

*The Address—Mr. A. Stewart*

was the difficulty we had in trying to talk to China when China was not a member of the United Nations. It was in refusing such recognition that the first blunder was committed. I agree that we have a right, perhaps even a duty, to be sceptical about the genuine nature of Peking's desire for peace. But the point we want to make is this, that so long as there were doubts and so long as those doubts were not resolved one way or the other, it was the responsibility of our leaders at the United Nations to do everything possible to try to arrive at some honourable agreement whereby the peace of the world could be preserved. That is our main argument. On the other hand, consider the position of the United States. We see a nation which is still young and virile, with perhaps all the faults of youth and virility; a nation which is not used to defeat, a nation which has not known, as others have, the necessity for withdrawal and retirement and which is unused to it; a nation which is smarting under the blows of those who were so contemptuously described as gooks and Chinks not only by soldiers of the United States but by soldiers of other nations who are in Korea just now. Once again we are displaying the arrogance of the whites which the people of Asia must find intolerable. Then the United States believes, and with great justification, that there has been such a long period of friendship between China and the United States that the Chinese ought to realize that fact. I think that American policy towards China, except in the last few years, has been generous. But unhappily, when the Chinese come to think of American friendship, what do they see? They see American bombs, in American planes with American markings, being used by Chiang Kai-shek to obliterate Chinese cities. What is regarded as friendship by the United States may be regarded as enmity by the Chinese.

I want there to be no mistake whatever as to where we stand. We yield to none, either collectively or individually, in our admiration for the people of the United States. They are capable of extraordinary generosity, and they have shown it. Just after the war ended the Americans had within their possession this most devastating weapon, the atomic bomb. Nowhere in recorded history has it ever been shown to me that a nation with a mighty weapon of destruction such as this in its own hands has said to the world "We are prepared to give it to you" on terms which the great majority of the countries of the world found highly acceptable indeed, only the Soviet union dissenting.

[Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North).]

There are few examples of generosity such as that which has been shown by the people of the United States in the Marshall plan, in taxing themselves for funds to raise the standard of living in Europe, in order to bring Europe back to a high productive level and to conduct the fight against that misery which must inevitably lead to communism. That they are a friendly people, we know. That they are an idealistic people, we know. That the leadership they gave at the beginning of this crisis was most commendable, we know. That they are an emotional people, we know. But it is because we are so friendly with them that on occasion it is advisable that we speak to them frankly as friend to friend. They should have this knowledge by now if they do not possess it, namely that we in Canada—and, I think, the other members of the North Atlantic treaty group—will always be at the side of the United States. But that does not mean to say that we desire in any way to be subservient or to be placed in the position of apparent satellites. We wish to be treated with the degree of equality which free men expect. What the Americans feel today is that there should be expressed in the United Nations—and there has been expressed—a moral condemnation for this aggression of China; for they fear if it is not done, then the green light will be given for further aggression. As I say, it is most important that we try to understand the position and the feeling of the United States which almost unanimously is in favour of this decision to vote on Chinese aggression.

What about recent events in the United Nations themselves? One or two of the comments made by the minister were most interesting. I refer specifically to his comments about the resolution which was passed on October 7 and which gave the United Nations and General MacArthur the tacit right to cross the 38th parallel. It was not much more than tacit. In the *Winnipeg Free Press* of January 9—and the *Free Press* has been carrying on a bitter campaign against the policy of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) until the last day or two—Mr. Freedman, writing from Lake Success, said this in discussing the 38th parallel:

Nowhere in the eight-power resolution adopted by the political committee and later confirmed by the general assembly in plenary session is there any mention of crossing the 38th parallel as such. But that was clearly implied in the resolution's numerous references to a unified Korea.

That is true. There was a tacit assurance given to General MacArthur that he should go ahead. But as the minister told us this afternoon, there was the strongest reason for