

Supply—External Affairs

direction of the west. Time is on our side and time is what Canada must fight for. The Russia of Khrushchev is not the Russia of Stalin. It has moved in our direction and we must continue to encourage that move.

There are other issues to which the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his department must give great consideration even though they are overshadowed by the present threat of Berlin. There is the recognition of communist China and bringing this issue before the United Nations. We in this corner believe that this must come, that there must perhaps be two Chinas. Otherwise we can have no real disarmament and, indeed, as the hon. member for Essex East suggested, it may well be that pressure is being exerted from the Far East. It would be well for us to attempt to relieve that pressure. It may mean that we must criticize our allies when necessary.

I was greatly interested in the remarks made about South America. This indeed is a problem on our own doorstep and one with which we must come to grips very soon.

I too believe we must have faith and the place where that faith can best be placed is in the United Nations. We must build up and support the United Nations as Canada and the Prime Minister have done by supporting the secretary general to the last ditch. We must build up the strength of the United Nations by making it in fact a police force. There indeed is where our faith can best be put.

Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I think the house has listened with a great deal of interest today to the speeches made by various members on external affairs and can be proud of the considered judgment they have displayed in this field. I cannot apply that comment to the last speech to which we have listened. If comfort is going to be taken from that speech it will be in Moscow and not in Ottawa. I would ask the Canadian people to read, mark and learn the aims and ideas of the New party if this is an indication of their left wing thinking. I seriously commend to the Canadian people sober second thought with regard to the speech to which we have just listened.

All history is written for our learning and yet we fail to take a proper interest and learn the lessons from it that we should. How soon we forget the lessons of history and how little we heed them. Today we heard of neutralism and of 25 nations meeting in Belgrade that have not committed themselves either to the west or to the east. It came as a great shock to those 25 nations when the three-year nuclear test ban was broken. They were horrified. How soon we forget Hungary, Tibet and other places in the world. How soon we forget the promises that were made

two or three times in our lifetime only to be broken when the time was propitious. Eventually all nations must choose. There will be no neutralism if a war should come, which God forbid.

Nehru's neutralism received a rude shock when Tibet was attacked, a peace loving neighbour that had never transgressed against any of the other Asian peoples. All they desired to do was to live in peace with their neighbours but that did not prevent them from being overrun. We should not forget that. I was glad, as I am sure were the house and the people of Canada to hear the Secretary of State for External Affairs announce, as we have all known before, that Canada stands for peace, and also his references to the strenuous efforts that have been made by Canada and Canada's representatives to maintain peace in a troubled world.

Events of the past few days have only served to emphasize the conditions that have existed since the end of the war in 1945. An armed and jittery world jumps from one crisis to another. I ask hon. members, has Canada, has the western world created any of these crises? The answer is no. Let hon. members turn their thoughts for a moment to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Korea, Laos, Malaya and Tibet. Berlin, of course, has always been a source of annoyance since the close of the war.

Let us not forget or fail to understand the march of events. Two world wars indicated that the United States of America tried to evade entanglement in those conflicts up to the eleventh hour. Why? Because they were a peaceful nation. They did not want to be involved in war. That has been their history. I say this because they are a peace loving people. They are our neighbours and we probably know them better than any other nation. The last resort, as far as they are concerned, is war. I hope the whole world will realize this. Consequently they and the western allies are being pushed on all fronts as never before.

Berlin at the moment—and I emphasize those words "at the moment"—is the powder keg. We well remember that the western world has always had its quislings, traitors and collaborators. We still have them with us. Let us not forget those who in the past days would sell their country to an enemy.

Last week there appeared in the *London Free Press* and I assume in other Canadian newspapers the words of a Canadian who said that Berlin was not worth the life of one Canadian. I say that is not the issue involved. If we were to sacrifice Berlin, would that guarantee peace in the world? I say it would only guarantee another crisis and then another crisis would follow as inevitably