

External Affairs

Bill No. 385, for the relief of Isabel Ruth Smith Newey.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 386, for the relief of Eugene Clifford Carboneau.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 387, for the relief of Jean Antoine Francois Armand.—Mr. Hunter.

Bill No. 388, for the relief of Maria Clara Anita Cauchon Quirion.—Mr. Hunter.

Motion agreed to and bills read the second time.

Mr. Speaker: The business which was to be considered during this hour having been dealt with, the house will now revert to the matter under consideration prior to five o'clock.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRSREFERENCE OF ESTIMATES OF DEPARTMENT TO
STANDING COMMITTEE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Pearson:

That items Nos. 84 to 103 inclusive, of the main estimates, 1954-55, be withdrawn from the committee of supply and referred to the standing committee on external affairs, saving always the powers of the committee of supply in relation to the voting of public moneys.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, in the remarks I have made I have in no way overstated my very strong and deep conviction that we are at a point in history very similar to that with which the free nations were confronted in the year 1935. Then people were ready to take assurances. In 1937 and 1938 the situation became still more critical. Finally, at the time of Munich, it reached its clearest expression when Czechoslovakia, brave, prosperous, free and democratic Czechoslovakia, was made a pawn and sacrificed to the vain hope of a peace that became less of a possibility because of that very act. It seems reasonably clear that if the nations had stood together without hesitation and had not relied on Hitler's assurances that he had no more territorial ambitions many millions of people who now lie in distant and, in many cases, unmarked graves, might be alive and enjoying the decent things that we ourselves share today.

I believe this is one of the most solemn hours in history. I believe that the Geneva conference beginning on April 26 can either be a second Munich or the glorious reassertion of the principles that were stated at Versailles in 1919 and abandoned, and the principles which at San Francisco in 1945 were incorporated in the United Nations charter and which we can still save. In addition, in the emphatic statements I have made against the recognition of China under present conditions and in the circumstances

we see today, in the emphatic stand I have taken against the entry of communist China into the United Nations—that would come automatically with recognition and no argument will convince me to the contrary for the reasons I have stated and in the light of speeches to which I have already referred—and in the emphatic statements I have made about trade either with communist China or with Russia until there is evidence of a type of conduct and not mere assurances, I have sought to place before the house the things that I hope our government will not do. I have sought to place before the house the position that I hope they will take, and in saying that I know that I express the thoughts of those with whom I am associated. I wish to remove one uncertainty, and one alone, that may conceivably be raised at any time if anyone wished to try to interpret my words in that way.

No one can say that anything is forever in this very uncertain world. Only a few years ago we were fighting Germany and we were fighting Japan. A course of action was taken which, rightly or wrongly, was believed to be a course that would purge these countries of the people who had led them along the dreadful path they had followed. We are dealing with something very different here today.

The faith that most of us share in whatever manner we worship one God is a faith that always contemplates the possibility of a change in conduct, forgiveness and of the return to fellowship and decency of those who have offended against the laws of God and the laws of man. These same principles surely apply in the international field. Certainly we cannot contemplate the possibility of China, with its 400 million people, or Russia with its 200 million people and the many millions more who will be there in the years to come, being separated for all time from us or from ordinary, decent contacts. Surely our hope is that in God's good time, through evolution and changes which no one can envisage today, freedom will come to them, the kind of freedom that we wish for ourselves.

But no one suggests that we can establish that freedom by imposing our will on other people. It must come by steps which we cannot now foresee. However, this is something it seems to me we should remember. The question was asked earlier today, am I my brother's keeper? We thought we had answered that in September of 1939 when Canada, with Britain, France, Australia and many other nations took up arms, not because their soil was attacked but because of the