

*External Affairs*

Victory for the United Nations forces in Korea would be a setback for communism and would cast the deepest gloom over the Kremlin. But victory for the communist forces, or even a stalemate which might be paraded as a victory, would give them the greatest joy.

We have noticed recently changes in the foreign policy of the United Kingdom. It has changed its attitude in some respects, perhaps as a result of the terrible suffering inflicted on a British regiment in the recent communist drive. Whatever the cause, the United Kingdom is prepared to change its attitude. Last year the United Kingdom sold \$350 million worth of goods to communist China while British soldiers were over there fighting communist troops and laying down their lives. I think the iniquity of such a proceeding is now being recognized. The United Kingdom also is reported to have changed its attitude on the bombing of bases in Manchuria. I believe it is now generally recognized that if large air forces should come from Manchuria and inflict serious damage upon the United Nations forces, the United Nations air force would be permitted to pursue them across the border into Manchuria and bomb the bases from which they come.

There are certain other matters in connection with foreign policy about which we know the general attitude of the United Kingdom, about which we know the attitude of the United States, about which we certainly know the attitude of the Soviet republic, but about which we do not know the attitude of Canada. I am going to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if he does not think that this house should be informed on these questions and that the people of this country should be informed as to where Canada stands today. Here are the questions:

1. What is the attitude of the government toward the recognition of the communist government of Red China?
2. What is the attitude of the government toward seating communist China in the United Nations?
3. What has been the attitude of the Canadian government toward handing over Formosa to Red China?

The government of communist China is a tyranny which has been imposed upon the Chinese people contrary to the wishes of the great majority. Neither in China nor in Russia would the government consent to have elections on any kind of a democratic basis, because they know they would never be returned. Let us avoid making any mistake

that might enlarge the area now controlled by the communists. Let us rather give consideration to restoring freedom or enlarging the area of free government.

I must confess that I agree with General MacArthur and General Ridgway, that the place to begin is in Korea. I hope that the minister, who has expressed his dislike at Canada being an echo of anybody else, will adopt an original line at the United Nations and call for a widening of the bounds of freedom. Did he read the statement made recently in Frankfurt by the mayor of Berlin? He said:

It is not the strength of communist Russia we fear so much as the weakness of the western nations.

That weakness is not so much military or material as it is moral and spiritual. They fear the vacillation, the wavering and uncertainties that leave the people of the world in doubt as to what they may expect from the United Nations. If the poor suffering people of Korea, of China, of Russia, of all the countries behind the iron curtain, could only speak to us today, they would ask us to adopt a positive attitude such as was advocated not long ago by a very distinguished soldier whom I consider to be a great statesman.

**Mr. H. R. Argue (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate for the purpose of emphasizing one aspect of our external policy. I refer to what seems to me to be a failure on the part of the government in connection with its foreign policy. I believe the time has come when the government should grant substantial economic assistance to the backward and underdeveloped countries of the world. The government should introduce a measure to provide economic assistance to India in order to alleviate famine in that country.

I want to say to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) that his statement of a week ago was very disappointing to me, not so much for what he said but for what he did not say. His statement was divided into two sections, and he devoted approximately equal time to each. The first section had to do with friendly relations with the United States. Our relations with the United States seems to me to be generally satisfactory. I believe they have been fairly satisfactory in the past, are quite satisfactory today, and in my opinion are likely to continue that way in the future. Nevertheless the minister drew fine distinctions, emphasized fine points, and took half of his time to talk about our relations with the United States. In the second section of his speech he dealt with the situation in Korea, and on this matter I am in general agreement with him.