritimes this lack of interest may have been due to a suspicion that any increase in shipment of goods to and from Latin-America would be through the United States Atlantic ports to Central Canada rather than via St. John and Halifax. It was assumed that support for closer ties with Latin America would be found in the Province of Quebec due to affinity of race, culture and religion, but a gallup poll in 1943 indicated that people in British Columbia were more knowledgeable in respect to the P.A.U./O.A.S. than any other province of Canada. While Cana-

dian newspapers and journalists have suggested strong support in Quebec for Canadian participation in the P.A.U./O.A.S. such a degree of interest is certainly not reflected in the speeches of French Canadian M.P.'s or Senators in Parliament.

Religion seems to have had little bearing on this matter although it was expected that there would be a certain affinity between the French Canadians and Latin-Americans since the great majority of both are Roman Catholics. However, in Canada support for closer ties with the O.A.S. came equally from Catholic and Protestant legislators. While not considered a determining factor in their decisions it is noted that the few legislators who openly opposed Canadian membership in the O.A.S. were all Conservatives, English Canadian and Protestants.

The ages and occupations of those participating in these debates have been analyzed but no conclusions are drawn. During the thirty years under review speakers (supporters and opponents) have been from all age groups and many occupations represented. As stated earlier lawyers tended to predominate however this is not considered significant in view of the high percentage of M.P.'s being from the legal profession.

There remains a great lack of interest and of knowledge on the part of both legislators and the Canadian public in respect to the inter-American system. This lack of interest is clearly indicated by the very small number of Members of Parliament who have spoken on this subject during the past

thirty years. It is of course understandable that a back-bencher in the House of Commons who may get to speak for only a few minutes during a session of the House is not going to devote this valuable time to a subject which will not catch the attention of the voters in his own constituency. The majority of M.P.'s who have asked questions in the House or have spoken on the subject have used the old platitudes of hemisphere solidarity and responsibility to underdeveloped countries and indicated a very superficial knowledge of the problems involved. In this regard, a worthwhile suggestion was put forward by Mr. Baldwin, P.C. Member from Peace River in 1964 when he recommended that the matter of Canadian membership in the O.A.S. be referred by means of a specific term of reference to the standing Committee on External Affairs so that the subject could be debated and thereby create a better understanding of the problem throughout the country.

Two events within recent years have brought the O.A.S. to the attention of the Canadian people. The Cuban missile crisis of 1962 led many Canadian to think that Canada should take a more active role in inter-American affairs.

On the other hand the Dominican crisis in 1965 was used by the more cautious to support their stand that Canada should not move too quickly in this area.

A moral responsibility for assistance to underdeveloped countries has been advanced by some M.P.'s as an

argument for Canadian membership in the O.A.S. This argument has been rejected by many including the present Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Martin, who says if there is such a moral obligation, then it exists whether Canada is a member or not a member of the O.A.S. In addition Canada is continuing to increase its assistance to Latin America through the inter-American Development Bank.

Two areas for further study of this problem are suggested. It is held by some that formal membership in the O.A.S. would lead to increased Canadian trade with Latin American countries whereas others believe that the same results can be achieved through bi-lateral agreements. The increase in trade with Latin America during the last fifteen years has certainly not increased at the rate prophesied by economic planners during World War II. Many Latin American exports compete with Canadian exports on the world market and in manufactured goods Canada competes with the United States for the Latin American market. Proposals have been made for free trade areas in Central and South America. These, too, could have an important bearing on Canadian trade with Latin America. It is therefore considered that an economic study examining these problems would result in a much clearer understanding of the trading opportunities which exist for Canada in Latin America.

A second area suggested for further study is the determination of whether Canada can afford to join the O.A.S.

Membership in the Organization would require an increase in our diplomatic staffs, a special staff at the O.A.S. headquarters in Washington, attendance of Canadian delegations at a large number of conferences and provision of scholarships for Latin-American students. Hon. Sidney Smith stated in 1959 that the Department of External Affairs estimated the costs of Canadian memberships in the O.A.S. would be no less than one million dollars per annum. With rising costs and increased activities of the Organization the figure today would likely be closer to one and one-quarter million dollars. In addition the Latin American countries would automatically expect greater financial assistance from Canada once she became a member of the Organization. There is a limit to what Canada can do and most people would be reluctant to reduce the assistance which this country is now providing in various parts of the world. One very important question then, is whether we can afford to join the Organization of American States without reducing our contributions elsewhere. If not what should be the priorities?

