

External Affairs

another with South Korea and she has a treaty of a little different sort with Japan. But Canada has been standing aloof in the Pacific. Canada has been following a no commitment policy in so far as entering into any defence treaty has been concerned.

Mr. Pearson: We have had 30,000 men in Korea.

Mr. Green: I am aware of that, but Canada has not seen fit to take any part in any of these treaties in the Pacific.

An hon. Member: Except in Korea.

Mr. Green: Canada should take a stand. Canada should have a policy for united action in the Pacific, a policy such that she will be consulted. We should be consulted about what is to be done in the Pacific, and we should have a policy of such a nature that the freedom-loving nations could work together in that area.

The present government has never agreed. The Secretary of State for External Affairs has rather pooh-poohed my suggestion along these lines now for several years. I suggest the time has come for Canada to take some action.

My suggestions have been that there should be worked out in the Pacific a defence pact similar to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and that in the meantime the ANZUS treaty could be extended to include some nations such as Canada and the United Kingdom. The Secretary of State for External Affairs replied with: "Oh, well, Canada has not been invited so how could we get in?" I am afraid Canada has never taken any steps to ask for an invitation. There has never been any suggestion from the minister or the Prime Minister that Canada was anxious to get in or that she would ever lift one little finger to bring about that result.

Senator William F. Knowland, the majority leader in the United States Senate, upon his return from a trip to the Far East last November made certain suggestions. I have here a press dispatch dated November 17 from Washington, in which he had some very interesting proposals to make. It reads in part as follows:

He expressed the hope that the new Philippine president Ramon Magsaysay would call a conference of free "non-neutralist" Pacific nations as soon as possible to consider widening the old Australia, New Zealand, United States pact, which he said was too narrow a base, savouring too much of the outworn colonialism, to build a general Pacific security system on.

Then the report continues:

Senator Knowland envisaged the conference as including, besides the English-speaking nations of the Pacific, the Philippines, South Korea, Japan, Formosa, Thailand, the Indo-Chinese succession

[Mr. Green.]

states of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam, and went as far west as Pakistan, where the United States is considering establishing American bomber bases.

He was asked about Canada, and whether he thought Canada should be a party. The report states as follows:

Asked whether he thought Canada should be included in the proposed conference, Senator Knowland said:

"If a conference of free nations were held certainly I would think Canada would be included."

Canada, although a major Pacific power, is not a party to ANZUS or any other Pacific regional pacts created by the United States. Senator Knowland said he thought it was imperative to get the conference under way soon. "Time is of the essence", he said.

I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs about that matter in the house in November. As reported at page 151 of *Hansard* he replied as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such negotiations taking place at the present time or of their imminent likelihood. I am aware that certain proposals have been made in Washington by members of the congress looking toward the extension of that pact. However, there have been no governmental negotiations as yet to this end.

Other suggestions have been made. Why would it not be reasonable and perhaps vital to encourage natural alliances of the Asiatic nations, to extend the ANZUS treaty, and to make a real attempt to build in the Pacific a defensive alliance? I should like to hear from the Secretary of State for External Affairs, when he answers, why it is not possible for something like that to be done. My suggestion may not be the best one, but we just cannot continue to have a vacuum in the Pacific. Something must be done to meet the situation in that area.

To me it is strange that the Prime Minister of this country, in thinking of the future in the Pacific, seemed to think that recognizing red China would end all the trouble. I regret that, while he was in the Far East, he did not direct his efforts to promoting a policy for united action by the freedom-loving nations in the Pacific area.

I hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, when he replies, will be able to tell us that Canada is now adopting a policy which will bring about that end. We have waited all too long for leadership from the Canadian government with regard to Canada's interest in the Pacific. On this question we have had altogether too much soothing syrup from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I hope he will now tell us that, for our own protection and in the interests of our fellow nations associated with us in trying to save freedom for the world, Canada must adopt in the Pacific area a policy which is more realistic than any she has ever had.