

External Affairs

to show these people now that we have at least some interest, that we are interested in what they are doing and in what they are thinking.

On February 2, 1953, in his speech before the United States congress President Eisenhower made this statement:

Our policy, dedicated to making the free world secure, will envision all peaceful methods and devices, except breaking faith with our friends. We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves. I shall ask the congress at a later date to join in an appropriate resolution making clear that this government recognizes no kind of commitment, contained in secret understandings of the past with foreign governments, which permit this kind of enslavement.

Almost at the same time the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, made this statement and gave this hope to the peoples enslaved by red Moscow, when he said, "The enslaved peoples should count on us".

I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am not too clear as to the interpretation of these words, and especially their application in connection with present American policy. However Canada is playing an important role in international affairs. I believe we should take some initiative; and I would like to make this suggestion to the minister—in fact, I would urge that the minister give this matter careful consideration—that is, that a separate section be set up in the Department of External Affairs for the purpose of giving careful study to these different movements of the captive nations behind the iron curtain, and especially within the U.S.S.R.

This is important to us in the event of a crisis. Let us not make the same stupid mistake that was made by Hitler. There are many books being written today, and many have been written in the last few years containing statements by German generals and German leaders who say that Hitler did not lose the war with Soviet Russia at Stalingrad, but that he lost it near Kiev. When the Germans marched in, at one time over 600,000 soldiers laid down their arms and surrendered. The people in that area welcomed the Germans with bread and salt; they looked upon the Germans as their liberators.

But Hitler did not realize the significance of that. He started treating these people in the same brutal fashion in which he was treating the Jews, with the result that they turned against him. As I say, let us not be in that position; let us not make the same blunder. I know there is a school of thought with a strong following which says that if we favour this policy, if we show any interest in the nations within the U.S.S.R., we would

be antagonizing the Russian people. Well, it is my submission that the Russian people as such are not interested in Russian imperialism—except for the upper strata—whether it be in the red or white ranks.

Let me say that the Kremlin, by exploiting the national aspirations of peoples, in Asia as well as in Africa, has caused the countries in the western world a great deal of embarrassment and difficulty. So why not turn the tables on them? I repeat: Let us recognize the natural enemies of Russian imperialism, and ascertain if they are not the natural allies of the free world.

Mr. J. M. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, it is not the most agreeable occupation in the world to enter a debate that is reaching the close of its fourth day. Actually I was strongly encouraged only at the dinner recess by one of my colleagues with a great gift for clear and vivid expression not to speak at all. He said, "There has been too much talk on this already." I might have accepted his view were it not for the fact that I wished to say a few words for exactly the same reason set out by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) who, in opening his speech the other day, said:

I must confess to not a little surprise and considerable regret that the Prime Minister . . . said not one word about the vital and beneficent role that the Commonwealth is playing in the struggle for world peace today.

It is on that, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to detain the house for a very short time.

In spite of ourselves this debate has centred—I should not say "in spite of ourselves"; it is perhaps natural—largely around the two great monolithic centres of power. I am not overlooking what the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Decore) said about the cracks in the power of the U.S.S.R., but the debate has centred around these two centres of power, these two great land masses. And I suppose we must face the fact that if it were not for the breadth of view which the United States has taken in these latter years we might easily have had a situation where these two great land masses retired on themselves, and we might have two regional states with all the dangers and temptation to rivalry and struggle that is involved in that.

Imagine, for example, if you can, the United States, without the expansive view that it has taken, as a great centre of capitalistic power centred in Washington, and on the other hand a great centre of state socialistic power based on Moscow.

Now, we know the United States; we know that they hate war; we know that they, like ourselves, wish to live and let live. They