

millions day and night, and may have some success. The fact is that in Korea, we are not helping the United States. The United States itself has been the first country to insist on this. We are discharging our obligation as a member of the United Nations in defence of peace. The Canadian Government has been determined from the beginning to make this principle the basis of its policy in respect of Korea. In doing so it is not influenced by considerations of constitutional propriety or of national amour propre. One reason why we, and others, have insisted that this must be the character of the Korean conflict is to make it clear to the Asian people that this conflict is not one of the East versus the West; the white man against the yellow man. It is the rallying of those from all the free world - East and West - who would defend peace against an aggressor, and who are determined to make it clear in quarters where it needs to be made clear, that aggression does not pay.

It should also be obvious now to everyone in Asia, that while western imperialism may have had its faults and committed its sins in the 19th century, it is no longer any threat to the complete freedom of Asiatic countries. On the contrary, the Western World now offers to co-operate with the free countries of Asia on a basis of mutual respect and mutual aid. It should be equally obvious, on the other hand, that there can be no genuine national freedom where international communism, acting as the agent of Soviet imperialism, holds sway. Yugoslavia is only one dramatic proof of that fact. Does Asia also have to learn the same lesson the hard way?

In order to get the strong and vigorous support of free Asia for United Nations action in Korea, and, indeed, for United Nations action wherever aggression has to be met, we must also continue to emphasize that the United Nations, in its recent decisions, is concerned only in defeating aggression in Korea, and is not concerned, for instance, with the re-conquest by the National Chinese Government in Formosa of the mainland of China. There is nothing that the U.S.S.R. would like better than to confuse the Korean and the Formosan issues. There is nothing that the democracies should be more careful to avoid than such confusion. If we do not, we play right into the hands of the communist propagandists, make anxious and uneasy those who wish to maintain a strong and united front against aggression in Korea.

We must also prove by our policy and action in Korea, and elsewhere in Asia, that the western democracies are not on the side of reaction and opposed to progress. We have made a good beginning in this respect by a policy of economic and technical assistance to Asian countries. The Western democracies, including Canada, have supported that policy and are taking steps to implement it. There is no one in Canada who has done more in this connection than our Minister of Fisheries. I have no doubt, however, that in his beneficial activities in Colombo, in Sydney, in Ottawa, and wherever he happens to be, Mr. Mayhew has been violently attacked by the Soviet propagandists as a "satrap of Wall Street" and as a sinister exploiter of the toiling millions of Asia!

In contrast to the kind of economic assistance and co-operative help which the democracies can and are planning to give Asian countries is that proffered by the communists. Any help they give will be given for the purpose of making the Asian territory in question a mere satellite of Moscow, to be used for Moscow's profit, and at Moscow's will. True, communists make certain immediate social and economic changes when they get control of a country, which may appear to be, and indeed often are, beneficial