

very general terms. I would like to read from his speech as reported at page 3326 of *Hansard*:

The United Nations' resolution on this subject reads—at least the important sentence of it—that the objectives we are to seek are:

And here he quoted the resolution:

Achievement by peaceful means of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area.

The minister went on to say:

These are the goals of the Canadian delegation to the conference.

And a little later on:

I can see no obstacle that could not be overcome in the way of the realization of that resolution if there is good faith and good will on both sides;

The minister went on to say that the "if" with respect to the communist delegation was a pretty large "if".

I wonder whether there is justification even for the hope which the minister expressed, and the wonder which I have on that score makes me concerned lest our delegation is prepared to make the sort of concession which we on this side feel would be highly improper for the Canadian delegation to make.

That is why we want to be taken into the confidence of the minister and of the government. We want a measure of consultation, a word which the minister himself stressed to such great extent yesterday. We want some consultation between the government and parliament as to what are going to be the terms of reference of that delegation. The minister said that our objectives are to achieve, by peaceful means, a unified, independent and democratic Korea.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me fair to say that our experience has proven that it is highly unlikely that you are going to get immediate agreement with Russia and with China on the restoring or the creation of a democratic government anywhere in the world, at least anywhere where the communist countries have any influence to prevent it. That is why I wonder whether there is even reason for the hope which the minister has expressed.

I think it would be an attitude of blind folly to say that we really hope we are going to get agreement with Russia and China on a democratic government, as we understand it, with regard to Korea unless we are going to make concessions which so far have not been indicated to us here. That is why it is proper and, in fact, essential that the minister should not content himself with the vague generality—"Oh, we are going over there to try to promote peace and democracy."

Of course we are going over there to try to promote peace and a unified Korea. That is what we fought for. But how do we propose to try to get it? What bargain are we going to make? What bargain, if any, are we prepared to enter into in order to achieve it, or are we prepared to enter into any bargain? I think parliament is entitled to be consulted by the government and to be informed by the government on this point.

When he replies I can imagine the minister's saying, "Surely my hon. friend will hardly expect the Canadian delegation to show its hand and to reveal in advance to the Russian and Chinese delegates just what bargaining points we have before we get there". I suppose there may be some faint shadow of justification for that position, Mr. Speaker; but if we are not going to be told in detail what the Canadian delegation will be told, what bargaining attitudes they will take, I think we are at least entitled to insist that we should be told what they will not do and the points beyond which they will not go in the making of concessions, or in the encouragement of our allies in the making of concessions, to Russia and to communist China. It seems to me that it might indeed strengthen the position of the whole free world before the conference if there were to be a measure of consultation between the free western nations that have been fighting in Korea and an agreement as to those points beyond which they will not go in these negotiations so that the Russians and the Chinese would understand clearly before they go there those concessions which they need not even hope to be able to force from us.

Not only should that measure of consultation take place between those governments but it is my opinion that this parliament is entitled to be consulted and to be informed by the minister and by the government as to what that position is, what it is we have agreed that we will not do, or that we will not give up, at the Geneva conference. If we are to continue this so-called, and as I sometimes think inaptly described, bilateral foreign policy, I am convinced that we on this side of the house cannot for much longer be expected to support only what we are told about after it has been accomplished. If we are expected to support Canada's foreign policy—even in broad general terms—we should not be asked afterwards to assume the responsibility for it in the technical sense of that word, but should be consulted so that we will know in advance the direction or trend of government policies in these matters so that we can express our opinion on them, in order that if we are going to be asked