

*The Address—Mr. L. J. Raymond*

the capitalist system of the western democracies with all its defects and imperfections.

Mr. Speaker, what did the Russians say to the Poles, the Roumanians, the Yugoslavs, Hungarians and Czechoslovaks to rally them to their cause? The Russians tried to make these people believe that the defects and imperfections of the capitalist system and of the democratic regime were the only things at stake. According to the Russian story, the aim was to free these people from what the Russians called American imperialism and an out-dated democratic regime. The communists of Poland, Hungary, Roumania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia succeeded in reaching their goal. They had to fight against the so-called American imperialism. They did and they won. These communists had to destroy what they called an obsolete democratic regime. They did and again they succeeded.

The important point, Mr. Speaker, is this: with what have they replaced it? They have established an atheistic and materialistic dictatorship which denies the rights of the human person and of religion. Today, the communists attack the fundamental freedoms of the human person and the church of Christ. In those countries, by all the means at their disposal, they seek to abolish religion; to take over schools and to make the human being a materialistic part of an omnipotent and oppressive state.

The recent arrest of His Eminence Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary, by the government at Budapest, is a striking demonstration of what I have just said. The cause of this prince of the church is the cause of human rights for millions of persons living behind the iron curtain. Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested because he dared to defend the rights of the human person and the right of religion. The Hungarian communists are making tremendous efforts to make the world believe he is a traitor. This Christian hero had the courage to defend such rights; that was his only guilt.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to put on record my personal protest, the protest of my constituents, and, I trust, the protest of the Canadian people, against the crime of which the government of Hungary is guilty.

What is taking place behind the iron curtain proves that, independently of the official intentions of the governments, there is in the dispute between soviet Russia and the western democracies something else at stake than the so-called American imperialism and the defects of the western democratic system. This something else is the fundamental freedoms of the human person, those of the church, and the rights of God.

May I remark here that at the last general election in Italy the Italian people, despite the appeals of the communists, against the so-called American imperialism and the defects of western democracy, would have had the same fate as those in Czechoslovakia and other countries and would today be behind the iron curtain had they not realized that what was really at stake was the fundamental freedoms of man and the rights of the church and of God. Let us not be mistaken, Mr. Speaker; the fate which the countries behind the iron curtain have suffered, one after the other, is a prefiguration, if I may use that word, of what will happen to France if ever the communists succeed in assuming power there. It is also the same fate to which the United States, Canada, Belgium, England, Holland, Scandinavia, Spain and Portugal will have to submit if ever Russia opens war against the United States and if the western democracies lose.

*(Translation):*

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to find that the majority of Canadians understand the true meaning of the conflict between soviet Russia and the western democracies. It is unfortunate however that a small number of Canadians, through misunderstanding of the facts, play into the hands of the communists. They apparently fail to understand that in the present disagreement the common heritage of humanity itself is at stake.

The attitude of this minority is further complicated by the fact that, inspired by false humanitarian ideals, it proclaims the immorality of all wars, because of the complexion of modern warfare. Displaying an inconsistency which I fail to understand, some of these people, although claiming all wars to be immoral in character, stand prepared, or so they claim, to defend their country should it be attacked. If modern warfare is immoral, I do not see how those people can take up arms to defend their country, should it be attacked, because even then the end does not justify the means. If they consider that modern warfare is immoral in character, they cannot do what they believe is immoral, even in the defence of their country.

Another section of the same group is more logical in its errors. From the false premise that modern warfare is immoral, they contend that under no circumstances can we resort to war. They make no distinction between aggressive and purely defensive warfare. According to them, in the last analysis, all modern wars are aggressive in character and, as such, both immoral and unjust.

The results of such an attitude, Mr. Speaker, are obvious: