

External Affairs

agreement with that statement. I take the view that today foreign affairs are so important that we should consider having a united foreign policy supported by all members of the house so that there will be no contention among us as to what our policy should be either in the east or in the west in the interests of the maintenance of peace.

As a member of the committee on external affairs, I am in agreement with the chairman, the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette), when he intimated on Friday night that he could not be responsible for receiving confidential information from the department without proper safeguards having been made. As I understand it, one of my duties in the house is to safeguard the safety of the nation. Much as I might desire more information on external affairs, I agree with the statement of the hon. member for Cochrane, and I am not prepared to receive such information if by any chance it might get into enemy hands and thus endanger the state. In view of what has happened in the past in Canada so far as espionage is concerned, and in view of recent world events, I take the view that we cannot be too careful about what information is given in this respect. We have had the spectacle of the Alger Hiss trial in the United States. In recent weeks we have had the spectacle of Dr. Fuchs in London. Lo and behold, we now have a secretary for war in England who a few years ago had communist leanings. Where are we going? Whither are we tending?

The communist peril is a serious question for Canada and the whole world, and we will do no good unless we recognize it for what it is. I should like to quote an article from the *New York Times* of February 12, 1950, which may open the eyes of some members of the house as to where we stand on the question of eastern policy, and where the great nation to the south of us stands. It may open their eyes to the peril in which we both stand from communist activities in the world. The article is written by Arthur Krock, political correspondent of the *New York Times* in Washington, who is commonly known as the dean of the correspondents there and as the pundit. He writes as follows:

The president, and secretary of state Acheson, reviewing the bases of American foreign policy in the light of recent and dynamic events, said in substance this week: The United States cannot do business with Soviet Russia (just as it could not do business with Hitler) except where a set of facts creates entrenched realities that force the Kremlin to adjust its aggressive policies downward. This happened and was proved in Berlin, Greece, Turkey and Iran; and all our efforts are to be directed toward increasing the number of such areas in the world.

To which important democrats as well as republicans in congress, some of whose demands for

[Mr. Stick.]

affirmative policy produced the executive statements, responded about as follows: You reject the concrete proposal by Senator Brien McMahon that a new approach be made to the problem, offering \$50 billion in gifts and loans over ten years to nations everywhere, including Russia, in exchange for effective suppression of atomic weapons. You say experience has demonstrated the futility of attaining such an agreement with Russia, or of Russian adherence to any agreements that could be made.

By the same reasoning you reject the concrete proposal by Senator Millard E. Tydings that a general disarmament conference be attempted.

On the ground that the moral commitment of this government makes it dishonourable as well as self-defeating to diminish or abolish the sovereignty of the Chinese nationalist regime on Formosa, you decline at least one hopeful opportunity to confine the international communists to the territory which they have now acquired in Asia.

Now I should like to mention the situation in the state department in Washington, as it is set out in this same newspaper:

In other executive departments and at the capitol, however, nerves show signs of high tension. This correspondent does not attribute that to panic in any degree or to lack of any of the items in Mr. Acheson's formula. Many of the president's sub-executives are frankly worried over security, not only with respect to atomic secrets but with reference to general fifth-column activities in the government itself.

One such official told this correspondent he felt certain there was such a column at work in the department where his jurisdiction is just short of the top, but that he was still unable to bring persuasion for forceful purging. Another said he would be uneasy over the successful execution of any foreign policy, however sound and strong, until "five or six individuals" are removed from a very important government office indeed.

Then I should like to quote a dispatch from the *New York Times* correspondent in Paris:

The United States' attitude is that there is no use beginning once again an exchange of words when it is clear that the Soviet union has no intention of implementing them by actions. Premier Stalin himself once said:

"Institutions and systems are not changed by words—they are changed by natural causes."

The "natural causes" which appear to be predominant in the minds of the Soviet politburo belie the "words" of amity. The U.S.S.R. is pressing a cold war against the United States and its friends. Until such deliberate hostility ceases, mere "words" can be of no avail.

We have heard a great deal said in this chamber about peace, from a humanitarian standpoint; and we all agree with what has been said and the way it was said. We all desire peace; we desire it now more than ever. But we must be realistic about this peace, and I contend that Canada must speak with a united voice. If she speaks with a divided voice advantage will be taken of that fact. If we are not united, no matter what policy we adopt it will not contribute to the peace of the world.

Much has been said of an eastern policy for Canada. I served in the east for two