

*Supply—External Affairs*

declarations of principle and support of freedom; third, to exhibit a mature attitude that is not deliberately provocative and so create tensions which work amongst themselves to produce crises; fourth, the necessity of absolute realism in the terrifying psychology of the cold war. The United Nations must be given an opportunity of increasing service. Its present relative weakness is demonstrated by the secondary position it is taking in these great events that are confronting us. It is playing no direct role in some of the events, particularly those in Germany. We look for an opportunity whereby the United Nations will be given a chance to play a significant role, perhaps as a means of guaranteeing the right of access to West Berlin. I would hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs would be prepared to anticipate and meet the kind of attack on the United Nations made last year by Chairman Khrushchev. Such an attack, if it succeeded, would destroy the United Nations as it was envisioned at San Francisco in 1946. It is possible that the Soviet union intends to destroy the United Nations because that body has not served its purposes. One might as well argue that certain nations opposed to the Soviet union might take a similar position if they find that the United Nations does not serve their immediate purposes. What we must do is to see to it that we do not lose the opportunity that has been built up of creating a vast reservoir of knowledge and experience in the existing United Nations. The Soviet union wants to destroy the United Nations as it now is. That is its policy. As was stated by Hamilton Fish Armstrong in a recent number of *Foreign Affairs*, in a brilliant and valuable contribution, we ourselves no matter what the sacrifice must be prepared to see that the United Nations is carried on.

I have spoken longer perhaps than I should have or intended. Undoubtedly in what I have said I have reflected the difficulty we all have in our desire to avoid nuclear war. It is only by a display of strength, responsibly asserted, that we will in the present scene avoid a nuclear conflict. I am sure that is now the case. War will not serve the cause of the Soviet union. It will not add to the might of the United States. It would simply destroy the effectiveness and richness of man himself and his institutions. This we must avoid. However, we are not going to avoid war by refusing to face up to our responsibilities. We must use the instruments, the only instruments, which we as finite beings know, to provide an effective guarantee against war. We shall not be respected by the Soviet union by being weak.

Because of the present armed position of the Soviet union we must be in a position to negotiate from strength. In my judgment only such a position will guarantee what so many people in the world, with the best of intentions, have in mind when they say that we must be prepared to resort to any device in order to avoid the possibility of conflict. Of course we must resort to any device. However, let us do it in a manner that protects the fundamental character of our society, the fundamental principles that govern, in the attempt to safeguard human dignity and preserve peace.

Canada has a responsibility in this matter. We do not sit in the front row at the bargaining table. However, whenever publicly or privately these important discussions are taking place, this government has the responsibility of making sure that the position of Canada is fully known, and that we exert on the Soviet union and others the kind of pressure of public opinion which undoubtedly in the final analysis may prove to be one of the effective means of persuading those responsible for this situation that nothing is to be gained by conflict.

It is in this spirit and with this great concern over this problem that I ask the government to exert its best efforts to bring forward all the sources available to it, and that it consult with every available body in our country. The Leader of the Opposition is perhaps not going to like what I am about to say but I feel that in a situation like this, Canada's role could be an extremely important one. I noticed yesterday that the Prime Minister had a talk with the Leader of the Opposition. There is no man in our country who has greater experience in these matters than has the Leader of the Opposition. The urgency of this situation is such that I make a suggestion and this I do without collaboration, and perhaps in doing so I run the risk of occasioning his displeasure. If the situation is as serious as has been suggested by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and by the Prime Minister in Winnipeg, this is no time for irresponsible party division. This is a moment in which to take advantage of every available bit of advice that can be given. With his background and his experience, I know of no one who can give more valuable advice in these matters than can the Leader of the Opposition. In this spirit I hope it will be possible for us to contribute to an era of peace and not one of continuing turbulence.

**Mr. Herridge:** As usual, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the whole committee listened with