

Supply—External Affairs

achieved so much for freedom's survival in Europe. Canada being a Pacific power, what attitude will the Canadian government take with reference to becoming a member of such an organization in the Pacific? For several years the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra has been advocating the formation of a Pacific pact. On occasion he has faced ridicule and sometimes indifference. The events of the last few months bear witness to the degree to which that hon. gentleman saw something of the needs in Asia in his advocacy of an organization similar to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The other day I referred to some conclusions I had formed in consequence of the visit I made to Europe a few weeks ago. In every part of Europe every opportunity and every courtesy was extended to me by members of the Canadian diplomatic corps, and every opportunity was given me to see the things I desired to see. I came back with a renewed confidence in the forcefulness and effectiveness of NATO and with the hope, almost one of assurance, that in the immediate future peace will be maintained through the instrumentality of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

What I said has been borne out since by a statement within the last few days by Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery, Deputy Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, when he said that allied forces are capable of stopping any Soviet surprise attack on western Europe.

Only an all-out Soviet offensive preceded by a big build-up could overwhelm present allied armies, he said, and such a build-up would give time for the west to prepare itself.

That is his considered opinion as to the effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and I think the minister could follow no wiser course to bring Britain and the United States together even closer than in the past, than making the announcement 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.

Indo-China, and what is happening there, may be a turning point in our history. What is happening in Geneva may bring the commonwealth closer to the United States than ever before. The commonwealth has a tremendous contribution to make in the world in the preservation of peace in Asia,

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

with its Asiatic membership joining with the western members of the family.

The future of southeast Asia is at stake. The unity of the western powers must be maintained. Communist strategy seems to be designed to divide and conquer. This debate will show that as far as Canada is concerned we will not be divided. I hope there will come in our country a fuller realization of the responsibilities of Canada in the world of today, and a determination to continue the course of peace we took in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 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.

Mr. Coldwell: Mr. Chairman, we listened this afternoon to an extremely interesting speech. I was particularly interested in the four points the minister made at the conclusion of his speech, when he said that Canada would continue at Geneva to endeavour to bring about a settlement in Korea through United Nations efforts; that, if unsuccessful, we would hope that a further examination of the situation could be made at a future date with the hope that something useful might come out of it and particularly that peace might be attained; and that we would oppose the reopening of hostilities in Korea. Then again, with regard to Indo-China, the minister made it clear—and I am glad he did so—that we share the anxieties that are felt by our commonwealth associates, particularly those in southeast Asia. Then he went on to say that Canada had already extended her defence commitments as far as he thought we were able to extend them.

I could not agree with the hon. member for Prince Albert when he said that this was a new statement involving further commitments because, as I understood the minister, he said that we had, under the United Nations charter, obligations which we were prepared at all times to fulfil. He also said that we had accepted obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which we were obliged to fulfil but that beyond that Canada should not go. I do not say that he used those words, but I think that was the inference.