

*External Affairs*

Everyone knows the procedure by which troops were moved to Korea, and how the United Nations was brought into it. But, Mr. Speaker, we all know that, through the ordinary machinery of the United Nations, that act which has been a great deterrent to aggression would not have been a practical possibility. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, carried out it is true within the structural framework of the United Nations Organization, as was ANZUS, recognized that if the free nations are going to be able to build up their defences against aggression, they must do it through some channel other than the ordinary machinery of the United Nations Organization. That does not mean that the United Nations Organization is not effective for many useful purposes. It does not mean that we should not support it in every way we can in the hope that through the years ahead it may become a forum for the reasonable discussion of international problems and for the advancement of the economic and social welfare of all people. In so far as effective defence against aggression is concerned, it has been necessary to follow another course.

In view of that fact, how can we justify any suggestion at this time of making the United Nations even less effective than it is today? What would happen would be that you would have Russia and China acting in unison to disrupt every effort at constructive development within that organization. You would simply double the trouble that Russia has already been able to make because of their special position. You would simply increase by exactly 100 per cent the measure of paralysis that has been imposed upon the United Nations Organization by Russia's planned sabotage.

No, Mr. Speaker, while this is not something in regard to which we are called upon to vote, let us hope that there will be a sufficiently emphatic expression here of a desire to see no compromise with this evil, that there will be no uncertainty at Geneva as to what the position of Canada is. It is my earnest hope that between now and April 26, when that conference begins, as a result of the discussion that has taken place here, there will be further discussion throughout Canada that will inform the government that the people of Canada want no compromise with the devil.

What a pitiful hope is that vain hope expressed in terms of such utter unreality that if only we should be kind, generous and gentle to Mao Tse-tung perhaps he will forget his associations with Moscow and will embrace our free nations in a formal fellowship which will pit him against Russia in

their threat to the world. What a mad dream! What a dangerous dream! What a pitfall for nations which fell into that pit once before. Just let us remember certain things which indicate what folly it would be to embrace any such preposterous dream.

There is a vast difference between Yugoslavia and China, not in the principles to which they adhere, not in the form of government, but in certain geographic realities. I almost hesitate to use that word "realities" or "realistic", having regard to the context in which it has been used, because "realistic" has been used as "materialistic", but "realistic" nevertheless perhaps does describe the approach we should make to it.

Tito broke with the Kremlin not because he had broken with communism, but because he had certain ambitions of his own and because he had a very powerful mountain barrier between him and Russia, and because he had behind him the ocean where he could get supplies from those who, wisely or unwisely, were prepared to give them to him. Can anyone think for one moment that if Tito had been on the other side of a great ocean and had no prospects of military supplies and other help, he would have invited certain punishment that would have been visited upon him by Russia's forces at that time?

No, Mr. Speaker, there were many reasons why Tito took the stand he did, and we should welcome that, and we should hope that as the first step toward free government the same thing may happen in other lands. And I say "the first step toward free government", because it is my hope that under the influence of the outside world Yugoslavia may gradually emerge from communism into a better form of government that will bring freedom to its people. That is a possibility, once they are separated from the Kremlin. It is not a possibility as long as that slavery is a continuing reality.

Let us see what chance there is of a similar thing happening in the case of Mao. May I repeat something that needs to be repeated? Mao Tse-tung did not lead any agrarian uprising. He used so-called agrarian uprisings and he used everything else that would help his cause at different times; but the turning point in the career of Mao Tse-tung came after what is known as the long march when, having fought his way more than 5,000 miles across China, he found himself on the Soviet border, in valleys, under the shadows of the mountains where, with the assistance of Russian officers, Russian supplies and Russian equipment he could prepare the army that later invaded China.

We need not compare governments; we are not called upon to examine the merits or