

*External Affairs*

oil from 19.4 to 37.8 million tons. While all these advances have been taking place industrially agricultural production has fallen to a level below that of 1928. In the U.S.S.R. cattle production is at least 13 million head below what it was in 1928, and sheep production is approximately 80 million head less than in 1928. So diminished has agricultural production become that at the present time the U.S.S.R. is mobilizing manpower in order to farm an additional 30 million acres.

These statistics indicate that one of the reasons the U.S.S.R. is so anxious to trade is on account of the difficulties inherent in potential hunger in that country, for not only is production far below the 1928 level but the population during the same time has materially increased. I hope and trust that in return for the benefits of the present that are apparent in finding markets for surpluses Canada will not rush into trade with the U.S.S.R. and will give every consideration to the perilous possibilities inherent in contributing in meeting ferment in the Soviet Union to which the Kremlin has found no better answer than more repression and the tyranny of purges.

Summarizing what I have endeavoured to place before the house, I agree with the stand taken by the minister that no nation among the free nations should take a stand which will in any way detrimentally affect any of the other nations in the partnership without consultation, and without full consultation. Canada has a right to have an assurance from Mr. Dulles and the government of the United States more definite and more complete than the conclusions to be drawn from the words used by him regarding mass retaliation instantly to be applied, during the occasion of a press conference.

I think Canadians will expect that the minister at the Geneva conference will not in any way indicate to Red China the hope of early recognition, but will demand the fullest assurances that aggression will be banished by it. As to the question of trade, I fear that the economic advantages of the present will lure many to believe in the necessity or at least in the attractiveness of trade with the U.S.S.R. on the assumption that we can restrict the things in which we trade to non-strategic commodities. In my opinion there is no more strategic commodity in the world than the production of agriculture, for after all, as I am sure the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) found as he travelled in Asia, the H weapon of communism in Asia is hunger.

Finally, I think the house and the country will agree with the view expressed by him with respect to the need of extending economic aid. Canada's record in this regard

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

under the Colombo plan has not been as extensive and complete as the challenge of the times demand. Twenty-five million dollars is scarcely in keeping with the challenging possibilities in Asia. Twenty-five million dollars is but a drop in the bucket. It is a token amount and does not indicate the necessary degree of comprehension of the possibilities of economic aid in halting the advance of communism.

So far as the other matters dealt with by the minister are concerned, several members of this party will speak, and in particular the Leader of the Opposition who will speak with the authority of his position. Let this be clear that upon one thing we are agreed, that this is no time to play with the problem of recognition of China. This is no time to give a fillip to communism in Asia by giving communism to believe that aggression will, if not rewarded, at least will be considered as worthy of recognition in the international world of the present.

**Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggart):** Mr. Speaker, this debate has given hon. members the opportunity this afternoon of hearing both the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) and the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), and I feel that a debate of this description, when the external affairs estimates are being sent to the committee, serves a very useful purpose. In the debate which took place at the end of January various groups in the house were able to express some of their opinions. I am quite sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister are cognizant of these facts.

All parties in this house believe that we must continue to co-operate with our friends to promote collective security in every sphere possible. I join with the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), the Secretary of State for External Affairs and I am sure the Prime Minister as well, in saying that if we are to have collective security and are going to have collective action following that collective security, whether it be economic action or any other form of action, then that collective action must be preceded by comprehensive consultation.

It is for that reason that I think most people in this house and in the country who were following international affairs closely were alarmed at the statement attributed to Mr. Dulles. I join with others in saying that the clarification the Secretary of State for External Affairs has been able to place before the house this afternoon is encouraging and helps to remove some of the misgivings. It sometimes seems to me in dealing with our powerful neighbour to the south there are