

... it is nevertheless true that the course of world events, particularly in the past two years, has made it necessary for Canada, in concert with other free nations, to adopt fundamentally new measures in our external relations ...

In the North Atlantic area we have undertaken to send armed forces overseas in time of peace, which is certainly something new. These Canadian forces will take their place in an international formation designed as a deterrent to aggression, a safeguard of peace in the whole North Atlantic area and a guarantee of the security of Canada itself ...

It seemed to us that it would be a source of encouragement to our forces in Korea and to the forces we are about to dispatch to Europe, as well as strengthening the position of those who will represent Canada at these international meetings, if there were an affirmation by this House of its wholehearted and, I would hope, unanimous support of the efforts our country is making to help maintain peace and security in the world ...

Mr. Pearson rose next, to support the Prime Minister's motion, and announced his intention of giving the House "a general ... review of the international situation at the present time" and of discussing "some developments in that situation" that had occurred since the previous session.\*

### **Pacific Pact**

Recurring to the subject of a "Pacific pact", already discussed in his sessional statement the previous day and referred to in speeches by Mr. Macdonnell, Mr. Green, Mr. Graydon and Mr. Hees, Mr. Pearson said, on October 23:

When you begin to contemplate the possibility of a Pacific pact of that kind you run up at once against the fact that those countries most concerned with general security in the Pacific do not think the time is ripe for it. If the United States of America and the United Kingdom do not feel that it is possible to work out that kind of Pacific pact in the present circumstances, is it desirable, is it appropriate that we should take the initiative in trying to make them change their minds? As I tried to say yesterday, if the United States had felt that a Pacific pact of that type was desirable in the present circumstances for the security of the Pacific they would not have made separate pacts with the Republic of the Philippines and with the two dominions, Australia and New Zealand. I have no doubt in my own mind, and I have discussed it more than once with representatives of these governments, because we take this question of a Pacific pact seriously — that one reason they think it undesirable under present circumstances to initiate discussions for a pact of that nature is that they would at once be faced with the question that I asked yesterday: what countries would be included and what countries would be left out. There are certain countries in the Pacific area at the present time which would certainly expect to be included in a general Pacific treaty of that nature; and in the minds of certain governments it would not be conducive to general security in the Pacific to include those governments at this time in any such policy. That is the reason we have not taken any leadership in regard to the development of such a Pacific pact. But we have discussed this matter on more than one occasion with governments concerned.

### **Japanese Peace Treaty**

To a question in Mr. Coldwell's speech regarding the submission of Canadian views on the Japanese Peace Treaty to the Government of the United States as the first mover, Mr. Pearson replied in part:

I would point out that the procedure adopted in the announcement of the Treaty was very unusual. It would have been a lot better in our minds, and in the minds of other governments, if we could have followed the traditional procedure of negotiating around a conference table ...

\* For the full text of the statement made to the House of Commons on October 22 by Mr. Pearson, see p. 354 of this issue.