

Supply—External Affairs

freedom, and that all those differences which today have emerged will be forgotten as other differences have been forgotten in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned these things because I believe that this is a time for a great affirmation of faith in the future of the commonwealth on the part of those of us here in this house and in Canada, and throughout the commonwealth generally—a great affirmation of faith in a basic organization which itself can give strength to the efforts of the United States, to the United Nations, and to all those other organizations with which we are associated.

We all remember the ancient injunction: For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who then shall prepare himself to the battle? Let us leave no uncertainty about our convictions in this respect. And let us plan with the broad vision of our own advancing prosperity, with all the human and material resources we possess within this commonwealth; and at the same time let us think of what that will mean to other nations as well. But, above all, let any plans of that kind be great and embracing plans. Small, limited plans have nothing in them to stir the heart and soul of red-blooded men and women. Let us place before our people, with greater opportunities than were ever known in those earlier days, confident statements of our own faith and hope, such as stirred the spirit of the people in that first Elizabethan age.

And as I close these remarks, may I recall the words spoken by our Queen when she herself defined so simply the change that has taken place in this great fellowship, this loosely defined fellowship of sovereign nations of which we form a part. These were her words:

The commonwealth bears no resemblance to the empire of the past. It is an entirely new conception—built on the highest qualities of the spirit of man: friendship, loyalty, and the desire of freedom and peace. To that new conception of an equal partnership of nations and races I shall give myself heart and soul every day of my life.

As we think of all that young Queen has done to fulfil that pledge within recent months, is it too much to suggest that each one of us will pledge himself to build on the highest qualities of the spirit of man: friendship, loyalty and the desire of freedom and peace; and that we, too, shall give ourselves, heart and soul, to that high ideal every day of our lives.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the item carry? Does the Secretary of State for External Affairs wish to speak at this time?

[Mr. Drew.]

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, before this item carries it probably would be expected of me that I should deal with one or two of the points that have been raised in the general discussion following the statement I made this afternoon.

I should like first of all to refer to an observation made by the hon. member for Prince Albert, and repeated a few moments ago by the Leader of the Opposition, that in my statement this afternoon—and I quote from the words of the hon. member for Prince Albert—I went further in the commitment of Canada in its world responsibilities than this government had ever gone before.

At the time I heard those words I was somewhat at a loss to find that interpretation in anything I had said. But the Leader of the Opposition made the matter clearer for me when he related the statement of my hon. friend to the sentence I had used earlier as follows: "We cannot accept"—and I did use these words—"the principle of collective security in one part of the world, and reject it in another".

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would not like it to be thought that in using those words I have added any commitment of any kind to anything that this government has previously undertaken. And I do not, myself, see how any such commitment can be read into those words or, indeed, into any other words I used this afternoon. I am talking about specific commitments on the part of this government for action.

What I had in mind in that sentence, of course, was the point that we cannot accept the principle of collective security in relation to the Atlantic area, and then deny its validity in respect of some other part of the world. But, as I see it, that of course is not remotely the same thing as saying that, having accepted specific commitments in NATO, we should accept similar commitments ourselves in respect of other parts of the world.

I think that if this principle works well for us in the Atlantic area, then if it is carried out in the right way on the initiative of the Asian people themselves, and those most directly concerned with the area, it might work well in that other part of the world. But of course that is a very different thing from saying that we as a government, having accepted commitments in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, should accept similar commitments in a southeast Asian treaty organization. And I would not like those words of mine to be interpreted in any other sense.