now wish, for tactical reasons, to avoid an open conflict, and try to sap our strength by other means. It may even attempt—indeed it has already attempted and with some effect—to deceive and divide us by false peace campaigns, by exploiting economic and social difficulties. In short, as it has been put very graphically, it may put poison in our soup instead of cutting our throats.

It is, I think, necessary for free countries to take counter measures against this danger as well as against the danger of military aggression. We should, for instance, never lose a chance to drive home the fact—it may be more obvious to us than it is to others—that we are for peace alone; that while we in NATO, for instance, are determined to press forward with our defence programme, undeterred either by threats of war or phony promises of peace, nevertheless our primary purpose is always to prevent war and not to fight one; to ensure that D-day like tomorrow never comes; to underline our desire to use our energy and wealth not for arming but for peaceful, social and economic progress in a world where armaments will not be necessary.

In the kind of situation with which we are faced today, it may be that if we have achieved our defence objectives by, say, the end of 1954, we will have surmounted the most acutely dangerous period; but that in its turn may be followed by the longer term phase of the conflict, the marathon race as opposed to the sprint, and that may last for many, many years. It will require discipline, steadiness and perseverance; a refusal also to yield to the temptation to adopt the policies of even the tactics of those who would destroy us. We must not only maintain, as a normal part of national activity, the level of defence effort required, but also prove to our own and other people that our civilization and our way of life are worthy of this effort.

The achievement of military and social strength, of short-term and long-term objectives, is now a main feature of the policy of every free state. To secure these objectives there must be mutual understanding and confidence. This can be blocked by a feeling, on the one hand, that there is an unequal sharing of the burden of defence. It can be blocked by the feeling on the other hand that there is an unequal sharing of the burden of existence.

This partnership of the free world must then be founded on mutual respect, mutual understanding and mutual aid. It is now backed by increasing strength. With that strength, we can defend ourselves if we have to. From it we can negotiate, if we are given a chance. From strength, used with wisdom and restraint, through negotiation, carried on with realism and sincerity, to a peace which rests on a more solid foundation than any that we have today; that is the course which the governments and peoples of the free world have set, and one which this Government in its foreign policy, and indeed which this Parliament and this people of Canada, will do their best to follow.





-National Defence

KOREAN STAMPS HONOUR CANADA

The Republic of Korea has issued a matched set of stamps, honouring Canada as one of the 19 nations which have sent forces to aid in the war against communist aggression. Designed by Park Moon Cho of the Korean Postel Section, one of the 500-Won stamps is in the United Nations color, a light blue, which symbolizes the sky. The other, in pastel green, represents the fruitful earth.