The newly independent Commonwealth countries of the Caribbean are giving thought to memberships in the O.A.S. Prime Minister Pearson and Mr. Martin, the Secretary of State for External Affairs have both stated that the decisions taken by those countries could have a bearing on the Canadian decision for membership in the Organization. Latin American countries

and the United States have all indicated that Canada would be welcome in the O.A.S. but would the welcome be as strong if Canada were to bring along her Caribbean friends?

A number of political scientists including Professors M. Roussin and R.A. Spencer writing on the subject of Canada and the O.A.S. have referred to a comment by a South American Ambassador in Ottawa in 1949 to the effect "During the war Canadian membership was a hope. Now it is merely an aspiration". On the basis of the interest and attitude of Canadian legislators as well as the general public the sentiments expressed by the South American diplomat some sixteen years ago are equally true today. However regardless of whether Canada becomes a member of the Organization of American States this country cannot ignore an area of the Western hemisphere whose population is expected to reach 650 millions by the end of this century.

ADDENDUM

JANUARY - AUGUST 1966

The first session of Canada's twenty-seventh Parliament opened on January 18, 1966. On the second day of the session Mr. T.C. Douglas (N.D.P. Burnaby-Coquitlam) referred to statements made by the Prime Minister at Banff and in Jamaica and asked Mr. Pearson whether the Government had made a decision to accept an invitation to membership in the O.A.S. if such invitation is proffered. In replying Mr. Pearson said the subject had been discussed with the Prime Ministers of Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago, but that in the expression of Canadian policy toward membership in the O.A.S. he had not gone beyond the statements previously made except to suggest to the two Prime Ministers that "it might be useful if the three countries, Canada, Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago should exchange information and, if possible, try to act in concert if an invitation to join that organization were received".¹

During the discussion of the estimates of the Department of External Affairs, in January and February 1966, Mr. Diefenbaker (PC - Prince Albert), Mr. Nesbit (PC - Oxford), Mr. Asselin (PC - Charlevoix) and Mr. Douglas (NDP Burnaby - Coquitlam), all referred to remarks made since the previous session by the Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs

¹ Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1966, p. 15

concerning possible membership for Canada in the O.A.S. Each of these speakers urged the Minister to make a clear statement of government policy on the matter.²

Mr. Martin replied that while discussions had been held with certain Caribbean countries in respect to this subject, no decisions had been reached on the matter.³

Mr. Nesbit continued to oppose membership for Canada in the Organization of American States and expressed the opinion that more advantages would accrue from bi-lateral agreements with the various countries of Latin America.⁴ In this he was supported by Mr. McCleave (PC - Halifax) and Mr. McIntosh (PC-Swift Current-Maple Creek).⁵ Two other Progressive Conservative M.P.'s, Mr. Bower (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare) and Mr. Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona) were opposed to Canadian Membership in the O.A.S.⁶ Mr. Heath Macquarrie (PC-Queens) once again offered his support to Mr. Martin in any move aimed at leading Canada into membership in the Organization of American States.⁷

2 Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1966, p. 754, 883, 927, 929.

3 Ibid, p. 927.

4 Ibid, p. 927.

5 Ibid, p. 741, 859.

6 Ibid, p. 647, 737.

7 Ibid, p. 690.

In the Senate, the Honourable A.J. Brooks (PC - Royal) speaking on January 26, 1966, expressed opposition to any move by Canada towards membership in the O.A.S. He said "there is simply nothing to gain--at this stage we would, in my view, simply be borrowing trouble".⁸

The Secretary of State for External Affairs appeared before the House of Commons Standing Committee on External Affairs on June 16, 1966. When questioned about Canadian membership in the O.A.S., the Minister stated that he "had nothing further to add to what was said last year in committee".⁹

The Commonwealth Caribbean - Canada Conference met in Ottawa July 6-8, 1966. The communique issued at the close of the conference contained the following paragraph:

19. The Commonwealth countries in the Western Hemisphere emphasized the great value they attach to their relations with the United States and the many countries of Latin America which make up the membership of the Organization of American States. Those participants in the conference whose countries would be eligible for membership in that Organization indicated their intention either to carry out a joint study of the question or to give one another the benefit of national studies which were being made. They also expect to consult together on this question in the months ahead.¹⁰

Parliament recessed for the summer on July 14, 1966.

