

Nations not to make that its ultimate political objective now. But Canada is not under any obligation, nor is any other member of the United Nations, to achieve that objective by force. We are under an obligation to retaliate against and to defeat aggression. You might say that that means driving the aggressor back where he came from, and that has been substantially done, but the ultimate objective of a free, democratic and unified Korea remains, and the achievement of that objective is not going to be easy.

Mr. QUELCH: Does the resolution not infer that the military forces will be maintained in Korea until that objective is reached? Section D reads:

United Nations forces should not remain in any part of Korea otherwise than as far as necessary for achieving the objectives specified in subparagraphs (a) and (b).

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: That was put in to make sure that, once Korea was united, no one power would have undue influence in the freed and united Korea by keeping its forces there. It was put in almost for the opposite purpose than the one you mentioned, to make sure that Korea would be free and that when it became free and united again, all foreign forces would withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you finished your questioning, Mr. Quelch?

Mr. QUELCH: Yes; although I think that inference is also there.

Mr. MACINNIS: Don't you think, Mr. Pearson, that the ideal of a united Korea militates against a realistic program of making South Korea strong enough to prevent North Korean aggression, and then that the idea should be to build up a strong southern Korea?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: That may be, Mr. MacInnis, but we are more and more relying on the South Korean army to defeat this aggression. At the present time there are, I think, about twelve South Korean divisions in action. Now, it would not be of much encouragement to South Koreans in the task they are facing, and the increasing burden which they are bearing, if they were told that there is not much chance of unifying their own country. Furthermore a lot of the Koreans fighting in the South Korean divisions come from North Korea. It would be discouraging for them to be told that by the rest of us.

Mr. Low: Especially with the whole of the communist world behind the north.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: There is a problem there of Korean morale.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, this question may be elementary to Mr. Pearson, but to me it is not. He has said that there was a resolution of the United Nations appointing the unified command for action in Korea. Is it confined normally to Korea? If any action was necessary in Europe, would another resolution be asked?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: This resolution has no effect on anything but the defeat of aggression in Korea.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I want again to hearken back to the old subject, this question of Korea. Away back in 1894 and 1896 there was quite a battle in the British House of Lords between Lord Rendall and Lord Roseberry as to who was going to have suzerainty over Korea, and one favoured China and the other favoured Japan. I guess my earlier education was badly neglected, because I do not ever recall at school learning anything about Korea, which at that time was Corea. However, be that as it may, I am trying to bring about verification, or a statement by the minister—I do not know whether you would make it or not, Mr. Minister, but as long as this situation with respect to Korea continues to exist, and with the terrific drain on taxation on the free world, does the minister think that that can continue, we will say for years, without a general economic and financial breakdown of what might be termed the free nations of the North American continent particularly. Then, again, on the other