

time, I suggest, the position in the Pacific is not the same. The United States, for instance, which would have to take the lead in this matter in Atlantic and European matters, has made it quite clear to us, in private and in public, that she is not ready for any general Pacific security pact, and thinks that it would be unwise to force that issue at this time. There are other Pacific countries with special interests in the Pacific which would be worried about any effort at this time to bring about a general security pact there because some of them are not yet convinced that there is only one danger in the Pacific, and that it is Communism; and some of them are not convinced as to whom should be members of any such pact. That difficulty is specifically illustrated by the differences over the ANZUS pact. That pact for consultation and co-operation in the Pacific, includes only three countries, the United States, Australia and New Zealand; it does not include certain countries which actually have territorial possessions and obligations in the Pacific and in the Southeast Asian area. And if it is impossible, as it was impossible, to widen that particular grouping at that time to include these countries, I think it is reasonable to come to the conclusion that a general Pacific pact at this time, along the lines of the North Atlantic pact, would not be wise, nor would it be a constructive move in the direction of the security to which we are all trying to work in the Pacific.

I suggest that we should let this matter of security arrangements develop, and help it to develop, in the Pacific, meanwhile trying to keep each other informed, as we do, recognizing that the threat to our security is not a regional one but a global one and that strategy and planning may have to be global as well covering the Atlantic, the Mediterranean and the Pacific.

I would not like to finish my observations on this point without stressing once again that there can be no lack of concern, there should be no lack of concern in any part of Canada, East or West, over the problem of security in the Pacific, because whatever may be the situation in Western Europe, and there is some evidence that tension is easing a little there, there certainly has been no easing of tension in that part of the world where open military aggression has first displayed itself in the post-war period.

These are some random and rather disconnected observations on some of the problems that are facing all of us in Asia and the Pacific. It is good to know that in this country there is a basis of unity on our objectives in foreign affairs. We may differ as to methods. We do differ - we differ inside the House of Commons and we differ outside the House of Commons - but not in our objectives and our principles. There is only one objective in the minds of all Canadians and that is to do what we can, as a member of the free world coalition under the leadership of our great neighbour, the United States of America, and with the wisdom and support in that coalition of our mother country, the United Kingdom -- and with our other friends, to bring about a situation in the world and in Canada where we will not have to spend 45 percent of our budget every year on military defence.