

*The Address—Mr. Pearson*

to provide, *inter alia*, for band funds and expenditures therefrom, and for other appropriations in case of deficiency or lack of band funds.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the house.

Motion agreed to.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE****OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION OF  
NATIONAL DEFENCE**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition):** In view of the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) yesterday that it is not the intention of the government to set up a committee on defence, may I return to the earlier suggestion that I made. In view of the primary importance of national defence in the discussions of this session and of the desirability of having an orderly debate on that subject without the intervention of other matters, may I again urge that a day or a number of days be set aside on which national defence can be debated following a statement by the Minister of National Defence.

**Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister):** I know of no standing order under which that can be done before the special order with respect to the speech from the throne has been complied with. I understand that it is the intention of the Minister of National Defence to make a full statement early in that debate and the minister's statement can be followed by discussion of everything contained therein; it would not be within the power of the government, however, even if it felt so inclined, to prevent any hon. member from raising any other question that he might think warranted the attention of the house and of the country.

**SPEECH FROM THE THRONE****CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The house resumed, from Thursday, February 1, consideration of the motion of Mr. W. H. McMillan for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Drew, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

**Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** In beginning, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate the mover (Mr. McMillan) and seconder (Mr. Breton) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne upon the way in which they performed their difficult duties. They did credit to themselves

and honour to the constituencies they represent in this house. They made some constructive and practical suggestions. Their speeches were short and to the point. I hope that mine this afternoon will at least be to the point. In view of the ramifications of the subject which I am discussing, I am afraid it may not be as short as I should like it to be, and as I am sure other members would like it to be.

We all know that these are fateful days in the relations between nations. Those relations involve many complicated and indeed dangerous issues which at times divide even friends. In dealing with some of them today—and I certainly shall not be able to deal with all of them—there are certain general considerations which I think we should keep in mind.

The first consideration seems to me to be absolutely fundamental: Our belief that freedom is valuable and precious in itself, and that the loss of freedom anywhere in the world means an impairment and indeed the endangering of our own freedom. We may not always be in a position to defeat attempts to reduce the area in which men can breathe freely, but we should never voluntarily give our consent to that process, because we know that by so doing we would be betraying the principle which is one of the chief inspirations of all free men. Freedom cannot be cloistered in one country, in one continent, or indeed in one hemisphere. To the limit of our resources, therefore, we must try to maintain and even hope to extend the jurisdiction where the writ of freedom runs. Only in that way can we be true to ourselves and to the inheritance we have received.

The second general consideration which I should like to mention is our faith in the United Nations. The aggression against the republic of Korea has tested the United Nations in a searching way and has led to a reappraisal of its role in maintaining the peace, of what it can and cannot do in a divided world of two superstates around which all others tend to group, on the one side willingly and on the other side by compulsion. It has certainly been made clear by recent events that our world organization is not yet in a position where it can safely undertake all the tasks which may be imposed on it by resolutions, and I think it is dishonest to pretend that it can. Whatever may be the result of this re-examination, however, it is certain that the United Nations still fulfils a number of functions which are indispensable if peace is to be maintained on any tolerable basis. For one thing, it holds out the promise of freedom to all. Second, it provides a framework in which men of good will