

*External Affairs*

that there is a lessening of the tension in the world, and that the danger of a third world war is receding. I have followed those statements by eminent statesmen, whom I do not need to name. I have been rather concerned with that view because, as I see it, the danger is that it may lessen our preparations for defence.

I do not hold those views, myself, because I have never seen any great lessening of the tension. I was glad to hear the Secretary of State for External Affairs, for whom I have the greatest regard, make certain statements. I am not going to quote his speech, which I do not have before me, but I shall refer to notes which I took at the time, and will take the liberty of reading.

One of the first statements he made was that there was no progress at the Berlin conference; secondly, that there was disappointment and disillusionment over the lack of success in making a peace treaty with Germany, and particularly with Austria. He pointed out that the basic foreign policy of Russia has not changed—and with that statement I agree entirely. He said, further, that the United Nations is not an effective agency for security, and that is why we formed NATO. He said also that, in view of the danger which threatens, local defence is not sufficient. In other words that we must have collective security if we are to survive. He said that collective action is needed on instant retaliation.

May I comment on that last note which I took. Much has been said before by way of criticism of Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State for the United States, when he announced the policy of instant retaliation. As on a great many other occasions in the history of this cold war in which we are engaged, the people in this and in other countries took counsel of their fears and wanted to know from Mr. Dulles what he meant by his statement.

They wanted to know from Mr. Dulles what he meant by it. Anybody who knows the United States and the foreign policy of the United States knows this. It has no aggressive intentions against anybody. When he made that statement he implied, if he did not specify it at the time, that instant retaliation meant only if we were suddenly attacked. With that statement of Mr. Dulles I agree. All military experts here and abroad will tell you that if we go into a third world war we are not going to have a declaration of war; that it will come suddenly and possibly overnight. If we are going to call the United Nations into session to decide whether we will hit back and whether we are going to consult the United States and whether they

[Mr. Stick.]

are going to consult us, we may lose the war overnight. We have to be reasonable about this and use our common sense.

If the U.S.S.R. strikes at us suddenly, through the air, are we going to wait to know what Washington is going to do, or are we going to tie their hands by waiting and wasting precious time so that we shall be handicapped to hit back? Because the expert military opinion today is that whoever gets in the first blow, and the first heavy blow, has a very good chance of winning the war on that basis. I am with Mr. Dulles. If we are suddenly attacked, arrangements should be made so that the United States' hands are not tied and so that the strategic air force of the United States can hit back at once without any waste of time; otherwise time will play into the hands of Russia and not on our side.

It has been stated in this house on more than one occasion that the battle in which we are participating today is a battle for the minds of men and women. That is true. I subscribe to that statement and I have used it myself. If we are in a battle for the minds of men what are we going to do about it? How are we going to counteract it? It is recognized by everybody here that you are not going to defeat communism by war, and that war will not change the minds of men. If that is true, then we must look to some other way to change the minds of men. Furthermore, it has been said in this house on many occasions that economics cause poverty and distress; in other words, economics play a large part in the thinking of those who favour communism. To some extent that is true but not absolutely so.

It has also been said in this house on many occasions that we shall lose Asia because of the poverty and distress in the Asian countries. I said here a year or two ago that the difference between the east and the west, the Orient and the Occident, is not economic, absolutely. It is racial and it is time we understand what this racial difference means.

They have had poverty in southeast Asia for many years. Communist countries have put forth their views as to how they should better their conditions of life. In one country it is to share land; in another country it is to appeal to nationalism. What are we doing to counteract it? Well, we have the Colombo plan. Through the Colombo plan we are demonstrating our good will toward those countries in southeast Asia. We are showing them that we are desirous of helping them economically. That plan is working. We are all glad to hear the reports on the progress that has taken place during the last