

*External Affairs*

immediate representations to the United States, urging the United States not to undertake these experiments in the Pacific ocean. The editorial suggests that other areas of the world might be found; for example, the Antarctic region or the far-distant Arctic regions, and it says that perhaps it might serve some useful purpose in melting some of the ice in these regions. But in any event it is certain that the world is revolted by what has happened in the Pacific ocean and is alarmed lest a further experiment with dire results should be undertaken.

This brings to my mind the peril to the world that a new war would bring. That is why I suggested when I spoke in the external affairs debate in January that no matter how small the area of negotiation would seem to be that was possible upon which to negotiate with those behind the iron curtain or in the communist countries, we should negotiate with them. I was very glad indeed, although the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) spanked me for saying that on January 29, that the hon. member for Prince Albert made the suggestion in another form when he said that if the hand is stretched out we should grasp it to the extent that we can do so. That was a good way of putting it. I think we should.

As far as the areas of negotiation are concerned, they may be very small, but every small dispute that is settled may be a step toward a better understanding. Let us remember that over the centuries our forefathers faced situations of this sort. You have only to read the speeches in the *Hansard* of Britain, following the French revolution, to learn that very much the same kind of things were said then that are being said today in relation to recognizing and trying to negotiate with iron curtain countries. When Cromwell was in power in England, and executed a British king, some of the things that were said at that time by the countries adjacent to Britain of the regicide and of all that he stood for could be used today in this house very much along the lines that such words were used at that time.

So we must not forget that we have to view these events somewhat in the perspective of history. We have got to try to settle disputes; we have got to live with these people—or we have got to exterminate them, or they have got to exterminate us. I say we have to live with them. And, step by step, perchance, as in centuries before, gradually they may come to a more reasonable attitude and a more democratic way of doing things. We may be able to associate with them on a better footing.

I wanted to say those things this afternoon. Then, as I said a moment ago, we have to think of what war would mean to this country, if it came. We hear the belligerent statement made at times: "You must not deal with these people, under any circumstances; you must keep them apart." What is the effect of that? Well, the end of that, I suppose, is war. And if there is one country just now which has a stake in the peaceful negotiation and peaceful settlement of differences between these giants, if you like, the United States and the Soviet union—the two sides in this cold war—certainly it is Canada. We lie between them. With the dreadful weapons of war now available we know what the end would be of some of our Canadian cities.

This is not the place for me to question what means of defence we have. I do not know. This House of Commons does not know. We do know we are spending great sums of money on defence, but we do not know what those defences are. I am one who believes that under certain circumstances either the House of Commons or a committee of the House of Commons should sit in camera and be informed. I do not know whether we have an effective radar screen; I do not know whether we have effective interceptor aircraft. I know we have sent a lot of them overseas; but what have we here in Canada? What would we have if there were an outbreak of hostilities?

It may be said that I do not expect an outbreak of hostilities. No, I do not; but, like everybody else, I am human, and my judgment may be at fault. It has been at fault before, and it will be at fault again. That applies to every human being in the world; and we cannot pass up any opportunities to see that our country is properly looked after.

This afternoon the Secretary of State for External Affairs mentioned the European defence community. I, too, am disturbed by some of the reports coming out from Paris respecting the political difficulties in that country, and the fact that the government is unable to get any decision one way or another from the legislative arm of government in that great country. But, Mr. Speaker, I have a very considerable amount of sympathy with France in the position she is taking at the present time. For after all we have to remember that in the 25 years between 1914 and 1939 or 1940, France was invaded twice by Germany. She was overrun twice; the flower of her manhood was destroyed in war. Her age-old monuments and many of her churches were destroyed;