

Supply—External Affairs

China. By admitting communist China, the U.N.O. would bring about its own destruction. It would mean the prelude to a first class funeral for the United Nations organization which would have been the first to depart from the spirit as well as the letter of its charter.

Hon. Senator Dessureault and myself have immensely enjoyed our visit to Japan and free China. We were in a position to realize the importance of Formosa to the countries of southeast Asia. In my opinion, the defence of Formosa is not only vital to the survival of free peoples, but also necessary to check communism in southeast Asia. If, by any chance, Formosa were not supported, I think we would lose much and that all countries in southeast Asia would fall prey to communism.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make those few personal remarks as a token of gratitude to the government of free China that welcomed us so kindly.

(Text):

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention originally to intervene in a debate of such importance and I do so with considerable temerity. I do so not as a statesman, not as one who is learned in the field of foreign policy but as an individual Canadian who has gained most of her information through the public press, through pronouncements made by this administration and by those of other countries and from news stories. In the intervening period of adjournment I attempted to ascertain from the people with whom I came in contact both in my riding and elsewhere the feeling of the Canadian people with respect to the crisis in Berlin, which was really little more than a small cloud on our horizon when we left this green chamber in July and which has grown horrifyingly to such proportions and to such an evil colour.

I cannot say that during the weeks of adjournment I have been able to find unanimity even among my own people, much less among the many other people throughout the country to whom I have spoken. Therefore I do not attempt to speak for all Canadians, for all of the people of my riding or indeed, Mr. Chairman, even for a majority of them.

There is no question that this debate into which we are launched on the first day of our return has within it the seeds of the most critical discussion that has taken place not only during this session but in this parliament and perhaps in any other parliament. Rather than the debate ending with too few people intervening, I would hope that most members of the house would attempt to search their

consciences and to give the government what it deserves, their best view with respect to their opinions and the people's opinions. I do not approach this matter in a partisan way. Survival or failure to survive is not a question of party politics. Indeed, in many ways it is not even a matter of nationalism or internationalism. Perhaps those who serve in this parliament and in other parliaments or congresses of the world have now to deal with the most important problem of all.

May I humbly associate myself with the remarks of many of those who have already spoken and particularly with those of the hon. member for Leeds. For us in Canada who have never felt bombs rain on our heads, who have never seen children without heads or arms lying in the streets, who have never seen our public monuments and our homes lying in rubble around us, for us in Canada, some of whom have worn a uniform but the majority of whom have learned about these things through news reels, films and from the press, it is easy to be rigid. It is easy for us to say that some place we will draw the line and stand and fight. I would think that many Canadians of my generation who once wore their country's uniform are prepared once again as Canadians, regardless of ethnic background, regardless of the part of the country from which they stem, to don the uniform of the Queen if their country calls them; but with what cold horror they would do so. I do not think they would do so this time with the feeling that there would be something of peace that could be won.

I recall when the first atomic bombs appeared on the scenes toward the end of the last war and first came into our common lexicon. Many people ignored them and said that in the last war the horror of gas was not used and mankind would never stoop to use atomic warfare. Yet here we are today four years from the time when we began to see what we could do with nuclear power for peaceful uses, four years this month from the time when the U.S.S.R. put its first sputnik into space. We have come the full cycle in a few short years in this country and the world, to the point where what we are actually discussing is whether those who sit in this chamber and those they represent will be here a year from now.

There are those who say with respect to the question of survival that there will always be some who will survive and they can start again. The essence of this debate with respect to Berlin must come down to this. Do we risk our future, the future of everyone in the world, the uncommitted nations, the committed nations, those millions of people in the world who do not even know that there is a Berlin much less that