

External Affairs

have been protracted discussions on the cessation of nuclear tests. There has been a road block in the way of reaching agreement on machinery for the use of outer space. There is not much comfort to be gained from the difficult starting point from which discussions on Berlin and Germany may begin. But, Mr. Speaker, I do think that there is some evidence that the international climate may be improving. The U.S.S.R. wants to discuss with us many problems. Certainly it should be evident to all sane men that there is a great interest in avoiding the mutual destruction of mankind in a nuclear conflict. May the desire for discussions on the part of Mr. Khrushchev and his comrades be a genuine readiness to negotiate in this particular instance of Berlin and Germany, rather than an attempt to impose their will on the three occupying powers and the two and a half million people in West Berlin to whose security we have pledged ourselves.

I conclude by saying that we wish and hope, as I am sure does every member of this house, that a meeting or meetings between the west and the soviet bloc will provide a greater mutual trust and confidence, even if that desideratum be reached only gradually.

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the house will have listened with great interest, and I believe also sympathetic understanding, to the comprehensive statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith) as he told us something about the international problems that we are facing today. They are problems just as complex and difficult as they have been at any time in our post world war II history. The minister ended on a note of at least qualified optimism. He did not think things were any worse; and I think he was realistic in this. He did not indicate that they were much better, and perhaps we have to leave it at that. He covered—I think the house will be grateful to him for so doing—a good deal of ground. Of course, the world is big and he could not deal with all the problems facing it. There was, I thought, one notable omission, and that was the relations of this country directly with the United States of America, and not relations merely arising out of our association with the United States in an alliance of free nations.

I was glad to hear the minister give his good wishes, and I am sure we all join him, to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in his current mission to Moscow, which is turning out to be, perhaps I can call it, a somewhat rugged one. However, Mr. Macmillan is well able to stand that kind of thing.

[Mr. Smith (Hastings-Frontenac).]

I am sure we also agree with the minister when he gave his good wishes and sympathy to the secretary of state for the United States in the illness which has taken him out of action for the time being, and we hope it is only for the time being. I have had my differences of opinion, Mr. Speaker, with Mr. Dulles. I remember once when I felt doubtful of the wisdom of the doctrine he had been preaching of what came to be known as massive retaliation. I went down to Washington and quarrelled with that doctrine in an address to the Press Club there, right in the grounds of the other side, and after I had spoken Mr. Dulles asked me to come and have dinner with him so that he could tell me how much he disagreed with my disagreement. After a very good dinner, because Mr. Dulles is a very good host, I was subjected to some massive argumentative retaliation by the secretary of state of the United States.

As the hon. minister has pointed out, Mr. Dulles is a man of courage. His courage is indomitable; his energy is unbelievable; his integrity and sincerity are unquestioned; and his knowledge of international affairs is certainly unrivalled. Perhaps the greatest tribute that can be paid to the importance of the part he has been playing now for so many years is the universal recognition of the vacuum in the United States foreign policy—if that is not too strong a word—which has been created temporarily, we hope, by his departure from the state department. We hope that his recovery will be early and complete.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation that faces us as, the hon. minister has said, is a serious one. Indeed, the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker), as recently as Monday of this week in a debate on another matter, indicated his view of that seriousness. It was so serious last September that it was considered undesirable—and I recognize there were other factors involved—to interfere with a contract for the production of manned interceptors, and it is equally serious now. I think the minister will agree with me when I say that it is not wise, and I am not suggesting he is doing it, to base one's foreign policy on the oscillations of an international situation which has remained serious ever since world war II, and will remain serious as long as we have what is known as the cold war: the east-west conflict. The minister quite rightly spent a good deal of his time telling us of that conflict and I will have something to say about it a little later.

He mentioned the commonwealth. We on this side would have been very interested on the occasion of this debate to have heard