

*External Affairs*

and not recognized the same day that China is recognized by the United States or the day after.

I now turn to another aspect of this same general debate, a matter on which I feel very strongly. Just the other day—on February 9 in fact—I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs in this house whether Canada would make a protest to the government of France in view of the pending nuclear explosion. As reported at page 866 of *Hansard* my question was as follows:

Will the minister say whether, since the commendable action by the government at the United Nations in this respect, any further representations have been made to the government of France, placing Canada's position once again before that government?

The answer to my question given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs was as follows:

No, Mr. Speaker. Our stand was made perfectly clear at the United Nations and in conversations, and at the moment I am afraid there is nothing further we can do on a matter which is not under our control.

I feel there was something that Canada could have done at that time. I think there is something that Canada should do now. I think there is something that Canada is duty bound to do now. There has been in effect now for many months an unofficial agreement with regard to the cessation of nuclear tests. While it has not been a stated agreement in legal terms, it has been effective until the other day when France exploded her first atomic bomb. I regret that action very much. Amongst other reasons I regret that action because it is one that has been taken by a country within the western world; that it is an action taken by a country within the NATO organization and that it is an action taken by the French government under its very distinguished president Charles De Gaulle who is following a commendable policy in dealing with the Algerian question and in endeavouring to work out a democratic settlement.

But this is, in my opinion, a very grave mistake. World reaction has been much in opposition to this test. There has been an adverse reaction from the government of West Germany, from Ghana, from Nigeria, and from most Asian and African countries. The Japanese government has expressed deep regret. The Canadian government has not spoken in recent days. I think this is an occasion when Canada should speak out, and speak out with one voice, in pleading with France to forego any further nuclear weapons tests. A great mistake, in my view, has been made. This great mistake should not be continued.

I have read of certain university professors and students and others having initiated in

[Mr. Argue.]

this country a campaign against nuclear explosions, a campaign pointing out the dangers of fall-out. I am proud of the initiative taken by these democracy-loving Canadians who have protested an action that not only endangers the peace of the world but endangers the survival of mankind.

**Mr. Green:** May I ask the hon. member a question. Is he not aware that Canada was one of the few western countries that voted against France on this question in the United Nations?

**Mr. Argue:** I am very much aware of that. I acknowledge the correctness of the position taken by the Canadian government at that time. That is one of the things I had in mind when I was speaking of the kind of leadership the Secretary of State for External Affairs had been giving in this and other fields. But I suggest a good position taken a few months ago is no substitute for forthright action now.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** What are you going to do?

**Mr. Argue:** I suggest the government ask this parliament to pass a unanimous resolution asking the government of France to cease further nuclear weapons tests. The hon. member can shake his head, but I admire the nations of the world that in recent hours and recent days have had the courage to protest this very inadvisable action on the part of a government of a friendly country.

Before my time expires I should like to refer to some of the events which took place in this debate today. The Secretary of State for External Affairs when he was putting forward the government's position failed to enunciate the government's policy on disarmament. In the course of the speech of the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), the Secretary of State for External Affairs interrupted with these words, as recorded on page 960 of *Hansard*:

May I ask the hon. member, is he suggesting that Canada's initiative in this regard should be taken in the way of propaganda, that is, by announcing a plan to the world today; or should it be taken in the councils of the countries with which she is now associated and later in the meeting of the 10-member committee? It comes down to a question of whether it is to be a case of propaganda or whether we are really going to try to work out a sound, worth-while scheme.

The hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Smith) said when he spoke that it would be sheer folly for Canada to enunciate its disarmament program, and it was following this statement by the hon. member for Calgary South that the Prime Minister moved in on his own minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and cut the ground from under him.