

I was filled with admiration for the statement on this subject made in the other place by the Prime Minister last Thursday afternoon. I think that the way in which he expressed the intention of the government to deal with these questions in a completely dispassionate and impartial manner, meeting the questions as they arise and telling the country from time to time what our necessities may be, is perhaps the highest form of statesmanship, and I for one am perfectly willing to leave to the Prime Minister and to our government the final determination on all questions of that kind.

Now, what is our situation today? Canada and the other nations of the Atlantic Pact are called upon to make a great effort to increase our military strength, and so far we can see no end to that effort. One feature that lies at the very root of the whole thing, and which has been emphasized time and again by General Eisenhower, and is also emphasized in the gracious Speech, is that it is essentially a defence effort. It is not an effort which involves any aggressive designs against anybody in the whole wide world. All that we of the Atlantic Union nations are doing is to follow that wise old Roman precept, which some of us learned in our Latin lessons in our school days, which goes, *si vis pacem, para bellum*, meaning, if you wish for peace, prepare for war.

The gracious Speech says that:

... communist imperialism is determined to dominate the world by force or the fear of force—

I am inclined to think that it is the fear of force, rather than force itself which is the main weapon in the communist armoury today. I shall have a few words to say on that branch of the subject a little later. But what we are now setting out to do is to meet and to overcome the fear of force in the only way in which it can be overcome, that is, by ourselves becoming so strong that the fear of force will have lost its power to affect us. A well-armed nation is not afraid, and we must become a well-armed nation.

The few observations which I wish to make this afternoon on the international situation will be largely confined to Europe. Although Korea and the Far East are much in our minds, I do not intend to deal with them, and that for two reasons which seem to me to be good and sufficient. The first is that the present position in Korea and the Far East is so fluid, so difficult to assess and so apt to change that anything which one might say this week may next week be completely inapplicable. Secondly, I think it is perhaps wise to leave what is to be said and done in the Far East to those who have expert and up-to-date knowledge, of which company I do not profess to be one. And, here, I want to pay

respectful tribute to the actions and speeches of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of External Affairs throughout this whole Korean crisis. I think they have done honour to Canada. I should like also to extend a word of praise to the whole of our delegation to the recent session of the United Nations, including our own representative, the honourable senator from Cariboo (Hon. Mr. Turgeon). Perhaps I should add, as a third reason why I do not intend to discuss Korea this afternoon, that the honourable gentleman has been to Lake Success and knows the situation thoroughly, and we are going to have the pleasure of hearing from him tomorrow afternoon.

There is, however, one thing about Korea that I do want to say. It was said most admirably by the leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) on Monday evening last, but I think it bears repetition. We hear criticisms, from sources in this country and in England, of certain aspects of the Far Eastern policy of President Truman and the United States Government. It may be that some of these criticisms are justified. Personally I would be more inclined to criticize certain public men and certain organs of public opinion in the United States which seem to me during the last few weeks to have indulged in hysteria and to have been perfectly willing, with complete irresponsibility, to plunge us all at once into full-scale war against communist China. Be that as it may, I do say that, looked at in the very broadest way, the policy of Mr. Truman and the United States Government in Korea has been both right and courageous. Let me ask honourable senators to cast their minds back only six months to last July, when Mr. Truman first authorized American forces to help the South Koreans in their fight against North Korean aggression, and when he asked for and obtained the support of the United Nations to resist that aggression. The whole free world applauded, and the whole free world was right to applaud, because after all that was the first real test of collective security under the United Nations charter. It was a challenge, and a challenge that was successfully met under the leadership of President Truman. So I repeat that, as a whole, United States policy in Korea has been both right and courageous.

Let me remind honourable senators—and the reminder perhaps is a rather painful one—that there was a very similar test under the League of Nations only twelve years ago. In that case the nation concerned was not Korea but Czechoslovakia, and the principal personality involved was not the President of the United States but the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Oh, there the result was neither right nor courageous!