

certain quarters that more might be done by some countries. It should also be pointed out that the military authorities, from the military point of view, find it a little difficult to fit small contingents from a variety of countries into the military organization. I am not suggesting that it should not be done, but there is that military problem. There are some contingents in Korea of 250 to 500 and less and it creates a bit of a problem for them. It would be much easier, from a military point of view, if the minimum contribution were a self-contained unit such as a brigade. But efforts have been made to circularize the United Nations members to see if they are in a position to add to their contributions. That is something which is under continual review down there. The United States is, for obvious reasons, especially interested in that.

Mr. QUELCH: At the time the unified command was set up, was there any understanding or assurance given that in the event of any change in policy, that is, a change of policy within the terms of the United Nations resolution, that the participating nations would be consulted first?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: There has been an understanding from the beginning that all the members of the United Nations who subscribed to the United Nations resolutions have the right to be consulted. In fact, they must be consulted on any general change of policy, because a resolution can only be amended by another resolution, and it would have to go through the United Nations. But apart from that, within the resolution, it is understood that there will be no change made which would have major political consequences, or indeed major military consequences without consulting those members which have forces in Korea.

Mr. QUELCH: I asked the question because of continually reading about protests being made by Britain to try to get a definite assurance that the forces in Korea will not do this or that without their first being consulted.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: That is true. We always talk a good deal about that because it is something in which we are all interested. There have been one or two occasions where consultations have been inadequate; but by and large I think the understanding to consult has been pretty well carried out by the United States, which is the power with the greatest responsibility, and with whom we all want to consult. There may not be the same eagerness on their part to find out what we are doing!

Mr. MACKENZIE: Has Japan many troops in Korea?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Japan?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: No troops.

Mr. MACKENZIE: None at all?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: No. I think there are some Japanese civilians that are engaged in some form of auxiliary activity, but there are no Japanese troops in Korea.

Mr. QUELCH: Did Syngman Rhee protest against their use?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I am sure the present Korean administration would not be very happy at the return of Japanese troops to Korea. They had them there for a good many years.

Mr. DECORE: Would the Japanese authorities favour Japanese troops in Korea?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Japan is now disarmed, and under the Japanese peace treaty it is prevented from having troops. It is entitled to have security police.

Mr. Low: Which of the South American republics have troops there?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Colombia has a contingent of troops in Korea. The Cubans, I think, sent some soldiers to Korea.