

External Affairs

was the chairman sitting there beside the lieutenant governor of Alberta. When I came to the end of the speech and the dear lady had to rise and say something to wind up the meeting, she audibly groaned as she rose to her feet, as much as to say "What can I ever say after that?" Then about three days later the leader of the great Conservative party in Canada, the then leader of the opposition, stood on the same platform and pretty well blasted everyone all over the map for daring to oppose Mr. Chamberlain's wonderful plan of appeasement.

I think there has been no more abused word than this word "appeasement". No other word has been so kicked around since as has been this word "appeasement". I took the trouble to go back and study history to find where this word and this process which has come to be known as appeasement was first used. I think I found it because I traced it back about six thousand years. If anybody can take it back any farther than that, I will yield my place right now.

You will find the first use of the word "appease" in the very first book of the Bible. It is found in the book of Genesis, in dealing with the story of Jacob and Esau. We all remember that Jacob, who was a very smart operator, had put over a very fast trick on his brother Esau and had cheated him out of property that belonged to Esau or should have gone to Esau. Jacob made his getaway and after a great many years was coming back to meet his brother Esau. But as he began to come back to meet his brother Esau he began to fear for his own hide; he began to fear for his own neck. If you look it up in the book of Genesis, you will find that Jacob devised a very clever plan because he said, "I must appease my brother Esau"; and he sent him a whole series of presents. If you take it that appeasement is making some kind of reparation for a dirty trick that you have played on the enemy, I do not think that appeasement is such a terribly bad thing. But I do not believe that it now applies because I do not know of any terribly dirty thing that we have done to the communists, the Russians, the Chinese or anybody else.

When appeasement came up in the late thirties and when, I am sorry to say, leading members on both sides of this house were at the beginning very strongly in favour of appeasement, appeasement became a sort of perverted process whereby you bought a little bit of time for yourself by selling out your poor relations to your enemy, as was done in the case of Czechoslovakia. But let us never think for a moment that there is anything similar or equivalent to that in facing the facts. There is no appeasement if we go down the road of working out and trying to get an

honourable peace with those with whom, if there is failure to get that peace, we will be engaged in mortal combat within a very few years.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, have no idea whether or not we shall escape a third world war. I do not know. I would not bet any money on it. I think that the most likely outcome of the present armament race in which the great nations are engaged is a third world war. I cannot find a single case in history where an armament race ended in anything else but war. However, I know this. If through God's grace and our own intelligence we get a reprieve and if we call a halt to this mad and frantic armament race which is now speeding up to its last spasms, the world will have to take a different direction from that which has been indicated in some of the speeches made in this house in the past week. We shall have to sit down with the people that are and have been our enemies, and we shall have to try to reach a basis of live and let live.

Therefore if you ask me what I have to say about the question of recognition of red China, I say that it is not my responsibility to say anything about it this afternoon. I know this, though. It is wanted by all of our great partners out in Asia, on whom we depend and who are the real strength of this thing the commonwealth. After all, if we never agree on another thing, let us never forget that this thing called the commonwealth is still the greatest institution in the world today for the stability and security of all of us. It is greater even than NATO and all of these other organizations that you can talk about. Our partners in the commonwealth want the recognition of China on an honourable basis. I for one fervently hope and pray that in the next few months things will turn out so that it may be possible for us to take at least a real step, not only along that path but to work out a basis of honourable peace with our great neighbour across the Pacific, which is by far the mightiest nation in the whole world today, a nation which before the second world war bought 38 per cent of all the pulp produced by our biggest pulp and paper company in British Columbia, namely the Powell River Company Limited, and which could buy much more than that again if we had stable relations worked out. I hope and pray we shall go down the road which may lead to peace and not go down the road which, in my opinion, will certainly lead to war.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, I rise only on a question of privilege. I want to make a reference to something that has been said merely for the purpose of keeping the record