

I have told the House on a number of occasions that, in my view, the time was not yet ripe for a Pacific pact along those lines. I believe that that is still the case. On June 20, 1952, when I last mentioned the subject in this House, I said we were in agreement with the views of Mr. John Foster Dulles, who had said that he did not think it feasible on any quick time-table to associate the countries of Asia in a security pact in the same way as the countries of the Atlantic were associated. Mr. Dulles is of course, now the United States Secretary of State. We continue to agree with these views which he then expressed and which I believe he still holds. I hope those who hold other views on this subject will produce concrete and impressive evidence in support of them, so we may be given an opportunity, on the basis of that evidence, to consider whether we should change our minds and not merely reiterate that we should have a Pacific pact and that we should do more in that respect in the Pacific.

As I see it, there are three fundamental difficulties which remain -- and I have mentioned them before -- in the way of the early realization of a Pacific pact on a multilateral basis. The first difficulty -- and it is a basic one -- is which Pacific states should be included and which should be left out; the second is how to get the various countries which might participate to agree to team up with other potential members; and finally there is the lack of community of interest and purpose and policy among some of the potential members.

Until these problems are solved, and they are certainly not solved yet, a Pacific pact which attempted to be the counterpart of the North Atlantic Pact would, I think, inevitably be an artificial creation and might well do more harm than good.

The Pacific, however, is by no means a security vacuum. The United States has security arrangements with Canada, of course, but also with Japan, with the Philippines, with Australia and with New Zealand.

... It has been suggested by some ... that Canada might adhere to the tripartite security treaty, now known as the ANZUS Pact, between the United States, Australia and New Zealand. On April 1, 1952, I expressed ... the opinion that the objections to broadening this arrangement at this time into a general Pacific pact, or indeed the objections to including any additional states in this arrangement, were accepted as overriding by certain countries whose support for such broadening would be essential; and that certainly means first of all the United States. That opinion, has subsequently been reinforced by the communiqué issued on August 7, 1952, by the ANZUS Council itself, at the conclusion of its first meeting. That communiqué reads in part as follows:

It would be premature at this early stage in its own development --

(that is the development of ANZUS)

-- to establish relationships with other states ...

As the ANZUS Council itself has taken that attitude not particularly or especially in relation to Canada but in relation to other countries as well, including countries which have a deep and abiding interest in such a pact, I do not think it would be appropriate for us to press for membership at this time ...