

*The Address—Mr. A. Stewart*

lion of Silver island; the peeping squaw; the princess of the mist, and the three sisters, to say nothing about Kakabeka falls, which are higher than Niagara though they have less water.

When I consider the question of war, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am not afraid of Russia nor of communist China. It is not heads that count; it is wills that are consecrated to do what is right. I think back to the first time I read the story of how the children of Israel were enslaved by the Midianites. Gideon got his commission from the right source. He called Israel together, and 32,000 men rallied to the support of the old flag. But there were too many, and those who were fearful and afraid of the campaign were given a chance to go home. Twenty-two thousand went home, but there were still too many. They had to be tested; and the men who went down to the brook were not so anxious to get a good satisfying drink; they had their eye on the hills beyond, and wanted to get after the enemy. Finally only three hundred were left, but they put to rout the armies of the Midianites.

What happened to the nations of the past? What happened to Hitler? He left God out of it, and because of that he made outstanding mistakes. The greatest was when he attacked Russia. What about Napoleon? He had burning ambition, but he left God out. Any nation like Russia or China which treats God as a myth and follows the teaching of Karl Marx is bound to make mistakes, and sooner or later it will find itself down and out.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay my tribute to the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) on his address yesterday and also to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew), because he has some practical common sense. As to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) I can only say we are thankful that we have men like him; and baseball cannot buy him for \$65,000 a year.

**Mr. Alistair Stewart (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring this debate back to the realm of international affairs. Almost the concluding words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) were that this house should turn down the amendment offered by my leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell), yesterday, which reads:

We further regret that while Your Excellency's advisers have generally followed a constructive course in relation to the Korean dispute, they have in relation to the resolution branding China as an aggressor supported a course which is premature and unwise at this particular moment, and which should not have been pursued until the methods of peaceful negotiation had been completely exhausted.

[Mr. McIvor.]

Until a day or two ago I thought we had some quite good company in those sentiments. Those of us who listened to the C.B.C. broadcast on Tuesday night from Lake Success by Peter Stursberg heard Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, who spoke in a voice which was strained and tired. Unquestionably he spoke with sincerity, and he said he thought it was premature and unwise at this particular moment to pursue this policy, until the methods of peaceful negotiation had been completely exhausted. Not only did the minister believe those words to be true on Tuesday, before the vote; he believed them to be true last week, and since we believe his words are true today we have accepted them. Now we find it is he who has recanted.

I think it is a good thing that as far as possible there should be in this house a reasonable approximation to unanimity as to the foreign policy we pursue. That has been so in the past, and I think it will be so in the future. But when there exists such a major difference of opinion as we have we would be untrue to what we believe, untrue to those who agree with us, if we remained silent and uncritical, even although the times may be dangerous. What we have advocated in the past should be known. It is on the record.

We have said that our policy should be designed towards keeping China neutral. We were not convinced we could make an ally, let alone a friend, of China; nor were we convinced that China was yet in the orbit of Russia. Indeed, the differences between China and Russia even today are obvious. Unfortunately we have pushed these two countries closer together, although their differences may not be so clear as has been the case in the past or as will be in the future. It is not without significance that Russian influence in North Korea has practically disappeared, and its place has been taken by that of China. It is not without significance that the quarrels which have existed between China and Russia over Manchuria are not yet patched up, and may possibly break out again in 1952. It is not without significance that Chinese nationalism is today stronger than Chinese allegiance to communism. With a strongly nationalist China, I do not see much possibility of China becoming as subservient to the Kremlin as have other powers which could more accurately be described as satellite countries.

In other words, what we have asked for, what we have advocated, is patience. Since we desire peace and the improved welfare of the world, patience was demanded of us even in the face of extraordinary provocation. What did the minister say this afternoon? He said that we called China an