

External Affairs

spoke from strength when it was unpopular, and in another instance he spoke from strength when it was popular.

The Prime Minister sowed a seed in India and those of us who know India will realize that he sowed that seed in India through strength and not through weakness and we will all do well to follow up his example—nourish that seed and bring it to its full fruit.

The seed is sown; and what we say in this house and how we back up the Prime Minister's example will determine whether the people of the Orient accept that message in the spirit in which it was offered. It is the message which they were waiting for because it is a message of hope and not one of fear. Because of that it will succeed. It will convince the great majority of the people of the Orient today who are sitting on the fence that they should reject the embrace of communism and accept the free and democratic way of life.

What the world requires today is this message of hope. You can never get peace or keep peace through fear. We are spending \$2,000 million on defence because we have to, and because it is necessary, but it is not the solution to the problem of whether we are going to have peace or war. It may deter nations against waging war but it will not prevent war.

I was interested in an article I read today in the *Globe and Mail* written by Drew Middleton of the *New York Times* service and datelined London, March 25. The article states:

The terrifying hydrogen weapon may prove a deterrent to war because of its terrible destructiveness, Foreign Secretary Eden said tonight.

This hope was offered the deeply concerned people of Britain by their foreign secretary toward the close of a Conservative party television program in which Eden spoke for the government.

If this means anything at all it means that our only hope for peace is through fear. But fear never brought peace to the world yet. We are living in fear and trembling today of what is going to happen tomorrow, the next day, or six months hence, and that fear is universal. But if we are to convince the people of the outside world as well as ourselves and destroy this fear, and if we wish to have a permanent peace, then we have to substitute something for that fear. We must substitute hope for fear and we have got to give the people of Canada and of the outside world a message of hope.

The only message of hope that I can suggest is that we urge the breaking down of all racial and religious barriers both in this country and abroad, and that we spread the good news of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. We should not only

spread that message but live up to it and if we do that we will give the people of the world not only peace but the only lasting peace in this world, which is the peace of God which passeth all understanding.

Mr. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in this debate, mainly about the matter of consultation as referred to at some considerable length by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) in the speech he made yesterday. I use the word in the sense in which it occurs to me in so far as foreign affairs are concerned, where, in the sort of world in which we live today, consultation has two aspects. The first is international—consultation between governments, and particularly between the governments of the western world in the North Atlantic treaty alliance, and secondly, national consultation, by which I mean consultation between the individual government and its parliament or whatever is the legislative body to which it owes responsibility.

I believe it is important for us to have a look at this matter of consultation in both these aspects, but I shall start with the second aspect which relates to consultation between our own government and this parliament to which it is responsible. Here we should have a look first at the extent to which this consultation has been going on in connection with the Geneva conference to be held on April 26, that is the extent to which we in this parliament are to be consulted and informed by the government about that conference.

As I listened to the debate it seemed to me that we are concerned here, and indeed all members of parliament are greatly concerned, with what the Canadian delegation may do at that conference in Geneva. The leader of the official opposition (Mr. Drew) has expressed our reasons for this concern. Those reasons are based on statements made from time to time by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, as well as by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), which gave rise to some feeling of concern that our delegation to Geneva by some conceivable stretch of the imagination might be prepared to enter into some compromise or make some unfortunate deal with communist Russia and with Red China which could only redound to the disadvantage of the western world. We want to know what stand our delegates are going to take. What is going to be their bargaining position?

It is true that the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the course of this debate yesterday dealt with the objectives of the Canadian delegation in what he himself called