

External Affairs

Mr. Hansell: Has my time expired? I was only about half-way through, so perhaps I shall stop now. However, Mr. Speaker, I would say this, that while I have to stop because my time has expired I shall continue my speech on another appropriate occasion.

Mr. L. T. Stick (Trinity-Conception): Mr. Speaker, roughly a month ago I objected to a debate continuing after hours. As this debate is a very important one, and there are many people in Canada who are following it and who would want to hear tonight what the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) has to say, I ask permission of the house to withdraw my turn in the debate in his favour, on the condition that his speech will not terminate the debate.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take away the right of the hon. member for Trinity-Conception to speak. But I want to make it perfectly clear that if he is not going to speak I shall take my place in the debate now. Therefore if the hon. member does wish to speak, perhaps he had better go ahead.

Mr. Stick: As I have not the unanimous consent of the house there is nothing left for me to do but to continue with my speech.

Once again we come to the debate on external affairs when the suggestion is made that the estimates of this department be sent to a committee for examination. Much has been said in the debate, to date. Views have been expressed in strong terms in one way or another. One could take exception to some of the remarks passed, and one could speak strongly about some of the views expressed in the house today.

I agree to a certain extent with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) when he took exception to the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Cameron). But while I do not want to kick a person when he is down, I do want to say a few words about what the hon. member for Nanaimo has said.

He has stated in this House of Commons that he is a socialist; and may I say right now that he is entitled to his views in that regard. That is the working of democracy; and I claim the same right to speak my mind when I wish to do so. When I make that claim for myself I do not take away a similar privilege from others. However, may I say in all sincerity to the hon. member for Nanaimo that some of the views he expressed this afternoon are, in my estimation, rather dangerous.

May I read an extract from the New York Times which deals with socialism and sets

out how communism works through socialism to destroy socialism itself. I quote this, a special item to the New York Times dated at The Hague, Netherlands, January 17:

The communist parties of Western Europe are launching a popular-front movement proposing unity of action with the socialists.

The latest in a rapidly developing series of appeals for common action has been launched here by Paul de Groot, general secretary of the Netherlands communist party. At the close of a meeting of party leaders, he called for "a broad basis for a new government, the unity of action of socialists and communists, as the nucleus for national co-operation with all others prepared for it".

Reporting his speech, the party newspaper *De Waarheid* (The Truth) carried the banner headline: "Unity of Action of Socialists and Communists!"

The communist call here is anything but an isolated measure. In France, Italy and Belgium the communist parties are making similar appeals—recalling the fact that between the two world wars and immediately after the second one the communists were taken into the governments of three western European nations.

The communists made an unsuccessful attempt to promote a coalition with the socialists during the drawn-out French presidential elections last month. The candidate both parties supported was Marcel Naegelin, a socialist, who was defeated. In the subsequent voting for a president (Speaker) of the French national assembly, the communists backed the winner, Andre Le Troquer. Some observers in France saw in this achievement the confirmation of a new tactic.

The Paris newspaper *Le Monde*, which commented, "The communists have returned to and are admitted in the political, parliamentary and electoral game", spoke of the "sketch of a cartel of the Left or a popular front on the political level."

On Thursday the Belgian communist newspaper *Le Drapeau Rouge* (The Red Flag) reported the declaration made by the French communist party as it prepared to support M. Le Troquer: "The communists intend to show—once again—their desire to struggle with all their strength for the triumph of a policy of unity of action with the socialist workers." *Le Drapeau Rouge* suggested that in Italy also there now was a hardening or regrouping of all the popular forces desiring "progress and peace". On Wednesday the Italian communist leader, Palmiro Togliatti, told Premier-designate Amintore Fanfani that all parties willing to share the responsibility of government, including the communist, should be in the pending cabinet.

In the field of foreign policy, and especially on the question of the European army, which would unite the national armies of France, Italy, West Germany and the Benelux countries, the communist appeal apparently will not always fall on deaf ears.

May I suggest in all sincerity, and with every respect for the hon. member, that this policy of the communist party in Europe could very well spread to Canada. And if we have very much more of the ideas expressed in the house this afternoon it may be that the hon. member is playing with fire; and if he does, he will probably get his fingers badly burned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for many months past we have heard not only from leaders in this country but from those in other countries