

*The Address—Mr. A. Stewart*

a judgment and at the same time give the impression that we can and will immediately and effectively enforce it no matter what the consequences may be, if we are not prepared to do that.

In other words, the Secretary of State for External Affairs was asking us not to repeat the error which we perpetrated in the league of nations with Italy. The *Free Press* does not yet accept that viewpoint. On January 26 it quoted from the *London Times* as follows:

Simply to dub China an aggressor without being able to take further, more decisive, measures would achieve nothing.

In other words, much the same as what the Secretary of State for External Affairs said. Then the *Free Press* went on to say:

Once the moral and legal position is established, the crime recorded and the criminal identified, what follows will inevitably be governed by strategic and military considerations.

I think this newspaper knows, as well as we do, that military considerations are such that they do not permit us to protect all the interests which we may have over the world. We have neither the troops nor the weapons. So that in effect what the *Winnipeg Free Press* is asking for is moral condemnation and no more, and yet if nothing is done beyond that—again I try to speak logically—if nothing is done beyond that, the United States may be happy at having had its own way, and the *Free Press* can wallow in its own moral rectitude, but the effect upon the United Nations may well be devastating; for as the United Nations may weaken, so will China be strengthened.

What we are doing is still to some extent playing the not very astute game asked us to be played by Russia. We are shoving China into Moscow's arms and we may have to fight a futile war in the Orient.

I now come to the position of the C.C.F. We do not think the real enemy in this world today is China. So far as we are concerned the threat to the world lies in the Soviet union. We believe that war in China means the wasting of human and material assets and a consequent weakening of our own position; and the position in which we are most engrossed, I imagine, is that of our membership and responsibilities in the North Atlantic treaty. But if our position there is weakened the North Atlantic grouping becomes weakened, and the green light is given to aggression, but not the aggression

which the United States has in mind. Should we become sufficiently weak the green light is given to the Soviet union in western Europe.

I am convinced that the majority of Canadians know that, as I am convinced that the great majority of the people of Canada do not want war with China. The majority of the people of Canada do not want war—period. But if war has to come we realize with whom it is going to be. It is going to be with these men in the Kremlin, who have made a mockery of human dignity, a travesty of human liberty and a shambles of every hope we had for a peaceful world following the end of the war.

In our opinion our national interest demands that our strength be not frittered away. Our national interest demands that our determination to defend ourselves be not deflected by secondary events. Why then are we pursuing this policy which may conceivably land us into a morass from which I can see no way to extricate ourselves? I think there is only one answer. Again I am speaking bluntly because I think between friends we can speak with a degree of candour as long as it is recognized to be honest and sincere. The reason is American pressure. But what sort of American pressure could conceivably be exercised to persuade our delegate at the United Nations to support the course which he admitted to be premature and unwise at that particular time? The pressure was the fear that the United States would revert to isolation, and that we could no longer count upon the United States as an ally in our common fight to maintain our freedom and our ideals. The inference, which I do not take, but the inference which undoubtedly will be taken in certain areas in Europe unhappily, is that the United States is perhaps not so reliable an ally as many had hoped, but that in fact it can only be relied upon so long as it gets its own way. I am convinced that there are many Americans who would be horrified at such an interpretation of what has been done. My only hope is that time will not make them even more horrified by a realization that they may have won a battle and lost a war.

On motion of Mr. Fournier (Hull) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fournier (Hull) the house adjourned at 5.42 p.m.