

its friends who were co-operating with it on this Korean question; or at least between their representatives at the United Nations, so that agreement could be reached on the course to be followed. But this was not done. True, there was no public indication of disunity or difference, but that was because the other countries agreed to maintain the common front at the United Nations in the face of a particular United States initiative about which they had not really been consulted in any effective way. There were serious practical difficulties in the way of such consultation at that time, I know, including those connected with military plans and timing. It is also true that by far the major share of responsibility and action in this United Nations operation was being borne by the United States. But others were involved. The episode is significant as showing how difficult it can be inside a coalition to reconcile the often conflicting obligations of national and collective responsibility.

The present, however, is more important than the past. Are there still differences now in Far Eastern policy that should be frankly examined and, if possible removed? There are, indeed especially in regard to our attitude to the Communist government in Peking.

Some of the Western group, as I have stated, have recognized this government as that of China; others have not. Those who have granted recognition, however, - and Canada is not one of them - have foregone much of the advantage that they might have, in their opinion, been expected to derive from it by rejecting the claim of the Peking Government to represent China at the United Nations. It is no secret that they have done this largely because of their concern for their relations with the United States. Some very influential Americans, after all, have said that once Red China goes into the United Nations, the United States goes out.

There are also some differences of opinion as to whether there should be a complete, or almost complete cessation of trade between the Allied group and Communist China, or a prohibition of trade only in a selected list of strategic commodities which might be progressively shortened, if and when the situation warranted such reduction.

There is also (and this is more fundamental) a difference of opinion over the very nature of the conflict between the two Chinese governments. Some governments consider it primarily as a civil war, which means that action of one side against the other - even over the off-shore islands - does not constitute aggression under the United Nations Charter and therefore require our intervention. Other governments, however - including Canada - feel that while this may be true in respect of action on the continent of China or against the off-shore island, it does not apply to Formosa, which should not be