

*External Affairs*

commonwealth, those young and immature Asiatic nations to whom we can be of great assistance at this time. We believe that this type of assistance is one way in which we can certainly strengthen understanding between various members of the commonwealth and strengthen the commonwealth itself. In addition, we believe that the government could be a little less niggardly in its contribution to the commonwealth parliamentary association with which this parliament is connected. Its membership is composed of the majority of the members of the House of Commons who are interested in international affairs, and if that association is going to function satisfactorily and make the contribution it should toward understanding between the various nations of the commonwealth it could do with a little more financial assistance than has been extended to it by Canadian governments.

I want to refer briefly now to the European situation. In that connection I was interested in a press report this morning on Mr. Macmillan's visit to Moscow, to which the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Smith) referred this afternoon. At the time the minister emphasized its importance and said that he was following the visit with interest. I want to quote a short paragraph or two from the report because I think this also indicates the stability of the British prime minister's outlook and his unruffled approach. That is the sort of approach which goes a long way to finding solutions to difficult problems in international affairs rather than blowing off steam and talking about massive retaliation. The report has this to say in part:

Mr. Macmillan's speeches have been marked by an unusual combination of admiration and jibes.

A delightful combination.

He has referred to Russian misconception of Britain as a land of Dickens; or the fact that he, unlike other prime ministers, is answerable to questions in parliament.

I think that is a wonderful little dig in the right spirit.

At the same time he has praised the achievements of the Soviet union with a lack of inhibition which has surprised both Russian and British listeners.

Here he shows his fairness.

"The rate and quality of your progress are indeed extraordinary and, so far as I know, unparalleled in history."

Both Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Khrushchev have referred in very similar terms to the splendour of the British-Soviet alliance in the war—

We should not forget that.

—and worsening of relations since. The prime minister's speech at the British embassy dinner has been treated by the Soviet press with obvious respect.

[Mr. Herridge.]

That is the sort of approach that engenders respect in any country. We in this group hope, regardless of the surface ruffles on the sea of diplomacy, that Mr. Macmillan's visit to Moscow will have some fruitful consequences and be part of the long and tedious period of negotiation to which we must inure ourselves.

So far as the European situation is concerned, I wish to say that there are growing indications that the vested interests of monopoly capitalism are beginning to have a serious influence on world affairs at this time and particularly in recent years. I think that that is indicated by the finger in the pie that the oil interests have had in the Middle East. We would not have had half the trouble we had with the Arabs if it had not been for the oil industry and their greed.

We also have the record of monopoly capitalism in South American countries throughout the years and recently in Cuba. So far as Cuba is concerned, we hardly heard a word about the frightful Batista regime until it was overthrown. The press kept almost complete silence on the tyranny of that regime. Now, and I am always aroused when I think of it, some of these birds are wanting to put their filthy paws on the natural resources of British Columbia.

These small groups in Europe, the Middle East and the United States are having a very serious effect and an undue influence on international affairs at this time and all democratic parliaments will have to keep their eyes open in that respect. I want to quote an editorial from the *Christian Science Monitor* of Monday, February 16, 1959. The *Christian Science Monitor* is a very well balanced and thoughtful paper, by no means radical. The editorial is entitled, "The Krupp Puzzle", and reads as follows:

Very few persons outside the Krupp family and some employees can be happy at news that the Krupp industrial empire in West Germany is apparently being put back together and even enlarged. Yet several very practical questions are involved in whether the world war II allies can or should hold Alfried Krupp to a postwar agreement to break up and dispose of his coal and steel enterprises by 1959.

Two views of the matter are presented on this page. To those still seared by memory of Nazi cruelty, the role of Alfried Krupp's father as armorer to Hitler is not easily forgotten. But today the most serious threat of dictatorial rule comes not from a revival of Hitlerism but from a Soviet empire devoted to the spread of communism. Against that threat the west needs strength in West Germany.

Herr Krupp points out factually that there is no one in West Germany with money enough to buy him out.