⁸ Canada, Senate Debates, 1966, p. 47.

⁹ House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, "Minutes of Proceedings No. 9" June 16, 1966, p. 281.

¹⁰ "Final Communique" - Commonwealth Caribbean - Canada Conference, C/1, July 8, 1966, p. 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clark, Gerald, The Coming Explosion in Latin America, Toronto, Musson, 1963, xi - 436 p.

An examination of the broad forces at work in Latin America. Based on 50,000 miles of travel and contact with representatives of all levels of social and political strata. Provides a good description of conditions in Latin America in the early 1960s.

Canadian Institute of International Affairs -

Soward, F.H., et al, Canada in World Affairs, The Pre-War Years, Toronto, Oxford, 1941, xiii - 343 p.

Dawson, Robert MacGreggor, Canada in World Affairs, Two Years of War, 1939-1941, Toronto, Oxford, 1943, viii, -342 p.

Lingard, C.Cecil and Trotter, Reginald G., Canada in World Affairs, September 1941 to May 1944, Toronto, Oxford, 1950, xii, 320 p.

Soward, F.H., Canada in World Affairs, from Normandy to Paris, 1944-1946, Toronto, Oxford, 1950, xi - 359 p.

Spencer, Robert A. Canada in World Affairs, from UN to NATO 1946-1949, Toronto, Oxford, 1959, xi - 447 p.

Keirstead, B.S., Canada in World Affairs September 1951 to October 1953, Toronto, Oxford, 1956 xi - 268 p.

Eayrs, James, Canada in World Affairs October 1955 to June 1957, Toronto, Oxford, 1959, vii - 291 p.

Preston, Richard A., Canada in World Affairs 1959 to 1961, Toronto, Oxford, 1965, x - 300 p.

This series presents a factual outline of events with the author's analysis of Canada's participation in world affairs for the period covered. A valuable series for a student during research in the field of Canadian international relations.

Macdonald, H. Ian, Canada in Two Hemispheres, CIIA "Behind the Headlines" series, Toronto, Baxter, Vol. 23, No. 9, July 1964, 23 p.

Considers the problems of Canada's hemispheric relations. Points up certain fallacies in Canadian position and discusses capabilities and limitations in the economic field, with special reference to Canada's external aid programme.

Duggan, Lawrence, The Americas, The Search for Hemisphere Security, New York, Holt, 1949, ix - p. 242.p.

History and social problems of Latin American countries. Contains a synopsis of inter-American conferences from 1826 to 1948.

Dziuban, Stanley W., Military Relations between the United States and Canada 1939 - 1945, Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C. 1959, xv - p. 432p.

Reports on Canadian - United States military collaboration during World War II. Valuable background information from U.S. viewpoint on Ogdensburg Agreement, and early years of Permanent Joint Board on Defence.

Government of Canada -

House of Commons Debates 1935 - 1966.

Senate Debates 1935 - 1966.

House of Commons, Standing Committee on External Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings.

Senate, Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings.

External Affairs - Monthly Bulletin of the Department of External Affairs.

These were the primary references used by the author in preparation of this thesis.

Macdonald, R. St.J. "The Organization of American States in Action", University of Toronto Law Journal, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1964, p. 359 - 429.

Provides a brief outline of the Organization, and discusses the Meetings of Consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs from 1959 to 1963 with special reference to the Cuban missile crisis 1962, and the Haitian crisis of 1963.

Massey, Vincent, On Being Canadian, Toronto, Dent, 1948, xv - p. 198.

