

*External Affairs*

that the offers of peace came from a nation which at the same time boasts about possessing the most destructive weapons in the world, and boasts that it will bury us. If it were not for the past record of this man, overtures such as his would have been most welcome, but due to his past record they are met with some reserve. I think the democratic leader of the United States senate described the gesture very appropriately. Here are his exact words. He said:

—the hand that holds out the olive branch and at the same time tries to hit us over the head.

Mr. Khrushchev offers us an alternative. What is that alternative? It is war. Why, our wounds have not yet healed from the first world war, much less from the second. Hence, we cannot pass up this opportunity of obtaining peace, even though at gunpoint, and this conviction led our minister of external affairs to say as quoted on page 45 of *Hansard* of January 18, 1960:

There is no inconsistency between the maintenance of a high degree of military preparedness and Canada's strong desire to reach an acceptable disarmament agreeable with the Soviet bloc.

We do not want war. Nobody wants war. But at the same time the minister says, and I quote:

The west must not let its guard down.

Some people may take this—as we have the legal term *obiter dictum*—as just something said in passing. I take it as a warning. We must not let our guard down, and I think the average Canadian who is not concerned with technical terms or higher diplomacy understands very well that we must remain armed and strong as long as the other side is armed and strong. There cannot be unilateral disarmament and I think this was clearly indicated in the speech which the minister made. Why charge that there is no policy or aim? Why a child could understand that and it is not understood only by those who do not want to understand it. In the speech from the throne we find these words:

Canada will strive for peace founded on understanding and tolerance.

Those are our terms but time does not permit me to develop this theme. I have not sufficient time at my disposal to analyse our policies and aims, but those are our terms for peace.

We have the right to ask comrade Khrushchev what are his terms. I believe we have the right to discuss them now and ask what are his motives. He is not suing for peace because of weakness. Could not one motive be to destroy the NATO alliance? His peace offensive has shaken the alliance to its very foundations. The NATO alliance has proved an impregnable barrier to the further

expansion of the communist totalitarian empire and has served to check communist invasion of western Europe.

Might not another motive be to secure our counter-signature to the death warrant which he and the likes of him signed with respect to the captive nations and those whose hope of freedom we have kept alive? He would like our counter-signature.

Might not another motive be to secure free admission into our countries for his ideology which has as its avowed aim the destruction of democracy? Might not another motive be to flood our markets with slave labour products at prices with which we cannot compete? Is it not because of the failure to find ready answers to these questions that our Secretary of State for External Affairs has been led to warn us not to let our guard down? These matters disturb the Canadian people. They disturb the average Canadian to whom the freedom and sovereignty of his country are very dear.

Another phenomenon that disturbs Canadians is this endless malicious political backbiting carried on by some hon. members of this house. This campaign of what I call political backbiting takes the theme that our sovereignty is threatened. By whom? Of all the people in this world, by the people of the United States. That country has never violated our territorial boundaries in almost 150 years. Further it is said that we are becoming an appendage of our neighbour to the south.

I have not sufficient time to read the contents of the various newspaper clippings which I hold in my hand but I could briefly refer to the headlines which will give a good indication of what is carried in these articles that have appeared in the press. I believe our press reporters are pretty objective. I believe they try to report what they hear. An article carried in the *Montreal Gazette* of November 17, 1959, bears this headline:

Pearson Hits U.S. Control of Nuclear Weapons Here.

How does this campaign affect us and the United States? I invite hon. members to consider that. Another article taken from the *Montreal Gazette* of November 17, 1959, carries this headline:

Pearson Fears NATO Troubles in 5 Years.

Comrade Khrushchev would like that. I believe this campaign is causing trouble in NATO right now. Another article taken from the *Ottawa Citizen* of November 24, 1959, was entitled:

Tories Not Standing Up to U.S., Pearson Claims.