

*External Affairs*

debate. The once great party whose stock-in-trade, whose most fundamental of all principles, was this unswerving loyalty to the British commonwealth, and whose motivating idea was "at Britain's side whate'er betide" will now, I believe, have to rewrite its principles and perhaps have it say "at Dulles' heel for woe or weal." That surely must be the case if we can judge by the remarkable statements emanating from a Conservative party these days, because if ever a great leader contributed something to the welfare of that thing we call the commonwealth, and if ever a great leader of a great country in the commonwealth did make a speech about it on the old biblical principle "let others praise thee and not thine own mouth," then it was surely the Prime Minister of Canada. The Prime Minister is a great builder of a new commonwealth and he does not need to come home and make boasting speeches about what he did or did not do, and he certainly does not need to make vainglorious speeches about the commonwealth.

When I hear hon. gentlemen opposite, who used to be so fervent in their concrete expressions of practical policies designed to promote the welfare of the British commonwealth, and when I contrast their expressions now, which seem far more closely tied in with the United States and not with the British line at all, I ask myself, "Do the modern Conservatives of the year 1954 know what this thing the commonwealth is?" One would never know, judging by the expressions we hear in this house. We hear Conservatives taking a line diametrically opposed to the line proposed by most of the members of the commonwealth.

We all know that this thing the commonwealth is a strange organization. A cynic and wit once said "God protects drunks, idiots and the British Empire," and I believe that, in the light of the history of the past ten or fifteen years, when the war came to an end and people were predicting the liquidation or dissolution of what we call the British Empire, it would have taken a bold prophet to see the rise of these great new democracies of Asia which between them vastly outnumber all the rest of the commonwealth put together.

I wish our friends of the Conservative party who used to be so fervent about the British connection would give some thought to the real commonwealth which exists in this year of 1954, and not to the old British Empire which passed away with Colonel Blimp and Kipling in the last decade of the nineteenth century. The real commonwealth which exists this year is based on what? It is based on Britain; it is based on Canada; and of course Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. But the vast majority of the people of the

new commonwealth live in India, Pakistan and Ceylon, and when I hear hon. gentlemen making the kind of rash statements I have heard in this house in the past few days, that we should never recognize the government of China, which is in fact the government of China, then I think to myself, "I wish these people who are making these rash statements would go out and spend a few months in the countries which now constitute the new commonwealth. I wish they would spend a few months in India; a few months in Pakistan; a few months in Ceylon, Burma and Indonesia, and all of the new democracies in Asia."

Every one of these countries of Asia, which must be the anchor and the hope of any peaceful future in that part of the world, they would find without exception, wants the recognition of the real government of China, not because they have any love of communism, because in every single case every one of them has a fierce fight on the home front with their own local communists, but because it is in their interests that stability be established in that part of the world. It therefore seems to me that before people go off so much at half-cock and make these rash and ill-advised statements of the kind we have heard in this house over the past week, to the effect that we should not recognize China—and indeed one member went to the other extreme and talked openly of attack—they should consider the commonwealth as it is in fact and not talk of commonwealth loyalty in terms of theory.

Just one final word about the much-abused kicked-about thing we call appeasement. I confess that when I heard my old friend the Leader of the Opposition getting wrought up about whether we might possibly appease our enemy my mind went back to that very day when Mr. Chamberlain returned from Munich, because on that very day I was to speak to the Canadian Club of Edmonton. Two or three days later the gentleman who occupied the position now occupied by the Leader of the Opposition was to follow me on the same platform. When I rose to speak, Mr. Chamberlain had just returned from Munich waving his piece of paper and uttering these words: "Peace with honour, peace in our time."

After all, I was hired to give a speech on international affairs. When I rose at noon I said that it was not peace with honour, that it was not peace in our time and that within a very short time the certain effect of what was done at Munich would be a deal or, as I called it, a dicker between Russia and Germany, which came, as we all know, within a year. I will never forget the dear lady who