

*Supply—External Affairs*

there is a crisis over it? Must we decide now which it will be? In my very humble opinion, Mr. Chairman, I think not.

This afternoon the Secretary of State for External Affairs made a brief statement and I must confess that to begin with it was disquieting to me, because the things for which he said Canada stood were things with which I think there would be no quarrel. He said that Canada stood for peace, for doing away with nuclear weapons, for banning tests, for supporting the United Nations and for supporting our treaties, including NATO. I would think that no country and no individual in a country could in fact disagree with those statements. So I was dissatisfied, as I think many in the country might be dissatisfied, to think that here was no leadership, here was no banner unfurled, here was nothing decisive.

In the past few weeks Canadians have become more and more apprehensive. What will be done? Most of us who are in parliament have had telephone calls and letters and are approached on the streets. Will there be war? What is it all about? How did it come to pass? Where are we going? There is an old Scottish air, "I know where I am going". I think most individuals like to feel that they know where they are going and all individuals like to feel that their government knows where it is going and where it is leading its people.

So at first blush at least I think the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs today may have been received coolly and with disappointment in the country. But even in the few short hours since then it may have been borne in upon Canadians, and will be if all members participate in this debate, that it is not so simple to say, "Here is what we stand for; this we negotiate and this we will not."

Earlier today the hon. member for Essex East did say that in our view some things with respect to Berlin are not negotiable, and when I say "our view" I mean a Canadian view and perhaps a western view. We will never be false to ourselves or other free men around the world. I do not think anyone now in Canada would choose that its leaders should be false to that principle. It is not enough to go into a grocery store and to have someone who is worried about the future of mankind say, "I will not defend that German city, I will not defend Germany, I fought once to destroy Germany". There are echoes in this country from people who said, "I will not fight to defend Britain." It may be that another time we will have those who will say, "I will not fight to defend France, I will not fight to defend the United States."

[Miss LaMarsh.]

Luckily or not, we do not have to answer that question any more because there is no longer any question of fighting to defend Germans, or a tiny city or even part of a city that happens to lie inside East Germany. What we are asked to stand up and be counted for is where we stand in the matter of freedom.

Freedom is a word that is much maligned. It perhaps means different things in the mouths of various men and women. Mr. Khrushchev in his speeches says that he stands for peace and freedom, and I suppose he does.

The greatest and most critical danger that we now face is something which the orientals call a possibility of loss of face. It is possible that the two protagonists, the United States and Russia, will adopt a rigidity of position in which one or the other must, willy-nilly, cause a war. It does not matter whether the war commences with nuclear weapons or whether it arises from someone on one side of the border using a hose and someone on the other side using a gas or smoke bomb. I think everyone is conscious of the fact that it does not matter how the conflict commences. The United States once felt that it was better to bring an end to the holocaust of world war II by using a nuclear weapon and it appears likely that in the event of another conflict one of the two parties would feel justified in doing the same thing. Whether war begins with sticks and stones or even with mere insults it will lead inevitably to a war that will destroy all humankind. We must not let this happen.

Prime Minister Nehru speaking at a recent meeting referred to the uncommitted nations. He said only what all men know, that Canada is kidding itself if it says it can alter present circumstances, if it takes the position that it can push the parties apart and make them decide the way it wishes them to. Mr. Nehru cannot do it on behalf of India nor can our Secretary of State for External Affairs on behalf of Canada.

Perhaps the greatest thing we can do is this. We can search our consciences to determine where we stand and, knowing this, be firm. Then as a nation, through our administration and its Secretary of State for External Affairs, we must do everything and anything to keep open the door to negotiations. It may be that we ourselves cannot effectively contribute to negotiations. It may be that we ourselves cannot offer guidance that will lead to the successful settlement of the problems under negotiation. Perhaps at this stage our only position is to keep fluid the situation, keep open the door, keep the parties meeting at all costs.