

External Affairs

we are at the same time halting the spread of communism in Asia. Although we give priority to Europe, Europe cannot be saved by losing Asia to Russian imperialism. The plans for world domination, as laid down in the Kremlin, are global in scope and not limited merely to Asia alone.

Then there is another course of action that can be adopted, the unlimited extension of the Korean war to China even at the risk of Russian intervention. This of course would be in line with the MacArthur plan. As a Canadian, I do not propose to take sides in the debate which is going on in the United States between President Truman and General MacArthur, but the extension of the present Korean war, and a possible third world war, are the very things that the United Nations are trying to prevent.

With nearly half a billion Chinese people to contend with, now under the control of the communist government, even if Soviet Russia did not formally enter on the side of the Chinese in Asia, we in effect would be shadow-boxing with our real opponent, Russia, if we engaged in a war with China. This would leave the Russian imperialists in Moscow relatively free to make their moves in Europe and in other parts of the world. In the event of Russian intervention in China, let us bear in mind that we are not ready to deal with that situation.

Only a few days ago General Bradley made a statement to the effect that we are now "buying time" in our preparation against a third world war. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) in his report to the house a few days ago emphasized that the United Nations are fighting to repel aggression in Korea. This of course is in compliance with the principles and the spirit of the United Nations charter, namely, that aggression should be halted by any form of collective action, including military collective action. The minister further pointed out, as reported at page 2754 of *Hansard*:

. . . it is not an aim or objective of the United Nations in its Korean policy to interfere in the internal affairs of any Asian country, to replace one regime by another. Its aim, as I said, is to defeat aggression . . . by proving that aggression does not pay.

He went on to say:

Communism itself, as a reactionary and debasing doctrine, must be fought on other planes and in different ways; by the use of economic, social, political and moral weapons.

Personally I am a great believer in the use of political weapons. On a previous occasion in this house I endeavoured to point out that international communism is being used by Stalin as an instrument to further Russian imperialism. I am also convinced

that the apparent unity which exists in Soviet Russia today has only been made possible through slave camps, liquidations and mass extermination of racial, ethnical and religious groups as such. We can feel quite certain that the rulers in the Kremlin, in order to maintain unity within their borders or that so-called unity within the Soviet union, must resort to further mass exilings, slave camps and liquidations. There are today throughout the Soviet union hundreds of thousands of families one or more of whose members have been either liquidated or sent to slave camps for political reasons.

The Soviet union's weak spot is to be found in the smouldering opposition of the population against its oppressors in the Kremlin, which once aroused can become an effective weapon in favour of the free world. That an open revolt has not yet erupted is due primarily to the fact that the peoples of these unhappy countries are totally disarmed. The dictatorial regimes are not only fully armed but would not hesitate for a single moment to put down in a most brutal fashion any revolt or any signs of revolt. In addition of course there is Titoism, which we should also exploit by the use of political warfare. I only hope I understood the minister correctly when he agreed that among the weapons we should use against Russian imperialism or communism is the political weapon, and I believe that it should be utilized, and utilized effectively, without delay.

Mr. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) closes the discussion at this stage, I wish to make some observations. Before dealing with the more general problems of international affairs, I wish to deal with two specific aspects of the work of the Department of External Affairs. First I shall refer briefly to a subject mentioned earlier in the present session, the number of conferences that the government is attending through representation on a large or small scale. I do not raise this point in any manner of harping criticism but rather in the belief that we must be prepared to examine the utility of every step that is taken by the government at this time. In the printed report of the Department of External Affairs for 1950, we find on page 61 that an international conference section was set up in January, 1950, to deal with invitations to international conferences. That is merely an indication of the extent to which conferences of all kinds have become the habit of the