

long run prove to have been the most dangerous of all possible courses, and that the greatest probability of safety may lie in decisive acts of faith."

In the following sentence he summed up Canada's goals at the forthcoming Geneva Conference:

"We shall do our best to assist in the process of converting the Korean armistice, a somewhat uneasy Korean armistice, into a durable and satisfactory peace within the United Nations frame of reference which has been set down for this Conference, and by which we as a Government, indeed as a Parliament, are bound."

Speaking of Canada's support for President Eisenhower's proposals regarding international atomic energy control, Mr. Pearson said, in part:

ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL

"But I think it is important that our strong support for this approach should be accompanied by a clear understanding, not only of what the proposal is but what it is not. For example, it does not of itself offer a solution for the terrible problem of the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes. But while it is a relatively modest one, therein may, as I said, lies its virtue, or at any rate lies the possibility of its early and general acceptance. Furthermore, it could, if it were adopted, be the starting point for further progress and for reaching more important forward results. . . ."

He touched further on many questions which arose concerning the international agency proposal.

On U.S. defence strategy, he commented, in part:

"Whether it is new or old it is extremely important. In the words of Mr. Dulles, it means 'local defence reinforced by mobile deterrent power'. It means refusal to be tied to any rigid strategy, to any fixed planning, and it gives the nations of the coalition, it is hoped, more freedom of manoeuvre.

"This old, or new doctrine, whatever you wish to call it, was dealt with in considerable detail by the United States Secretary of State in his speech in New York on January 12. He confirmed his views on this strategy at his press conference on March 17 in Washington. . . ."

"So far as I am concerned I do not criticize the view that this kind of strategy is a valuable deterrent against aggression, and a shield for defence. In my speech in Washington last week I went out of my way to say that I did not criticize it as such because it might very well be the best deterrent against war at the present time. What I thought was important, however, was to clarify some of the ambiguities of this new strategy, and to make it as clear as possible to us all where we stood as friends and allies in relation to it.

"Within the last few weeks some very im-

portant and reassuring clarifications have been made in Washington of what seemed to some of us to be obscurities. I believe that has been a good result. I know that personally I feel better after having heard some of these statements. . . ."

After quoting from the speech of the United States Secretary of State in New York on January 12, in which United States policy was set forth, Mr. Pearson said that clarifications of that statement had provided "a fairly clear and reassuring idea of what this new strategy and this new planning for defence is."

DIPLMACY, CONSULTATION

One thing the interpretation did make clear, he added, "is that diplomacy and consultation, which is part of diplomacy, is under this doctrine not less important but more important than ever before. Any decisions must surely be collective, whenever that can be done, before action has to be taken."

Mr. Pearson concluded:

"We in this country have already built up with our friends in the free world valuable habits of consultation and co-operation. We know now that our fundamental interests are identical. There is, of course, a long way still to go. We must, for instance, increasingly apply the realization of interdependence to our economic policies as well as to our defence policies. In respect of consultation for defence, defence planning and all that kind of thing, I suggest that we should try to use the North Atlantic Council more than we have in the past. . . ."

"We must also constantly seek not only to preserve but to widen and develop still further our attitudes and habits of confidence, frank discussion and consultation, restraint and tolerance. Notwithstanding the importance of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which I have just emphasized, this must be done on a scale which is not limited to the North Atlantic Alliance but which is as broad as the globe. Indeed, our co-operation, our friendships must extend beyond our western civilization. Improving the economic and social conditions under which the major part of humanity lives will not ensure peace but it will make peace more likely.

"More important possibly than even economic aid is the opportunity for understanding and for genuine friendliness between the peoples of Asia in their hundreds of millions and those of the western world. These Asians will form their impressions of our civilization and values above all by what they learn and sense of our real attitudes. That is only one reason, I think, why all members of the House have been so happy over the magnificent results of the journey of our Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) into that part of the world.

"I would go even further and say that our sense of understanding must even extend to the very people whom we think threaten our peace.