

Two of these principles laid it down that Canada was under no special obligation to participate in the military or economic sanctions of the League of Nations. Well, as you know, most Canadians as well as other peoples came to realize, after the tragic mistakes in our dealings with Hitler and Mussolini, that there was little safety in a policy of no commitments, no collective obligations. In the United Nations Charter, we therefore willingly accepted certain quite explicit commitments for a system of collective security. This could have proved workable if the co-operation of the Soviet Union with the West had continued after World War II. When this expectation proved unfounded, our Prime Minister voiced, I think, the feelings of the great majority of Canadians when he suggested, in a memorable speech to the United Nations General Assembly in 1947, that more explicit obligations for collective security than those of the Charter might be adopted by those countries who would be prepared to accept them. This proposal became one of the sources of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Quite apart from our NATO obligations, which are quite explicit, Canada has also accepted certain collective security obligations, moral if not legal, in the "Uniting for Peace" resolution of the United Nations General Assembly. These are, of course, in addition to the general obligations of the Charter.

That these various military and political obligations are by no means academic is amply evidenced by the fact that at the present time Canada is maintaining an air division in Europe, and an infantry brigade in Korea and one in Germany.

As contrasted with Canada's unwillingness, in the 1930's, to accept an obligation to participate even in economic sanctions of the League of Nations, Canada is today participating not merely in such sanctions under a United Nations resolution (against Communist China, as a result of its declared aggression against Korea), but in collective measures, prudential rather than punitive, which have been adopted by a group representing many of the free nations of the world, to limit or prevent trade in strategic materials with the communist totalitarian nations of Eastern Europe.

I do not myself accept the argument that our claim to have accepted, as a Canadian Government our fair share of responsibility for collective security, is weakened by hesitation now to undertake additional specific defence commitments in other areas than the Western Hemisphere, Western Europe, the Mediterranean and Turkey.

It is not, I think, a valid criticism that we are inconsistent and weak if we show great caution in joining any collective defence arrangements for Southeast Asia, which might not include the most important free Asian countries, and which would probably include commitments for Canadian participation in military planning and defence contributions of men and material, such as we have already undertaken in NATO.

I think also that the special obligations we have already assumed, along with the fact that we take seriously our United Nations collective security commitments, gives any Canadian Government the right, and, indeed,