

*External Affairs*

each hon. member has a responsibility toward his people, toward the people of Canada and toward his own conscience.

The leader of this group has put on record, not only yesterday but in days gone by, the official position of this party in respect to external affairs and many other matters. I am happy to support and stand by every word my leader pronounces as Social Credit policy, and should I at any time in or out of this house discuss matters with perhaps a little different emphasis I do so as expressing my own personal views.

Before dealing with a few matters in respect to the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) and the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), I wish to say a word about the speech made this afternoon by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Cameron). I am not going to discuss the content of his speech, but I am interested for one particular reason. Some of us go through this country in an attempt to interpret the political policies of the various parties in this country. In this respect I wish to be fair with my friends in the C.C.F. party. Therefore I would like to ask the leader of that party if the speech we listened to this afternoon was a pronouncement of C.C.F. policy. The leader of the C.C.F. party is not in the house at the moment but there will be plenty of time for him to tell the house whether the speech we listened to this afternoon from the hon. member for Nanaimo is in reality C.C.F. policy. If he does not tell us then we can only interpret his silence as being in the affirmative.

When the Secretary of State for External Affairs replies to this debate this evening or later on in this debate I would like to hear whether he agrees with that speech. The speech was a very colourful one in more ways than one, but I would like to hear the Secretary of State for External Affairs say, "No, the position I take and the position my government takes is altogether contrary to the position taken by the hon. member for Nanaimo."

I would like to deal with one or two things which occurred to me as I listened to the speech made yesterday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He dealt with the forthcoming conference at Geneva and expressed the hope that some good would come of that conference. I believe he expressed the hope of everyone. But I would like to say this. I would like to know before that conference takes place what Canada's position is as regards whether we are going to grant any more concessions which will play into the hands of Russian imperialism. It seems that no matter what

[Mr. Hansell.]

conferences have been held in the past the Soviets have come out on top and always with more than they entered the conference with, and the rest of the free nations always come out with less. Surely we should call a halt to this thing sooner or later, and as far as I am concerned the sooner the better.

The minister dealt with collective security and I suppose in these days when the world has become so small and nations so inter-related we cannot blind our eyes to what is generally known as collective security. But I would remind the house that the greatest demonstration of collective security which we have just observed in Korea failed. I do not mean by that that we should not adhere to collective security. The minister has himself pointed out that we cannot have continental security without collective security. I agree with that, and I believe we all agree with that. But the question which arises in my mind in this regard relates to the conference which was recently held for the purpose of formulating certain policies with respect to collective security for the North and South American countries. I refer to the conference held recently at Caracas. Canada was absent from that conference and some of us are not altogether satisfied yet as to why Canada was absent from that conference. If we are to have collective security for North and South America and that security is discussed at a conference, then surely Canada, which has become a strong nation today, particularly in its potential, should at least have had a part in that conference.

Another thought which came to my mind in regard to the minister's speech, and I cannot help mentioning this, is that it appeared to me that he played the double role of Secretary of State for External Affairs and Minister of National Defence. I am quite conscious of the fact that it is hard in these days to tell just where the responsibility of the Department of National Defence ceases, and the responsibility of the Department of External Affairs begins, or vice versa. But I mention this because I fear that we may eventually experience the sort of blunders which have been made in recent years by the state department of the United States, the blunder of interference in the military who in times of a shooting war are out to win.

The minister analysed at some length the speech made by Mr. Dulles consequent to the Caracas conference. I do not wish to be harsh but I must confess that the status of Mr. Dulles has been raised considerably in my estimation in the last few months, particularly since that conference, because