

*Supply—External Affairs*

gets within the very heart and centre of the storm, or have we ridden it out and are we now sailing into smoother waters? I do not know. The next few weeks are going to tell and I can only hope that the common-sense of the American people will show them the peril of certain ways which conceivably they might travel.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Chairman, with a great deal that has been said in the committee today I think there will be general agreement. The Secretary of State for External Affairs has placed before us the broad problems confronting the conference at Geneva in a manner which I think will be regarded as a fair appraisal of the situation as it exists today.

I was very happy to hear the tribute he paid to Mr. Anthony Eden and the remark that he made that his patience and judgment did play such an important role in keeping alive the hopes of those who are still meeting at Geneva. It seemed to me that in summing up the situation the Secretary of State for External Affairs did lay down a proposition that unquestionably carries this government farther into acceptance of responsibility than it has yet gone at any time before. The exact words he used were: "We cannot accept the principle of collective security in one part of the world and reject it in another." If one will examine these words and their implication he will see that it is a statement of immense importance to hon. members, to the parliament of Canada and to the people of Canada generally.

Shortly after he had made that statement he made a statement that I think will find general acceptance, as well as some of the comments he made about the situation in Geneva. He said that no nation can be saved from communism unless it wants to be. That I think is a statement that cannot be challenged. However, I think we can go a great deal farther than that, because I do not know any nation yet that has wanted communism. That is something we should remember. Less than 2 per cent of the people of Russia were communists at the time of the Russian revolution. I doubt whether there has been a single country in the world where communism has taken power that 10 per cent of the people have been communists. There has been no single case where communism has come to power as an expression of the will of the people. There is no communist government in the world which can be regarded as the government the people of that country want.

While not in any way challenging the statement that no nation can be saved from communism unless it wants to be, I should like

to emphasize the fact that many nations which have not wanted to be communist have become communist by force, by a threat of force and by treachery. The latter weapon is the weapon most employed by communists the world over. Undoubtedly the problem of those who are seeking to stem the tide of communism is very much greater in those countries where an understanding of the danger of communism is not already in their minds. We can see the difference in some of the countries of Asia and what happened in Malaya. It was not alone the stern discipline which was exercised by that very gallant soldier, General Templer, which dealt so effectively with communism in Malaya. There also was the fact that the people of Malaya did not want communism, had some idea of the danger and were ready to be rallied by those who sought to lead them against that evil force.

I must say, however, there is one other thought we should perhaps keep in mind. We have heard a great deal about the fact that under no circumstances must we do anything to preserve colonialism. Undoubtedly the world is moving forward. Undoubtedly great strides have been taken away from the kind of dependence that we describe as colonialism. I think, however, it would be wise for those who talk so loosely in those terms to ask themselves one question. Are they prepared to insist upon an immediate end, without any period of transition, of the colonialism under western powers, and by doing so create a vacuum into which the Soviet empire will immediately move?

**Mr. Nicholson:** It did not happen in India.

**Mr. Drew:** I just heard the interjection "They have in India".

**Mr. Nicholson:** It did not happen in India.

**Mr. Drew:** Well, then, I hear it better now: "It did not happen in India." Of course it did not happen in India because the situation was in no way parallel. What happened in India was a long process of the history of this commonwealth, and there is no single incident which offers more hope to those today than the transition by which step by step India advanced to full nationhood by the voluntary action of the government of Great Britain.

**Mr. Nicholson:** It took a Labour government to bring it about.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Chairman, we are talking about those nations which as yet have not had the opportunity to establish a form of government under which any organized resistance of their own could become a reality. Those of us who believe in the steady