

• Should similar proposals be forthcoming from China now on this basis what is Canada's present position on these matters? It is reported that Sir Oliver Franks, the United Kingdom ambassador at Washington, discussed with the United States last week the far eastern situation in an endeavour to obtain a clarification of United States policy.

What I am asking is if the Minister can clarify for the committee and the people of Canada the apparently changed and conflicting statements emanating from the United States regarding the basis of negotiations for the ending of the Korean war now that the fourth all-out communist offensive in Korea since last October appears to have been defeated? It is important, I think, that the present confusion as far as we are concerned in this country should be ended.

Of course I know that he cannot speak for American policy but I do think, in view of the confusion that exists in the public mind—not only in the United States but reflected in our own country—that if Mr. Pearson as Minister of External Affairs can do anything to give the Canadian people an idea of how this war can be brought to an end honourably, and where we and the other countries are thinking of going in connection with the war, I think that would be valuable. That is the reason I raise the question.

I read the speech Mr. Pearson made very carefully—as far as I could read it in the *New York Times*. He told me that he would send me a copy but I have not received it yet.

I thought the speech was one that should receive some attention by this committee and by the country although I have not seen it reported in the Canadian papers.

Mr. STICK: Why did you not raise that this afternoon? Do you think the committee should deal with it or should you not have asked Mr. Pearson in the House?

Mr. COLDWELL: Well, you cannot do more than ask a single question on the orders of the day, and I think that when the External Affairs Committee is sitting it is probably better to ask a question on external affairs here where the minister can make an extended answer and where further supplementary questions can be asked—rather than in the House.

Mr. Low: It is very properly raised. I too read the speech, Mr. Chairman, and I have one question that may well be put for Mr. Pearson at a time when he can answer.

He has reported to have said in the same speech: "Complete capitulation of the enemy might not be necessary. The United Nations objectives can be obtained with the defeat of aggression."

Well, now, I think it would help the committee and the Canadian people generally if the minister would define what he means by "defeat of aggression". I notice Mr. Coldwell mentions that he presumes it refers to South Korea?

Mr. COLDWELL: That is what it looks like—"the republic of Korea", was the statement.

Mr. Low: I think it would be advisable to have a pretty specific definition of that term—defeat of aggression. In the first place we know that China is branded as an aggressor—China became an aggressor the minute she stepped into North Korea. Now does "defeat of aggression" mean driving China completely out of North Korea as well as South Korea or what?

Mr. MURRAY: I think each member of the committee should have a full transcript of the speech before we begin to pass judgment.

Mr. Low: We are not trying to pass judgment. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that these are merely specific questions arising out of the speech. I imagine Mr. Coldwell would feel as I do that we should wait for Mr. Pearson to come back and give us the answers.

Mr. MURRAY: I think we could very well be provided with a copy of the speech?