

External Affairs

or in Austria. What is the position? What is the relation between the government and parliament if that development should occur while Canadian troops are in Europe? Are they to wait there until the government consults parliament?

The minister has laid great stress on this matter of consultation in the international sphere, but he has left us in the dark on the question of national consultation. The minister said on Thursday last, as reported at page 3330 of *Hansard*:

There is a second word to which I devoted some attention in my Washington speech, and that was the word "instantly". That word, in connection with the strategy we are discussing, involves no problem, as I see it, if there is a direct attack on your own territory, or indeed possibly on the territory of your neighbour, because then it becomes a question of self-preservation and quick, effective, and instant action is essential and would be taken by any country attacked. No one, I believe, would take exception to that.

What happens then in the light of those statements and in the light of the present position in Europe with Canadian forces there in an atomic age with the possibility of atomic attack? What happens to the principles enunciated in 1949 and 1950?

I conclude, sir, by repeating my position. This parliament is entitled to demand from the government a statement as to government policy on these issues. We are entitled to know from the government what they would do with respect to the matter of consulting parliament in this sphere in the event of an attack in Europe.

Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I believe this has been quite a useful debate and I believe it wise that hon. members should periodically discuss international affairs in the world today.

I read some of the remarks made yesterday by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) and I must congratulate him on his speech. The minister said as reported in this evening's newspaper:

If the nations of the world engage in a third world war, civilization would be destroyed, external affairs minister Pearson warned Sunday. . . Mr. Pearson said that "horrible devastation" would be brought about by the new atomic and chemical weapons devised by men.

"Should we ever get into world war III, there probably won't be more than a handful of people left", Mr. Pearson said.

He referred to the hydrogen bomb explosion in the Pacific and said he was glad that the public was now becoming acquainted with the fantastic power of the weapon. "That one bomb in the Pacific was more devastating than all the bombs dropped on Germany and Italy during the last war."

The minister then blasted communism and used language similar to that often used in the house. He went on to say:

"But we will never defeat communism unless we understand it. We must have faith and a positive approach. We have to confront communism with something stronger and more dynamic."

There was little danger of communism triumphing in Canada, Mr. Pearson observed, so long as the people held to a "living belief". If they did not, the country would go by default.

Later on the minister added:

"So often in the international field today, problems are not all black and white. They are often in terms of grey and it is hard to find what is right and what is wrong".

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with that suggestion that everything is not black and white. If I thought world war III were inevitable I would probably be using the sort of language used by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) and the leader of the Social Credit party (Mr. Low) in this debate. But I do not believe that we are going to have a third world war. I could be wrong; it is possible that we could have war, but I have no interest in being in this world if I am proved wrong. I believe that as long as there is a possibility that we can solve our problems peacefully we should refrain from using the sort of language used by the leader of the Social Credit party the other day when he took our leader to task. The hon. member said, as reported at page 3346 of *Hansard*:

This afternoon the C.C.F. leader said that we have got to live with the communists. I ask, "Is that right"? He says that the only alternative is to exterminate them or to be exterminated. In the light of these things, what should our policy be? Should it be our policy to resign ourselves to the hopeless future of trying to live with the devil himself?

Later on he said:

Of course it would mean the extermination of the venal tormentors and betrayers of humanity. Certainly it would, but better a few men should perish than the whole earth should waste.

Likewise, the Leader of the Opposition, winding up his speech on January 29, as reported at page 1622 of *Hansard* said:

Let us prevent this supreme catastrophe but, Mr. Speaker, let our voices be raised in a way that will leave no doubt that in Canada we want no bargain with the devil.

In the home in which I was brought up I was taught that that was a naughty word, and I went to the library to find out what it meant. There were quite a few definitions and I shall not place them on the record, but those of us who have some respect for the teachings of our parents would, I believe, wish that hon. members should refrain from using that sort of language. We have a great