

*External Affairs*

of action which would receive the support and the acknowledgment of the Canadian people.

**Mr. Green:** May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he think that Canada should adopt nuclear weapons?

**Mr. Argue:** On our soil, no. The answer to that is, no.

**Mr. Green:** Or for our forces in NATO?

**Mr. Argue:** The answer to that is, no.

**Mr. Speakman:** Would the hon. gentleman permit another question? The hon. gentleman and others in his group have urged, very strongly, the recognition of red China. Would the hon. member for Assiniboia not agree that red China is still acting in the role of an aggressor, and would he further not agree that we would not be keeping faith with Canadians who lie buried in Korea on the field of honour as a result of the aggression of red China if we followed the proposal for recognition which he advocates?

**Mr. Argue:** That general type of question could be applied to other nations, and other communist nations. I suggest that the need to recognize China at this time and the need to bring China into the councils of the world is based on a belief held by many clear-thinking people that this is the best way to save Canadian lives, to bring about real disarmament and to achieve real peace in the world.

(Translation):

**Mr. Robert Lafreniere (Quebec-Montmorency):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the speeches made by the hon. members who spoke before me. However, one of them made a remark which is indeed not to my liking; I refer to the hon. member for Richelieu-Vercheres (Mr. Cardin) who gave to understand that the government was trying to introduce "partisanship" in the debate on external affairs. Well, Mr. Speaker, to any one who knows the sincerity, the objectivity and the honesty of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Green), such an opinion is inadmissible.

I am convinced that all members listened with great interest to the brilliant review given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and, in particular, to the remarks he made about disarmament.

He stressed the grave concern of the public in general about this matter, and of Canadians in particular, in view of Canada's participation in the ten-nation committee, which will begin its proceedings in Geneva in a few weeks.

[Mr. Argue.]

The importance that the minister attaches to disarmament is indeed shared by the Canadian people. The government has demonstrated to what extent it seriously considers that matter, by appointing a most distinguished Canadian, Lieutenant General Burns, to represent Canada on that committee and by insisting that the committee start its proceedings as soon as possible.

We have only to hope now that the Canadian delegation will maintain that atmosphere of firm determination, throughout the proceedings, so that concrete results may be achieved.

It is obvious that in a world threatened by the horror of nuclear war, our hope for the success of those discussions goes far beyond what we can express in mere words.

Disarmament negotiations are nothing new. The first concept of international agreement with regard to a reduction of military forces was proposed more than 50 years ago. Yet, it was in the intervening period that humanity discovered the most terrifying arms, that might even lead to world suicide.

As a matter of fact, many people are inclined to believe that total and complete disarmament is an impossibility. At all events, if it were possible, it would impose upon the peace-makers years of strenuous effort and an infinite patience. Each of the nations concerned hesitates—and to a certain extent understandably so—to reduce its armaments, and this mental attitude is easy to understand. In order to illustrate the thought I just expressed, may I be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to quote a fable attributed to Sir Winston Churchill and to which the Spanish delegate alluded during the Geneva conference on world disarmament, in 1932. The Spanish delegate had asked the Russian minister of foreign affairs whether he remembered the fable of the animal disarmament conference. That fourteenth fable goes like this,—and I quote *La Presse* of November 9, 1959:

When the animals had gathered, the lion looked at the eagle and said: "Claws should be abolished." The tiger looked at the elephant and said: "Trunks must go". And the elephant, in turn, looked at the tiger saying: "Claws and fangs should be outlawed". Thus, each animal wanted abolition of the arms and defenses of all the others. There remained the bear, who spoke last, saying with gentle good sense: "Comrades, let us abolish everything—everything except the great universal hug".

That fable shows, to a certain extent, the approach which nations have taken in the past toward that crucial problem.