

anything intentionally for the preservation of peace. I defy anyone who has attended United Nations meetings as a representative of Canada to point out to me one vote, one speech or one move of any other kind by Russian representatives there, for the purpose of safeguarding peace. Whenever Russian representatives have spoken at the United Nations they have said something designed to cause trouble, and they have used the organization for propaganda purposes and nothing else.

Now I come to what the Secretary of State for External Affairs said yesterday, and I call attention to it because had Russia been represented at the meeting of the Security Council on the 29th of June the council could not have passed the resolution calling upon member countries to stop the aggression in Korea. Here is what Mr. Pearson said:

For reasons which to me seem pretty clear, we did not contemplate this kind of aggression. I admitted that the other day and a good deal has been made of that admission. Why did we not expect it? In the first place, we did not expect it because there were no military agreements under article 43 by which we were bound.

I am quite free to admit that the leader of the Canadian Government delegation to the United Nations in 1946—at that time he was, I think, Secretary of State for External Affairs, and he is now Prime Minister—suggested that the United Nations should have a military force to be used against any nation that took aggressive action in any part of the world. My honourable friend the leader of the government here (Hon. Mr. Robertson) was there at the time, as I was. The suggestion did not get very far, as I felt it would not after I heard the speech that Molotov made at that session.

Mr. Pearson went on to say:

In the second place, we did not expect it because it was difficult to visualize a resolution of the Security Council to use force against a communist state which would not be vetoed by the U.S.S.R. as a member of the Security Council. Therefore, realizing the weaknesses of the Security Council in this matter, realizing the unlikelihood of the United Nations being able to live up to its joint obligations in respect to this kind of aggression, certainly from communist countries, we had along with other countries worked out the North Atlantic pact under which our obligations in respect of that group of states would be specific and would not be vetoed by anybody.

It is fortunate for the rest of the world that Russian representatives, who for some six months had been absenting themselves from Security Council meetings, were absent on June 29. But Russia undoubtedly saw her mistake, because at the July meeting she was represented again.

Hon. Mr. Horner: The Russian representative came back on the 1st of August.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Yes, the 1st of August. Thank you.

On the 14th of July the Secretary General of the United Nations called upon member countries to send ground forces to defend South Korea. We sent three destroyers from the Pacific coast, and about a dozen TCA planes were used for transport purposes from Washington, on the Pacific coast, to Tokyo. But what was the response of our government to the call for ground forces? None at all. On the 7th of August the government announced that it would raise a special force to be sent wherever the United Nations might require them, but that probably six months would be required to train the force.

Now, here is what I wish to emphasize. From 1945 to the end of June this year we had spent or voted \$1,500 million to help fight aggression by Russia or any other country, but when we were called upon to send ground forces the government admitted that it was unable to furnish any at all. That is the situation. Today the defenders of South Korea are fighting to save that country against the invaders from the north, and the question in everybody's mind is, "Are the defenders going to succeed, or will there be another Dunkirk?" All the world knows that the British people have been hard pressed to get enough money and goods to do with; and the British government has trouble in Malaya, and threats of trouble at Hong Kong. Yet British troops are helping to defend South Korea. We also know that Australia had fighting airplanes in South Korea almost as soon as the Americans did, and now she is sending ground troops as well. I am not saying whether or not we should have sent troops. I am simply pointing out that when we were asked to send some we did not have any. I may be told that we have forty-five thousand men in the army, navy and air force, but the government has said that they were not trained for the kind of fighting going on in Korea. They were trained to defend Winnipeg, Edmonton, Lethbridge and other cities against the Russians if an invasion were attempted from the north. But does anyone think that any little force we could put in the north country would stand up against the kind of attack that Russia would make if she did decide on an invasion?

Here are two simple facts that have always appealed to me. We fought World War I in Europe, but we know from what the Germans have told since that if they had been successful in that war Canada would have been the first country taken over by them. World War II also was fought in Europe, and again we know that had the Germans been successful in that war the