

*Supply—External Affairs*

assistance; for people who suffer from the curse of hunger cannot have their stomachs filled by promises of democracy.

The views he expressed at Geneva on May 4 regarding Korea in general represent, I think, the point of view of the Canadian people. What people want everywhere in the world is a cessation of war and the achievement of a degree of peace, which has not been present in recent years.

While the minister weighed the views of two schools of thought in Geneva on the proper course to take to oppose successfully the communist march, as revealed here in the course of his speech, he did not place Canada's position before the conference as I think he should have done. The point of view he has expressed today on southeast Asia is one that he could have expressed there regardless of whether Canada was in fact a member of that conference.

All the peoples of the world, apart from those who are dominated in communist countries, desire peace. Peace can be achieved either by negotiation or through collective action. The minister states that it is the intention of the free nations associated at Geneva to continue negotiation until such time as it will have been established that there is a possibility that negotiation may lead to settlement; but if it is demonstrably established that what is taking place is mere propaganda, that will be the time to terminate the gathering. I agree to the utmost that Canada has a responsibility to bring about the closest relationship between Great Britain and the United States of America. Any divisions that have taken place can be regarded only as difficulties and divergences of views such as happen at any time between nations, however closely allied or united in common objectives they may be.

The real trouble at Geneva was well set out in an editorial in the *Ottawa Journal* of May 15, which reads as follows:

The true reason for Geneva's failure becomes starkly clear. It is that the western powers, unable to make peace, are unwilling to make war—unwilling to make even the limited war that might lead to something worse.

The communists know this. They learned it when Mr. Dulles arrived at Geneva brandishing a sword only to return it to its scabbard. They learned it when they saw Britain and France turn away from Mr. Dulles. They learned it completely when the congress of Mr. Dulles' own country showed that Mr. Dulles was in fact offering something he had no power to deliver.

The communists, thus enlightened, and with time on their side had but to wait.

This is the west's tragedy.

Everywhere in the allied camp there was disunity, doubt, confusion.

Yet now, with the test come in Indo-China, with the whole western case in the balance in Asia, it is the west that falters, not the communists.

One can understand why it is they falter, for the free nations with the grim experience of two world wars realize something of the awfulness of the possibility which faces the world. It is so easy for us here to say what nations should do; it is difficult to secure that unity in the action they may take with the inherent risk of war should too drastic a course be entered upon.

The tribute the minister paid to Mr. Eden is one that I believe will be accepted everywhere among the peoples of the free nations. With dignity, with a capacity for negotiation based on experience, with a realization that only in give and take is there hope for the achievement of peace, he represented and epitomized something of what British statesmanship can achieve.

I was struck with the fact that while the minister generally dealt with the necessity for unity in southeast Asia among freedom-loving nations, he did not definitely state the views of this government regarding a pact in southeast Asia to protect, preserve and maintain freedom in southeast Asia.

He spoke of the need for collective action there; and of bringing the free nations in southeast Asia into an Asiatic pact. I think Mr. Eden, by his conciliatory course at the Geneva conference, has gone a long way to show the people of India that straightforward negotiations for peace are being met by the communists who place roadblocks in the road that leads to peace and settlement—roadblocks of evasion and postponement of final conclusions.

But there is hope. The attitude of Pakistan and of Ceylon indicate that those nations are beginning to realize this, that only in collective security is there survival. They are beginning to realize, too, that communism is something more than a philosophy. They recognize its aggressiveness and danger to their freedom and survival.

They are looking for a declaration by the free nations of the need for the establishment and the setting up in Asia of an organization similar to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has operated in Europe, why then will not a similarly conceived organization for peace operate in Asia? It will not operate, unless it includes Asian members. I think that is a salient feature which must be realized.

Out of the travail of Geneva may well be achieved a realization by India, Burma and other Asian countries of what communism means, so there is hope for the establishment of an organization similar to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has