

*External Affairs*

**Mr. Green:** I think the Leader of the Opposition is misconstruing the statement made by the parliamentary secretary.

**Mr. Pearson:** I would be glad to read his speech.

**Mr. Green:** Our position has been absolutely clear on this.

What does the Leader of the Opposition say on this subject at page 980 of *Hansard*? He gave the Liberal policy with regard to nuclear tests. I said at that time that it was just as clear as mud, and if anybody can make anything out of it which is practical or makes sense, then I give them credit for being extremely intelligent. This is what the Leader of the Opposition said, and he made this speech in Vancouver. I am reading from page 980 of *Hansard* for February 11:

I said then and I repeat tonight:

I suggest our policy... should include the following:

(1) There will be no more nuclear tests on our side—

How he thought that would help very much, I do not know. Apparently it did not refer to the communists carrying on tests.

—for a period of time, say two years, even if the other side refuses to make the same commitment. At the end of the period... the prohibition can be re-examined in the light of what has happened...

(2) During this period... we should make a supreme effort to agree with the other side on an international treaty for prohibiting all such tests in the future, with appropriate measures for international control and supervision.

I went on to say:

The Geneva conference has made some progress here but not enough.

(3) We can take the lead at the United Nations in pressing for a solemn declaration by all member states... that do not now possess atomic weapons that they will not in the future manufacture such weapons...

It is bad enough to have two, or three or even four powers with the capacity for total destruction of peoples. It would be infinitely worse if 15 or 20 or 30 nations, including some irresponsible dictatorships had that capacity. And that will certainly happen unless something is done to stop it.

(4) We in Canada must be given full information by the United States on the fall-out danger from the small tactical atomic weapons "that are now being developed for use not against cities and peoples but against the armed forces of an aggressor."

There is no clear cut statement there on the question of nuclear tests, and this question had to be faced last year. It is of vital importance now, not two years from now.

The Leader of the Opposition accused us of changing our policy on the eve of negotiations. I have pointed out that we made our policy perfectly clear last September within a few weeks of the time that the 10-member disarmament committee was set up, and there has been no variation since.

[Mr. Pearson.]

This very policy gained us widespread support from the countries in Africa and Asia, as I explained earlier in my remarks. They now realize that we are in earnest in this policy of being against nuclear tests. There was no such comfort for them in the policy enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition. Our plan was a clear-cut plan. This is one of the reasons that today all of these nations are so friendly to Canada.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, on this extremely important point would the minister then explain the words used by his parliamentary secretary on November 2 last at the United Nations. I quote from the text of his speech put out by his own department:

In particular we hope that a solution will be found to the central problem of how one reaches decisions in the control organ regarding inspections which may provide a useful guide for other deliberations.

That does not mean the end of testing without control and inspection, that is clear. It is not the policy talked about now.

**Mr. Green:** The Leader of the Opposition is not right. My parliamentary secretary recognized the need for working out in the three-member committee now dealing with this question of nuclear tests some method of control. That is one thing. The other thing is that Canada believes there should be no more nuclear tests of any kind.

I can give hon. members one instance of the great friendship for Canada felt by people from Africa and Asia. Just about three weeks ago the Department of External Affairs held a reception for the trainees who were in Ottawa under various assistance plans. In addition, there happened to be about twelve African economists visiting here under United Nations auspices. We had young men and women at that reception from the following countries, and I think the number will amaze and prove inspiring to hon. members of the house: Ghana, Nigeria, Guinea, Liberia, Libya, Somaliland, United Arab Republic, Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Malaya, Indonesia, North Borneo, Sarawak, the Philippines, Laos, Burma and Thailand. Right through those two continents today Canada has many friends.

Then the Leader of the Opposition made some strange remarks the other day about the commonwealth and our attitude to it. I had been pointing out that the commonwealth must be for peace and I put it in this way, as reported on page 934 of *Hansard* for February 10:

This commonwealth of ours is so spread out around the world that it must work for peace. If there should be war the commonwealth would be in far more trouble than the United States or the Soviet union because, as I say, it is so