

an accurate statement, I am not sure that that is a question of privilege. The Executive, of course, announces policy, in the House of Commons when possible, but wherever it may be announced Parliament decides whether or not to adopt that policy and make it effective. The fact is that on this particular occasion no new policy of any kind was announced.

The argument of the Leader of the official Opposition is based on a paragraph from that New York statement which he has quoted in the House, and which had in it four suggestions. He proceeded to put an interpretation on those suggestions, which I claim to be a wrong interpretation, and drew from it the conclusion that I had announced new policy. Let us see what those suggestions or proposals were. The first is, and I am quoting from my statement:

"...we-- "

That is the United Nations peoples and governments who are defeating aggression in Korea.

" --should let the Peking government know that they must expect Communist aggression to be met by collective resistance; ..."

The Leader of the Opposition says that by that statement I am in some form proposing a Pacific pact, and that that is new policy and contrary to the statements made previously by me about a Pacific pact. I suggest that that is as inaccurate an inference to draw from that statement as it would be to suggest, for instance, that the Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Eden, was proposing a Pacific security pact when he said in New York in January that if there were further aggression in South-eastern Asia,-- he was thinking particularly of aggression against Indo-China--it should be met by the solid resistance of the United Nations. All that could have been meant by the statement I made in New York on this matter was that aggression anywhere should be met by collective resistance. Of course, the form of such resistance, and the machinery through which it should operate, would vary according to the means at our disposal and the nature of the aggression.

This is already our obligation under the United Nations Charter. How we are to discharge it may, as we know already from experience, have to depend on circumstances. There is nothing new in this. I have said the same thing many times in this House. We accepted this obligation of collective resistance to aggression when we signed the Charter, especially in Articles 1, 39, 42, 48 and 49. We also accepted this obligation when we accepted the resolution of the United Nations Assembly a year and a half ago, the resolution to unite for peace.. Paragraph 1 of which states that if the Security Council is unable to do its duty the Assembly will become the agency for collective security.

The second point which it was suggested meant that new policy had been laid down is found in the words which I used, and I quote:

"...no government in Peking committing such aggression can hope to be accepted into the community of nations; --"