

External Affairs

most concerned with that pact do not feel that that would be the best way to proceed. I am thinking of the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia.

They have decided to work out their own arrangements under articles 51 and 52 of the charter of the United Nations, with the object of bringing about a mutual guarantee and security pact. We welcome those arrangements as a furtherance of general security. But I assure members of the house, though no assurance is needed, that this does not mean that we are not alive to the importance of general security in the Pacific. Our participation in the Korean campaign is surely sufficient evidence of that fact.

In this connection—

Mr. Green: May I ask a question? Why does Canada not ask to be allowed to participate in this pact which is being negotiated between the United States, Australia and New Zealand, with possibly the addition of the Philippines?

Mr. Pearson: Well, we do not ask to participate in bilateral arrangements between friendly countries. We usually wait for an invitation or we participate, or ask to participate, when our immediate interests are affected. This is a development between the three countries most concerned, but if it should lead into something wider in the Pacific, as I think I have already indicated to the house, we will be most interested in that development.

I do not think in this regard I could do much better than to quote the leader of the opposition this afternoon when he said:

The commitment in Korea refers specifically to Korea and one of the major problems of dealing with the situation there is the fact that no matter how far the same nations might be prepared to go to deal with any act of aggression against any nation in the Pacific ocean or bordering on it, there seems little possibility of any general pact affecting Asia at this time which would create a general commitment in that area such as has been accepted in Europe.

Then, if I might deal for a few moments with some more general considerations that have arisen during the course of the discussion, I should like to turn for the moment to the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Hees), who, in his very interesting statement the other night, reproached the government—and his reproach has been repeated by other members opposite—because they displayed no sense of urgency in the face of the danger of the present position.

Well, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that we reject his assertion that the Canadian government has no sense of the urgency of the

[Mr. Pearson.]

present situation. If there were time it would be simple to quote chapter and verses to show that we are aware of that urgency.

I do not think that we need also accept the assertion that the Canadian people are not aware of the seriousness of the situation; and I for one reject the suggestion of the hon. member for Broadview that young Canadians generally are represented by the school boys of whom he spoke the other night, as it is set out at page 2786 of *Hansard* for May 7, 1951. These are his words:

They were boys who, I imagine, in the United States would have been subject to conscription, so I was interested in ascertaining whether it ever occurred to them to wonder why we were so free from anything of that kind; why they were not only free from conscription but they were even free from any sense of duty toward their country.

Well, I for one do not accept any statement that young Canadians have no sense of duty to their country.

Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Does the minister think that is quite fair? My whole argument was that they were not being called on to show this feeling.

Mr. Pearson: If that was the meaning of the hon. member, then of course I accept it. But I read his words, and they seemed to have the opposite meaning. He was implying that they were even free from any sense of duty toward their country. That was the conclusion I drew from his words. If it was a wrong conclusion, then I am sorry.

Mr. Coldwell: To whose remarks is the minister referring? Is it the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Hees) or the hon. member for Greenwood. He said "Broadview".

Mr. Pearson: I meant the hon. member for Greenwood.

Mr. Fulton: That is two mistakes.

Mr. Pearson: Well, I hope I never make any more serious than that. It is difficult to keep up with the hon. member for Greenwood. I thought he was a little over-pessimistic in his remarks the other night. I hope I do not do him an injustice, but I got the feeling that he seemed to take a sort of sad satisfaction out of the misfortunes which face us, and that he was indulging in what the Germans call "schadenfreude."

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, during his remarks he gloomed for some time over a speech I made in Toronto last month. There were remarks made by other hon. members in connection with that speech, and more particularly this afternoon by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. Drew: That was not the hoop-la speech, was it?