In Chapter 9, "North American or Pan American" the author brings forth a series of strong arguments against Canadian membership in the O.A.S.

Miller, Eugene H., "Canada and the Pan American Union", International Journal, Vol. 3. (Winter 1947-48), Toronto, p. 24 - 39.

Describes the political, social and cultural movements at work in Canada in support of Canadian membership in P.A.U. during period 1940-1946.

Organization of American States -

Documents of the Committee on Juridicial - Political Affairs on Admission of New Members to the Organization of American States, OEA/Ser G/VII, CP/CAJP - 46 (English). Rev., November 2, 1964, vi - 107 p.

Report of special committee which met from May 16, 1962 to October 31, 1963, dealing with procedure for admission of new members to the O.A.S.

First Special Inter-American Conference O.A.S., Official Records, OEA/Ser C/I. 12 (English), 1964, 12 p.

This conference dealt with procedures for admission of new members to the O.A.S. which were promulgated as the Act of Washington.

Podea, Iris S., "Pan American Sentiment in French Canada", International Journal Vol. 3 (Autumn 1948), Toronto, p. 33 - 49.

Discusses affinity of French Canada and Latin America with reference to race, language, and religion. Refers to press and other activities in support of Canada-Latin American relations especially during period of Second World War.

Roussin, Marcel, Le Canada et le système inter-Américain, Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1959, ix - 285 p.

History of inter-American system, description of important conferences, review of Canadian attitude up to 1959 and a resumé of advantages and disadvantages of Canadian membership in the O.A.S.

Schmitt, Karl M. and Bruks, David D., Evolution of Chaos - Dynamics of Latin American Government and Politics, New York Praeger, 1963, ix - 308 p.

Survey of political, social and economic institutions in Latin America. Includes observations on the ideas, prejudices, and psychology of the leaders and the people. Designed to inform U.S. public of the problems and difficulties facing Kennedy administration in implementing the Alliance for Progress.

Szulc, Tad, Latin America, New York, Athenium, 1966, 185 p.

A short historical account of development of Latin American problems. Discusses current problems, political movements, and their leaders. Provides up-to-date resumé of Cuban missile crisis and Dominican civil war.

Whitaker, Arthur P., Inter-American Affairs, 1943, New York, Columbia, 1944, v - 277 p.

A record with critical comment and interpretation of principal developments in the political, economic, social and cultural fields during 1943. Canadian sections provide valuable resumé of Canadian-Latin American relations during this period of World War II.

APPENDIX I

ABSTRACT OF

Canadian Legislators and the Inter-American System
1935 - 1965

The question of Canadian membership in the inter-American System has been a controversial subject in Canadian politics for over fifty years. This thesis brings together and analyses ~~of~~ the statements of Canadian legislators on this subject during the thirty year period, 1935 - 1965.

Sentiment favouring Canadian membership in the P.A.U./O.A.S. was at its height during the latter years of World War II and to a lesser degree in 1960-61 but even then interest was not wide-spread and confined to a very small group of legislators.

No political party, except for the C.C.F. prior to 1946, has taken a definite stand on the subject. Interested Liberal legislators have tended to support membership while Conservatives have opposed. Since 1946, C.C.F. M.P.'s have not been in favour of membership while recently Social Credit M.P.'s have supported such a move. All parties and legislators have been in favour of strengthening Canada-Latin American relations through bi-lateral agreements and increased trade.

The age, religion, racial origin or occupation of the legislators has had no significant bearing on their

attitude towards this matter. Despite popular opinion French Canadian legislators from Quebec indicated no greater interest in this subject than those from other provinces. With one exception legislators from the Maritime provinces have expressed little interest in the problem.

There are now no legal or technical barriers to Canadian membership in the O.A.S. and the United States and all Latin American countries have indicated a desire to see Canada a member. However, no Canadian government has felt that there was sufficient wide-spread interest on the part of the Canadian public generally, to warrant such a move.

Certain of the newly independent Commonwealth countries of the Caribbean are examining the question of membership in the O.A.S. In view of Canada's relationship with those countries their decisions could well have an important bearing on the Canadian Government's future stand on this age-old problem.