

External Affairs

are a warning signal for the world. Can there be any other purpose from the German point of view—the desire for armaments, the desire again to play that disastrous role of pitting the east against the west, the desire once more to take control of the continent of Europe and use it as a base for attack upon the whole world. I submit that we would be foolish indeed if we persist in this policy of arming Germany, which, all too clearly now to anyone who studies reports from Germany, is again falling into the hands of that evil combination that has been a disaster to Germany and the rest of the world twice in our lifetime,—

Mr. Gauthier (Forineuf): That is a very strong statement.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo):—a combination which is perhaps exemplified as well as anything by such people as General Kurt Meyer and Mr. Alfred Krupp, a combination that is perhaps best exemplified by all the ex-nazis who are now being released and the Ruhr industrialists, the same people and the same combination that very nearly destroyed human freedom in the world. I cannot forget that today. I cannot forget that two generations from this country went to destroy that danger; and to see our government acquiescing in rebuilding that danger today is to see the betrayal of everything that two generations of young Canadians fought for.

In the house yesterday we discussed the question of Asia. We heard ringing denunciations from certain quarters in the house of the suggestion of the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), if it was a suggestion—I am not sure whether he retracted it—that we should at some time recognize communist China. With regard to the whole question of Asia I feel that we have been the victims of the most ridiculous and puerile oversimplification. We speak very boldly of the wickedness of the Chinese and their aggression in Korea. We do not look at that against the background of China which for centuries was the victim of white exploitation, which for centuries had to suffer humiliation at the hands of Great Britain and other western powers, the humiliation of seeing a large part of their economy placed in the hands of these foreign elements, the humiliation of seeing extraterritorial rights wrenched from them without any possibility of protest, the humiliation of seeing their entire economy used merely as a milch cow for western Europe.

Against that background I think that perhaps the Chinese action in Korea may take on a different light. I have always felt that it must be extremely difficult for any oriental to distinguish between those of our race who

have exploited them in the past ruthlessly, cruelly and most dishonestly and those of our race who go to fight them under the bright banners of the United Nations. I feel, as many have felt, that in acquiescing as Canada did in the disastrous advances to the Yalu river in Korea we were in fact acquiescing in throwing away the very last chance we had that the Chinese people could be kept out of the clutches of the Kremlin. We threw them into their arms.

I am not sure whether it was yesterday but the Prime Minister did say at one time that we must consider the question of the admission of China to the United Nations and the recognition of China. I am going to suggest that we can view that perhaps in a more rational light if we do not use terms such as I have heard used on the floor of the house, used indeed by the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he spoke here in January, terms such as “the free world”, “freedom-loving people”, without specifying just what peoples are designated. I believe there is something a little intellectually dishonest in pretending that we can put into one bag as the free world such nations as Franco’s Spain, Salazar’s Portugal, such nations as Greece under a reactionary regime imposed upon them from abroad, such nations as the dictatorships of South America whose votes, incidentally, were the deciding votes in the United Nations that were supposed to be votes for a free world.

I feel that these oversimplifications are one of the dangers that face us today. What has Canada’s role been in this whole affair? I was one of those who welcomed with great enthusiasm the speeches of the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the United States because I felt that when he made those speeches he went very far to redeem what had been, to put it as mildly as possible, a most embarrassing position for Canadians. Certainly I was embarrassed and I am sure a great many other Canadians were embarrassed when we read the report of a speech made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in this house to the effect that, although the government to which he belonged considered that a certain resolution before the United Nations was ill-advised and ill-timed and not likely to contribute to world peace, nevertheless this government felt obliged to support it. As I say, I welcomed his recent speeches in the United States because I felt they had redressed our situation somewhat. What has Canada’s role been? I think on the most charitable basis we can only say that it has been a somewhat shabby role.

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo).]