

*The Address—Mr. Coldwell*

say may—a negotiated settlement more difficult. Certainly, it will delay it. At its best it will merely delay it, and at its worst it will make a negotiated settlement impossible. I feel that heed should have been paid to the last warning given to a like effect by Sir Benegal Rau, whose country understands the Asiatic opinion, and whose efforts for a peaceful settlement have been entirely consistent throughout. When I heard his very tired voice over the radio the other night making one last plea, I thought that it carried rather deep conviction with it. At any rate I was deeply impressed with it. Let us remember this, that India joined with the rest of us in recognizing that the invasion of South Korea by North Korea was an act of aggression. Subsequently, India gave warning that any close approach to the borders of Manchuria and the Yalu river would invite Chinese participation. In that, of course, she proved prophetic.

The minister of external affairs (Mr. Pearson), in his speech before the United Nations last Friday, January 26, put the view which we share. I am going to quote from that speech, because I have a verbatim copy of it before me. After discussing the Canadian position rather frankly, he says on page 13:

... we think the putting of such a resolution at this stage and in this form, when the possibilities of negotiation with the people's government of China are not, in our opinion, completely exhausted, to be premature and unwise.

In fairness to him I should like to continue and put the rest of the paragraph on the record, because I think I should.

Why then is the Canadian delegation voting for the draft resolution as a whole? In the first place, we are doing so because the main purport of this resolution, as we understand it, and certainly as the public in our own country will understand it, is to condemn the Chinese people's government for the assistance they have given the aggressors in Korea. We think that there is no shadow of doubt about this participation in aggression and we believe that the action of the Chinese people's government in this matter has been morally wrong and is to be condemned. The United Nations cannot ignore such a defiance of the principles upon which it is founded.

I agree that the United Nations cannot overlook a defiance of the principles upon which it was founded, but on the other hand there might be a time and a place when condemnation for violation of those principles should be made. The question is, had we reached that time? The minister himself said he regarded the resolution as premature and unwise. He asked for further assurance, and Sir Benegal Rau obtained it. Coupled with it there was a warning, I understand, said to be from the highest sources in Peking. Whether or not this is correct, the story came

[Mr. Coldwell.]

over the air that Sir Benegal Rau had received that warning from none other than Mao Tse-tung, head of the Chinese government. The minister clearly counselled caution, and gave very good reasons for this caution.

Looking at his speech a little earlier, on page 12, we find he said this:

... the free world as a whole is now under a menace far greater than anything offered by the Chinese regime in Peking, a menace which even that regime itself will, we hope, one day come to recognize and to resist, and that our main objective must be to hold ourselves prepared to meet that threat. We have certainly not accepted anything like the prospects of inevitable war with the Soviet union, and we are still ready to accept genuine conciliation with members of the Soviet union bloc. We cannot, however, close our eyes to the complicity of the Soviet union in the aggressive action of the North Koreans and the Chinese communists, their subjugation of neighbouring countries, their world-wide sabotage of peace, and the continuous instigation of a new war by their propaganda machines, disguised these days as propaganda for peace. It is for these reasons, for purely defensive reasons, that I feel we must remain on guard and not allow ourselves to be deliberately distracted into weakening skirmishes or open war with a country with which we have no basic grounds to quarrel.

I most thoroughly agree with that statement. It has seemed to me, and this view is shared by many of the people in this country and indeed across the world, that what we have actually done is to run into the grave danger of being distracted into weakening skirmishes or open war with a people with whom we have no basic grounds to quarrel. If it is true, and I believe it is, that "we cannot close our eyes to the complicity of the Soviet union in the aggressive action of the North Koreans and the Chinese communists," then on much the same grounds as the minister enunciated before the United Nations committee in regard to China, we could declare the Soviet union to be an aggressor; not an aggressor in precisely the same way but none the less an aggressor in provoking aggression by others on a much wider scale. Indeed such aggression is much more dangerous and much more widespread than the aggression committed by China. But be that as it may, even before the final vote was taken on Tuesday evening, January 30, the minister reiterated the same grave warning and the same opinion. After again outlining the considerations which had brought the Canadian delegation to vote "yes" on the resolution, he said this:

... we still feel that it is premature and unwise to confront the committee with the necessity for a decision on these facts at this particular moment and, as we see it, the methods of peaceful negotiation before condemnation have not yet been completely exhausted.