

Congress and concerning which differences of opinion have already appeared, but I think I can say without impropriety that the ideas behind this doctrine are welcomed by this Government as evidence of the increased interest of the United States in the Middle East in terms of both defence and economic aid for the development of the area. It seems to me important that those two things go together there as elsewhere.

IMPORTANT IMPLICATIONS

"Mr. Dulles, in quoting the President's declaration to a Congressional Committee, has warned, and I think the warning is a good one, that no single formula will solve all the problems in the Middle East and that there is no single panacea for them. Nevertheless it is quite obvious I think that those proposals have very important implications which have been very well put in my view by the Washington correspondent of the Winnipeg Free Press, and I quote from one of his articles as follows:

'The American Government, once Congress has given its expected approval,--

"Or perhaps as I should say 'if congress gives its expected approval.'

--will be committed to a solemn and unprecedented obligation in the Middle East. It will be pledged to use force if necessary to protect that region from Russia or from any state responsive to Russia's pressures.

"Then Mr. Freedman went on to say this:

'That is the ultimate commitment. There can be none greater. It has been defined in this challenging form to prevent Russia from believing that the eclipse of British and French influence allows it to bring the Middle East under Moscow's control.'

"...It has been said that the principles and the procedures envisaged in this doctrine are the same as those which prompted Anglo-French intervention in the Suez crisis last October. But I doubt whether that deduction will be borne out by the text of the presidential declaration which contains the following points, and some of these bear on the particular point raised by my friend the honourable member for Winnipeg North: (1) any assistance against aggression would be given only at the request of the state attacked; (2) any obligation to give such assistance is restricted to overt aggression by any nation controlled by international communism; (3)--and this is of some importance--any measures taken must be consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and with any action or any recommendations of the United Nations; and I take it that would mean either positive or negative action by the United Nations....

"The fourth point is that the measures to be taken or envisaged would be 'subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations Security Council in accordance with the Charter'.

"Then, Mr. Speaker, I think I should also point out--and this is of some importance--that the declaration does not deal with conflict between non-communist states in the Middle East nor does it deal with communist subversion brought about by non-military means.

"Welcome as is this indication of the acceptance by the United States of a direct and immediate responsibility for peace and economic progress in the Middle East, even more welcome to a Canadian would be the full restoration of close and friendly relations between London, Paris and Washington in respect of that area, and the strengthening of their co-operation generally.

"Perhaps we in Canada are particularly conscious of the desirability and the need of this result. For that reason I think we would all want to give particularly wholehearted support, especially at this time, to one sentence from President Eisenhower's State of the Union message last Thursday when he said this:

'America, alone and isolated, cannot assure even its own security. We must be joined by the capability and resolution of nations that have proved themselves dependable defenders of freedom. Isolation from them invites war.'

"I think it is hardly necessary to add in this House that no people in the world have proved themselves more 'dependable defenders of freedom' than have the British.

"Co-operation in the Commonwealth of Nations, in the United Nations and in NATO--all this--is important, indeed essential. But nothing is more important in the preservation of peace and the promotion of progress than is an enduring and solid friendship as the basis for co-operation and unity between the United Kingdom, France and the United States. The recent NATO Council meeting in Paris--and this may have been almost its most important achievement--began the process of restoring and strengthening that co-operation after the strains and interruptions to it brought about by the Suez crisis. It is essential that this process should continue.

"We now have a great opportunity to profit from the unhappy experiences of the recent past by taking steps to ensure that those experiences will not be repeated.

"Perhaps I should not close, Mr. Speaker, without at least mentioning--and there will be time only to mention it--a fourth factor which bears strongly on the formulation and execution of Canadian foreign policy. I refer to the fact that we are a neighbour of the United States on the North American Continent.

"On our relations with the United States my colleagues and I have often spoken over the last few years. I think we have made it abundantly clear that our acknowledgement of the United States as the inevitable and indispensable leader of the free world does not at all imply automatic agreement with all its