

*Supply—External Affairs*

recent convention to which the hon. member for Essex East referred and to which I shall refer later.

On one occasion I had the opportunity to address a picnic which over 600 people attended. These people were members of the C.C.F. party and some of them were former members of both the Progressive Conservative and Liberal parties. They seemed to enjoy themselves and seemed to be moving in a progressive direction. I had the opportunity to talk with many of these people and find out what was their approach. I can say that people's attention is directed to what this government does under these circumstances and to what we all do in this House of Commons.

I was very pleased to note their interest. I noticed it came from quarters and from persons who in the past were rather given to taking things for granted. To indicate the attitude of the people I met—and I spoke to dozens and dozens—I can say there is a general feeling in the country that to consider war over the Berlin issue would be tragic and most unfortunate. That is not only the opinion of the people; it is the opinion of a good section of the press of this country.

To indicate this I wish to read from a few editorials. I read first from the Vancouver *Sun* of August 19. The editorial is headed "Myths" and states:

It is time to expose the myths that surround the Berlin question, myths that could plunge the world into a final war.

Prime Minister Diefenbaker might have taken on the unpleasant task of exposing them this week. Instead he devoted his oratorical skill to declaring that the Berlin crisis is forging allied strength and NATO unity to the toughness and temper of Damascus steel.

This in itself is perilously close to myth. Unity alone does not constitute strength. Chickens huddle together when a hawk passes overhead. As for NATO's strength, it is obviously lacking in Berlin. Our position is dangerously exposed. Strategically, the city is practically indefensible.

There has been too much talk of unity and strength in recent weeks, too little critical appraisal of the western position on the German question. There have been practically no imaginative or constructive moves by western diplomats.

The central myth, on which others feed and grow, is that the reunification of Germany is a foundation stone of western policy. This myth should be clearly labelled "Made in west Germany".

We agree with that statement. The editorial continues.

To our knowledge, no western leader since Anthony Eden has suggested realistic terms for this reunification.

A unified Germany would be powerful and pro-western. Russia knows this and fears it, and with reason. She was one nation which suffered most from the savagery of German invasion.

For that matter, is there a unanimous western desire for a reunified Germany? Do nations of west Europe which have suffered German invasion twice in this century wholeheartedly hope for a new and mightier Germany to rise in Europe's centre?

Western diplomacy can only advance from realism. And the cold truth is that the boundary of the Russian empire will be fixed at the centre of old Germany for the foreseeable future. (Barring an agreement for mutual disengagement of the two main antagonists,—

Which we hope will take place in the not too distant future:

—leaving a single but neutralized Germany at Europe's centre).

It is no less realistic that we should recognize the fiction of an independent east German state than that we should recognize the Hungarian, Polish and other governments of territories now held by the Russian empire. We may not recognize the east German regime's right to control their regions. But there is ample precedent for recognizing the Pankow clique as the *de facto* government.

Sometime, soon we hope, some western leader will recall Washington and Bonn from the dream which they now seem to share of extending the boundary of the western camp to the Polish border.

Recent statements of German statesmen have indicated this is a final objective of some of the persons in power in West Germany. The editorial continues:

Why not a Canadian voice?

Andrei Gromyko, when he was Russian ambassador to the U.N., once remarked that the Canadian delegation frequently said what other people were only thinking.

Perhaps this is the time for Canadian diplomacy to again adopt this role.

We agree with the concluding paragraph of that editorial. We believe there is an opportunity for the Canadian government to take a stronger position than it has in the past in this connection. I wish to make a very brief reference to *Maclean's* magazine. These editorials reflect a very widespread opinion amongst Canadians, as I can tell from conversations. This editorial is to be found in *Maclean's* magazine of August 26, 1961. It is entitled "Berlin. The Crisis that Propaganda Built" and states:

Canadians don't normally think of themselves as subject to propaganda. That happens to the Russians and the Chinese, the Arabs under Nasser or the Germans under Hitler, not to citizens of a democracy served by a free press. Yet the fact is that we are, right now, targets of a propaganda campaign for which it's hard to find a precedent in peacetime. Its object is to make us believe in a crisis over Berlin.

For weeks the reports of United States news services have been alerting us to the imminence of a showdown. The western powers are said to be wanting Khrushchev to "keep hands off West Berlin". In the face of "threats" by Khrushchev the west is "standing firm", set to "defend" West Berlin with nuclear weapons if need be.

The editorial continues in a similar vein. I am not going to take the time of the house to read it all. It is quite critical of, shall I say, the almost hysterical approach to this question which one sees if one reads the United States press and which has been reflected to some extent in the Canadian press. If you read the press of the United Kingdom