

*External Affairs*

last the *Edmonton Journal*, speaking of the Yalta papers, made this very strong statement:

British fears that these disclosures would lead to embarrassment all round are likely to be only too justified. Even the first summaries appearing in the news are full of dynamite. All the participants, but especially the late President Roosevelt, appear in an extremely bad light. That the president's judgment was failing in the later years of his life has long been known, but few realized the depth of his credulity towards Soviet Russia and his animosity towards Britain, or at least towards the commonwealth idea, as revealed in these papers. The most striking example, of course, was his secret proposal to Stalin for excluding British influence in the Far East and even for the surrender of Hong Kong.

The editorial continues:

It is dismaying, too, to find the responsible leaders of the free world seriously talking about such fantastic propositions as the division of Germany into three—or perhaps five—parts.

Perhaps under the pressure of his heavy and exacting duties the Prime Minister did not have the time two years ago to keep up with his homework and research work. Perhaps because of that we should excuse him, but I merely point out that sometimes when we are trying to get the facts and inform the Canadian people we suffer in consequence abuse and attack.

The *Edmonton Journal* editorial winds up by saying that today's statesmen and diplomats, by studying the record of why and how their predecessors went wrong, will have an opportunity of avoiding their mistakes. Relating that to the Far Eastern situation I should like to point out that the communists in China appear confident and alert to take advantage of any hesitation whatsoever on the part of America and the western nations. When Mr. Dulles was here last week he called it recklessness, but whether it is alert confidence or recklessness born of a belief that they whipped the United Nations' forces in the Korean war and France in Indo-China, it is clear that in the present situation any hesitation on the part of the United States and the western nations will be interpreted as a sign of weakness and will likely encourage the reds to try to take the offshore islands, and perhaps Formosa, by force.

The United States quite rightly feels that she must not sacrifice what loyal allies she has in the Far East. The 600,000 freedom-loving soldiers on Formosa and the R.O.K. army in South Korea, with valuable naval and air bases in their possession, it seems to me, are of tremendous importance to the morale and security of all the free peoples of southeastern Asia as well as Australia, New Zealand and the North American continent.

[Mr. Low.]

I think there is solid strategic sense in Secretary of State Dulles' recent statements of American policy in the Pacific. I think that this is in strong contrast to what some of the starry-eyed dreamers of the British Labour party have been saying. Only a few weeks ago one of Mr. Attlee's cabinet ministers made the silly recommendation that Formosa be handed over to the communists and that Chiang Kai-shek be exiled to St. Helena, there to be kept under guard by the United States seventh fleet. This kind of poison has been fed to the British people now for so long that the government today is not able to take a stand except one which is interpreted by the communists as weakness.

It appears that Mr. Churchill has been influenced to a quite extensive degree by the attitude of the British Labour party. It appears likely also that Mr. Churchill has been influenced very strongly by Britain's need for trade with red China. If that is so, we in Canada and the United States have nobody to blame but ourselves for the situation. By our reprehensible attitude toward trade and the dollar problem in the early post-war years we literally forced Britain into a position of dependence upon trade with Russia and China for many things essential to her very existence. Britain's present foreign policy reflects her anxiety about keeping some favourable trading relations with those countries. I think one of the strongest pieces of evidence in support of this belief is to be found in the speed and vehemence with which Britain denounced the recent proposal that she give up Hong Kong.

We were heartened by a number of things which Mr. Dulles said in his broadcast to the American people on March 8 last. I read the script in *U.S. News and World Report*. Mr. Dulles had just got back from Bangkok and he told the American people about how the United States, working within the framework of the United Nations charter, had joined in mutual security treaties which cover the freedom-loving countries of Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, South Viet Nam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya, Pakistan, Australia and New Zealand. He said that one of these treaties, the eight-nation Manila pact for southeast Asia, has just come into force and that he went to Bangkok to attend the first meeting of the treaty council.

Mr. Dulles stated that the three main purposes of the Manila pact were, first, defence against open-armed aggression; second, defence against subversion; and, third, the improvement of economic and social conditions in all these countries. As I read Mr. Dulles' speech it seemed to me that the whole attitude of the American government toward