

*Supply—External Affairs*

Certainly, we have to fight against communism. But we are fighting for our goods and chattels. They too are fighting for something—for the right to live. And until they have achieved that right to live on the same basis that we have it they are not going to be interested in our power pacts in south-east Asia, or anywhere else. Asia will join us only when their circumstances are infinitely better than they are today; Asia will join us when they feel that they can trust us.

But the hon. member for Prince Albert also said that if the Geneva conference is unsuccessful Canada should join a pact in Asia to ensure peace. Well, what sort of a pact would this be? With whom would it be? I am quite sure that New Zealand and Australia would be more than chary about joining such a pact. As I said earlier, if the United States wants the Philippines and South Korea, it is welcome to them; but as an alliance it is not one which will strike terror to anybody's heart.

What would be the purpose of a treaty such as that? I think we should examine it as fairly and objectively as we can. Would its intention be to issue a stern warning? And if the situation got worse would its intention be to issue a graver warning? Well, we have had warnings issued ad nauseam almost every day recently. But would such a treaty have as its purpose direct intervention, the use of force, against Asian nations? I hope not, because then that would mean the scuttling of the United Nations.

But, if it does, what sort of intervention is needed in Indo-China today? General Leclerc of the French army has given his figure as 500,000 men. Is North America prepared to put anything like that number of men into Indo-China to try to win it back from the communists? Certainly not. And yet to recover Indo-China intervention on the most massive scale is the only thing which could be undertaken and immediately there would be retaliation which would mean intervention on a massive scale from the other side.

I agree that we and our allies should be constantly examining what is happening in Asia. But, as I said earlier, any Asian treaty is worse than hopeless without the Colombo nations in it. And while I cannot say that this is a matter of party policy, I state as strongly as I can that I would oppose such a treaty without these Asian nations in it.

I wish to ask the hon. member for Prince Albert a question, or if the leader of the Conservative party speaks tonight I would ask him if the Conservative party is prepared to enter into such an Asian pact against the express objections of the Colombo nations. And I would appreciate an answer to that question.

[Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North).]

By all means let there be consultation; by all means let there be discussion. We know that there may be an answer to be found; but I doubt if we can go much farther than that. And now, let me say this. The western world today is frustrated, and the western world is nervous. It is frustrated because there is no clear leadership, because by the dominant partner in the western alliance there are day to day changes in policy, and statements of leaders, and statements of pseudo-leaders, and statements of would-be leaders which leave us completely confused, and not knowing what the situation really is. There is nervousness in the west because of this conflict in policy, and because we do not know what is going on.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart read an editorial from the *Economist* which suggested that America's allies had more to fear as a result of American statements than had America's enemies. And that reminded me of what the Duke of Wellington said when he had a shipload of new recruits given to him during the Spanish war. He said, "Well, I don't know what effect they will have on the enemy but, by God, they terrify me". And there are times when I am in the same position with regard to American policies.

I have no idea what influence American statements will have on any potential enemy but I certainly feel nervous and confused. But of this I am completely certain, if the United States is determined to take military action in Indo-China to bolster up colonialism, then it goes it alone. The people of Canada will not accept such a policy.

The United States has told us about "massive retaliation" which ended in a monsoon in Indo-China. It has told us about its agonizing reappraisal, and perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that reappraisal has taken place. If it has, it may be a most significant one. That reappraisal has given United States two alternatives. She has to decide who are her allies. Are her allies in the world to be Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai, or are her allies to be Canada, the United Kingdom and the rest of the free countries of the west? That surely should not be an agonizing reappraisal; but the Americans have to make up their minds which way they are going. I do not suggest for a moment that there is here a hopeless split; there is here no parting of the ways. I can only hope and I think that wise counsel will prevail over the interventionists; that cool minds will be listened to in preference to hot heads.

It is so difficult to see the situation clearly just now. There seems to be a lull, a quietness; but is it the lull before the storm, or is it the deathly sort of quietness which one