

*Supply—External Affairs*

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, in the latter part of my observations I did give utterance to some cautionary observations in regard to the extension of Canada's commitments, her specific commitments, apart from our general commitments in the United Nations, which we recognize as extending to all the world. But I did express cautionary observations with regard to the extension of additional specific commitments to other areas. As I understood him, the hon. member for Prince Albert, however, made an interesting and, indeed, an important statement in regard to his view as to the desirability of the government's accepting additional commitments. He made this statement this afternoon:

—on behalf of the people of Canada he—

That is, the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

—should give notice that, in the event of the Geneva conference proving unsuccessful in settling the Indo-China problem Canada would join with other freedom-loving nations in a pact in Asia designed to assure peace to the same degree as peace has been assured in Europe through the instrumentality of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

And later on he came back to that point when he said:

The minister has shown that Canada has responsibilities for peace in all parts of the world, not only in the United Nations; we have to accept them in any Pacific pact that may be achieved, so that the other parts of our commonwealth—Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan and Ceylon—will know that Canada and the commonwealth will stand with the United States and thereby assure the maintenance of a solid wall against the advance of communism everywhere in the world.

Well, all I would say in regard to that, Mr. Chairman—and I was asked by the hon. member to state my view in regard to it—is that this government is not ready to take any such far-reaching additional specific commitment in respect of collective security at this time. But we remain ready to carry out our obligations of collective security under the United Nations charter in any part of the world at any time, along with the other members of the United Nations, and we accept and confirm the specific obligations that we already have under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As I said earlier this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, we would have to be, in our opinion, very careful, in view of our resources and our other commitments, in the extension of specific commitments beyond those which we have already undertaken. On that very point, Mr. Chairman, the advice which was given to the government in this house on May 20

by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich is very much to the point, when he said—and I quote from *Hansard* at page 4916:

In closing, I repeat that we on this side of the house appreciate the difficulties confronting the minister—

That is the Minister of National Defence. I continue:

—and his department in these very uncertain times. We urge caution in accepting new commitments; we stress the importance of continued emphasis on the defence of the home front, the North American continent; we urge care in all expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, that, in so far as commitments are concerned, expresses the viewpoint to which I tried to give expression this afternoon. We urge caution in respect of the undertaking of new special commitments in any other area of the world than that of the north Atlantic area, to which we are already committed.

That, Mr. Chairman, as I have already said, is not the same as saying that we cannot accept the principle of collective security in one part of the world and reject it in another. I would be glad to stand by that statement, because if the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is working well in the defence of the Atlantic area against aggression, and if it has worked well as a deterrent against aggression, a southeast Asia security organization, which would include, as pointed out by more than one speaker, the Asian countries themselves and those other countries who have special commitments and special responsibilities for Asian territories, might well contribute, not only to the security but to the progress and indeed to the freedom of that part of the world.

I do not think that there were any other specific questions that were addressed to me this afternoon except possibly by the hon. member for Fort William. If he were in his seat I would like to thank him for the kind words he said about me, and I hope that my reply to his question will not interfere with our friendship because I do not think it is going to be the kind of answer that he might welcome. He asked me whether Mr. Syngman Rhee and Mr. Chiang Kai-shek were in close co-operation, and whether there was any chance of an attack on China from that co-operative source. Well, all I can say to the hon. member is that I know very little about the co-operation between Mr. Syngman Rhee and General Chiang Kai-shek, but I do understand there does exist such co-operation. I express my own view in saying that I hope that the co-operation will not result in an attack by those two governments on the mainland of China. I say that, not because I have any high regard for