

that is not democracy, perhaps I do not understand what is meant when certain people talk about democracy.

Certain reactionary forces in the United States and Britain are encouraging those minorities in the Balkans who in their own countries were either collaborators of the nazis or did nothing when it came to a question of resistance. They are being encouraged to try to destroy the governments that are in power to-day.

There are coalitions in some parts of this country—in British Columbia and a coalition government in Manitoba. But the peoples of the Balkans cannot have coalition governments made up of progressive forces! I say that what is good for us must also be recognized as being good for them because, as I have said, we cannot have two distinct yardsticks.

It is not, however, merely a question of opposing those governments with words. Those people are being opposed with deeds, and shameful deeds. On Wednesday, October 17, two days ago, Mr. Sulzberger, writing in the *New York Times* from London with regard to the Balkan situation, said:

The American ambassador, Richard C. Patterson, has Washington's full approval to make a battle for democracy as America knows it, and not only is he withholding all economic aid from Tito and insisting on the implementation of the four freedoms, but he is employing the potential threat of withdrawal of recognition.

I would call this a shameful act, because it means they are saying to the people of Yugoslavia, "Either you change your government or you shall starve; we will give you no economic aid." That is what it means, and we in Canada have a committee supposedly known as the committee of the friends of Yugoslavia, which is withholding aid because it does not like these people's regime. That is disgraceful because it is inhuman. It is simply starving an ally into submission, because I have given the figures: 1,600,000 Yugoslavs have given their lives in this war, but they are to be starved into submission because we do not like their form of government. And now, according to Mr. Sulzberger in the *New York Times*, they are being threatened by the United States and Britain with withdrawal of recognition. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why the threat of withdrawal of recognition from Yugoslavia, an ally? Do we threaten Franco's Spain which has helped nazi Germany and given them supplies? They sent their Blue division to fight against the Soviet Union but we do not threaten them. We say that we cannot inter-

fere in the internal affairs of a state. But when it comes to an ally, just because they want a different sort of government, we threaten them with withdrawal of recognition.

In the whole of this attitude I, and many others, see what I would call a bit of atomic diplomacy. This atomic diplomacy means: I have an atomic bomb in my hand and you either take what I offer, or else. This is dangerous diplomacy because, once you start playing around with secret weapons, you will soon find that somebody else has secret weapons too. Hitler at one time thought he had special secret weapons but there were others who had secret weapons. I repeat, this is very dangerous diplomacy and it can lead to catastrophe. We must have a realistic kind of diplomacy and not an atomic kind of diplomacy. It is all right for the United States to say: "We will take an island seven thousand miles away from the shores of the United States; we will make that a defence outpost for the United States." But it is wrong for the Soviet Union to say: "We want friendly powers on our borders." It is all right for the United States to say: "We want internationalization of the Danube, Dardanelles and the Kiel canal;" but it would be definitely wrong to say: "Internationalize the Panama canal, the gulf of St. Lawrence and perhaps the St. Lawrence river." It is all right for the United States to say: "We give instructions to MacArthur that he is the man who has full power in Japan and nobody can say anything." But it is wrong for the Soviet Union to say in Europe: "We shall have a bit more to say about what is on our borders." No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot have that sort of policy. That will not help to reinforce the San Francisco charter.

Recently we had a conference in London. There were many, many stories that came out of the London conference; but I would say that the real story did not come out of London. We heard about petty squabbles and petty arguments; but I would say that the basic disagreements there flowed from the atomic diplomacy, from the belief on the part of certain politicians that now that we have the atomic bomb we can change the Potsdam decisions. At Potsdam there was an agreement about the de-industrialization of Germany. I have here the text of the decisions reached at Potsdam. It states that the industries used for war in Germany will be taken out of Germany; that these industries will be used for reparation purposes. But there are some who have different ideas about