

*External Affairs*

qualified to do this at the present time. That country is India, and the man is Nehru. If the prime minister of India, whose bona fides in regard to objectivity certainly are not questioned because he is criticized on both sides, would take the initiative and responsibility of summoning a conference at the summit, perhaps there would be more possibility of successful results from that kind of conference than one called by either side to the east-west conflict. He could take complete charge and decide who would be there. He could decide what the agenda would be if an agenda were required, and he could determine the basis on which the conference would be held. This is asking someone who is not directly committed to either side to take a great deal of responsibility. Well, the stakes are very high and the reward would be very great if a conference of this kind would make some contribution toward cutting through the circle of fear which now surrounds us.

The minister talked about the implications in the future in regard to the conquest which had been made in outer space. It does indeed mean that we are approaching an entirely new dimension, one which frightens us as well as entices us. It is a new dimension of politics, of strategy, of economics, and indeed a new dimension with respect to population. But while it is a frightening and alluring prospect for the next ten years, with the effect it may have on all our worldly conflicts, I am inclined myself to agree with the remark made by the Right Hon. R. A. Butler in the house of commons in London the other day, when he said:

I don't want to go to the moon or the sun, I only want to find peace on this earth.

**Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the comprehensive and general review of international affairs given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith). I must say that at some points in his speech I was very pleased while at others all the members of this group were, I am sure, somewhat disappointed. I will deal with the disappointments later. I was also interested in the speech just completed by the leader of the official opposition. I was very interested to note his increased flexibility since he became Leader of the Opposition with respect to certain important international questions and also his progressive advance, shall I say, toward the view taken by the C.C.F. on the recognition of China and the composition of the United Nations.

Although we are small in numbers it seems we are having a definite influence on

the official opposition and I hope this influence will continue.

**Mr. Pearson:** I hope it works both ways.

**Mr. Herridge:** I hope it does as far as an increase in our numbers is concerned after the next election.

I must frankly confess that I rise to speak in this debate with a considerable sense of inadequacy, and I say this in all sincerity. The issues raised when we discuss international affairs are so profound and so complicated and involve so many facets of human behaviour that I feel unable to discuss the question with the competence it demands. All I can say in justification of my plunge into the stormy waters of international affairs is that a study of history, speeches—excluding the speeches to which I listened this afternoon—writings and documents on this subject convinces me of the equal inadequacy of many others who have dealt with international affairs throughout the years.

I might say that this afternoon I am speaking for the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation—long may it live—and I am expressing the views of the members who represent that organization in this house.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Some of them are trying to break up that federation.

**Mr. Herridge:** I do wish the farmer member for Essex East would confine himself to international affairs this afternoon.

First of all, I must stress the fact that the power relationships between the NATO nations have drastically changed within the last two or three years. If it ever made any sense for the western powers to negotiate on the assumption of United States military superiority, this approach has now become totally untenable. A second major development, and a much more hopeful one, is the evidence of a greater flexibility in approach on the part of both the Soviet union and the United States. Coupled with this is the apparent desire of the Soviet union to wage its battles more and more, according to the reports we receive, on the economic front. There was a day when the United States could answer most of its critics, at least to its own satisfaction, by stating that it was its military superiority that saved the non-communist world from being seriously challenged by the communist military might.

While western military strength may still be a deterrent to communist ambitions it is becoming obvious now in the opinion of an increasing number of people that the power of the west to deter is shrinking rapidly, particularly if we look at both the western side