

*Supply—External Affairs*

freedom that we have. Are we going to deny them, dare we deny them it? That is another of the questions which we have got to answer.

It could be argued, of course, that the colonial peoples are not yet ready for self-government. It may be true, yet I doubt if our ancestors were ready for self-government and freedom when they obtained them. After all we do learn to govern ourselves by governing. We learn to do by doing. If we want to learn to swim, we do not learn by placing ourselves over a kitchen chair and wildly flailing our arms and legs in the air. We learn by going into the water. If we want to learn how to govern, we learn by governing, and no other way.

There is no argument in morality why people should not have the right to do that. Yet, there are those even in this country who for their own purposes, probably quite honestly, do not want to see these colonial peoples given their freedom. They do not want that because they see Asia as a fighting ground between communists and anti-communists, and nothing else. That sort of oversimplification does our cause no good, because although we might believe it the people of Asia do not; the people of Asia know much better.

In this morning's *Montreal Gazette* there was an editorial entitled, "Britain makes a Hard Decision". It is a really extraordinary statement, and I am going to quote two sentences from it. The first is:

The prospect of entering into a military pact which would primarily help the French cause in Indo-China and thus make possible a full scale war with China, is not a pleasant one for Britons to face.

How kind of the *Gazette* editor to realize this. How magnanimous of him to realize that war with China would not be a pleasant thing for Britons to face. Why would it not be pleasant? Because the British people know full well if there is a war with China the chances are there will be a war with Russia. The British suspect also that perhaps in certain quarters they are considered to be expendable; that they will provide the advance airfields for other people to use. If there is going to be a war on that scale, then the United Kingdom and the rest of Europe is going to be destroyed. The people in Europe are not prepared yet for that sort of nonsense, no matter what the editor of the *Gazette* may desire.

There are other aspects to the matter. There is the political one which I am sure will appeal to all of us in this house, because I am quite certain any British gov-

[Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North).]

ernment that decides to support the French cause and take the risk of war with China is going to find itself out of power within a matter of hours. The British people are opposed to such a policy, as I suspect most other people in Europe are. After all, what is this French cause? Rightly or wrongly, in the minds of Asians it is the cause of colonialism. In our minds, the issue might not be so clearly cut, but in Asia that is what it means. There are those who talk, as I think the leader of the Social Credit party hinted, of localized wars, regional wars. They are taking a most fantastic risk. It is possible that war can be localized, but the chances of a conflagration are far too great to assume that risk.

There is another aspect to the British situation. If they were to get into this war in Indo-China, if they were to enter into a war with China, obviously it would mean the end of the commonwealth of nations as we know it now. Of this much I am certain. Great as is his gift of irony, I cannot see Sir Winston Churchill presiding over this final irony. It is for that reason I feel the British government will not accept the invitation of the editor of the *Gazette*. But there is another sentence in this editorial that is a really brutal distortion of history. It says:

It is the same kind of decision that had to be made in 1939.

I say that is a brutal distortion of history. Fortunately, we have not yet arrived at 1984, but we can see with great clarity what could happen in 1984 if men like this were running the country. After all, what was the situation in 1939? We had seen Austria engulfed, but Austria did not lose her identity because the people of Austria rose up against their own government. The Austrian people were taken over and others were content to forget it because they felt there was some sort of kinship between Austrians and Germans. After all, did they not speak the same language? Then, there was the Sudeten. The people there did not rise against their oppressors in Prague. The Sudeten people were "rescued" by an aggressive enemy power that came in and within six months went further to take Prague and all Czechoslovakia. Only a few months later, in September, 1939, the Polish people did not rise against their own government, but the German armies marched in in the most aggressive sense of the word. Where then, is there a comparison between 1939 and 1954? It is only in the superheated brain of the man who wrote these words.

I say that is an editorial which is deliberately mischievous. I only hope it is not read by people outside Canada who might believe