

External Affairs

example. The depletion of our forests is another example of an instance where men are setting themselves up as arbiters, and are defying the natural and fundamental laws. So it is with every aspect of our endeavours with human relationship. I believe that as a nation we ought to be concentrating upon getting people to realize that until they begin to observe law, in every one of its aspects, we cannot hope to achieve world peace. I am looking forward to the day when we shall be engaged actively on a program of this kind, and I pledge the minister my support in everything he undertakes that will lead us to that goal.

Mr. J. M. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to detain the house for just a short time to make a few comments on what has been said. In common with the member for Peel, I find myself in agreement with the line the minister has taken, but I have one or two questions I should like to ask. The first point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I understand these London decisions had to do with the matter of defence, and it is about defence I am going to talk. Of course, we all want to avoid a war, especially those of us who have seen war. We believe too that in so far as we can develop economically we will help to meet the scourge of communism—we all agree with that. But I want to address myself particularly to what the minister said this afternoon with regard to those decisions which have been hailed as most important decisions throughout the world.

One comment I wish to make is that, while the minister said quite enough things to make me feel he regarded this matter as urgent, nevertheless I did not carry away from his speech any sense of urgency at all. On the one hand he told us that we were moving into one world and that we would get there either as a result of peaceful co-operation or through a devastating war. He also said that we had gone a long way in the preparation of a unified defence system. That sounded good. Nevertheless, he also told us these decisions were decisions on principle only, and that many bridges had to be crossed before we could take any action. It is quite true that, compared with what was said about Sydney, he went very far, because with regard to Sydney I had a feeling it was just a shadow of a shadow of the real thing. He was talking about the months or years it would take to get co-operation. If the people of southeastern Asia are hoping much will come from the Sydney conference, I would advise them to change their ideas.

I am making this point, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is extraordinarily difficult

[Mr. Low.]

at the present time to make the people of this country take a serious view of these dangers. After all, spring is here; the baseball season is opening; people are going fishing and the summer holiday season is coming. It is the hardest thing for anyone to make people believe there is really such a thing as danger about in this country. I feel there is a special duty on the minister. I was quite in agreement with the member for Peace River (Mr. Low), when he said he wished the minister would tell us what Canada is to do, because I have no idea of what Canada is to do. I should like to read an article from the *New York Times*. From that I get the feeling that they had a sense of urgency, that they thought the London discussions meant something and that they thought the decisions had to be followed up quickly. On May 22 the *New York Times* had this to say:

With the momentous decisions of the London conferences of the Atlantic powers spread upon the record of history, there devolve upon the Atlantic governments and peoples the task and the duty to take speedy and concrete action to transform the paper agreements into living reality.

Those are words which, so far as words can go, suggest a sense of urgency. But I did not get that sense of urgency out of the speech of the minister this afternoon. In the same article later on the *New York Times* said:

But the first and foremost of all these obligations would seem to be that, beyond all previous technical reservations in the North Atlantic pact, all the nations providing the collective force must be ready to act in concert the instant any one of them is attacked.

Then later on they say:

For the defection, or even hesitation, of any one nation would immediately and inevitably wreck the whole collective force and expose all to defeat and subjugation.

Those are extremely ugly words, Mr. Speaker; and I submit, with deference, that nobody reading the minister's speech would have such ugly words in mind at all. We had the rather pleasant suggestion that things were better. As a matter of fact, I suppose the only thing that warrants us in believing that things are better in the last two or three months is what happened in Berlin on May 28. As someone pointed out to me this afternoon, let us remember that it was Germans who did that. True, it was Germans with the feeling that behind them there was a common sense of purpose. Nevertheless, there it was.

It seems to me the minister is trying to make the best of two worlds. He says we have got to find out how to have both "guns and butter". Of course, that is true; and I recognize that that is true. In time of peace we cannot suddenly plunge people into great sacrifices or even a part of the sacrifices that they are ready to make in wartime. But again