

*The Address—Mr. Pearson*

United Nations general assembly as long as there was any possibility of the good offices committee completing its work satisfactorily. That was made clear by an amendment to the United States' resolution proposed by the delegate for Lebanon. Fourth, we were anxious to make it quite clear in this resolution that the work of mediation and conciliation could go on after the resolution passed, and indeed that that work would be given priority over any enforcement. We wanted to make it clear beyond doubt that, so far as the United Nations was concerned, we had not slammed any doors on anybody. And then finally we want to make it quite clear that this resolution did not give anybody any authority to take any action which he did not already possess. It certainly does not give the United Nations, or any agent of the United Nations in Asia, any power or right to use United Nations forces to liberate Asia from communism. The mandate of the United Nations in this operation remains the same, namely, to defeat aggression in Korea, and nothing else.

Well, having had these amendments put forward, and having received these clarifications from the United States delegation, which removed most of our doubts, we felt, Mr. Speaker, that to vote against this resolution, or to abstain in regard to it, would have been to refuse to accept as true the statement that the Chinese government had participated in aggression—something we had no right to do without denying the justice of United Nations action in Korea. Furthermore, it would have meant breaking the unity of the western nations on an issue of timing and tactics. We did not take that course. We voted for the resolution, and I think we were right in doing so. Forty-four other countries, including every member of the north Atlantic alliance, agreed with us.

But we have made our view abundantly clear that this resolution does not give anyone on one side any shadow of excuse for rash and adventurous courses, or anyone on the other any shadow of excuse for refusing to discuss an ending of hostilities or a peaceful solution of this problem. Why should it? It was said at Lake Success by the Indian delegate, and it was said yesterday by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell): "You have now branded them as aggressors. How can you expect them to talk to you?" Well, they have been branding us in the United Nations as aggressors steadily for the last two or three months, and they have shown no reluctance to talk with us on their terms, or any feeling that we should not talk with them because they have called us aggressors in very rude and uncivilized

tones. So I am optimistic, and I hope my optimism is justified, Mr. Speaker, that the passing of our resolution will not be followed by the catastrophic consequences that some people sincerely believe it will.

We do not believe that by passing this resolution we are slamming the door to subsequent negotiation, or that the government in Peking would have any justification for interpreting our action in this way. I hope, Mr. Speaker, and I expressed this hope in my last statement at the United Nations before I came back to Ottawa, that whatever happened to this resolution—and it is now part of the law of the United Nations—the work of cease-fire, discussion and peaceful settlement, through the machinery provided in the resolution, will proceed with a view to ending the war in Korea and removing the causes of war in other areas of Asia.

That, Mr. Speaker, is our position. It is not one which, in my opinion, warrants support for the amendment of the C.C.F. party which is now before the house. To support that amendment, Mr. Speaker, would, I think, be to accept the despairing but sincere plea of that wise and saintly gentleman, Sir Benegal Rau, that by passing this resolution we had ended all hope of a peaceful solution of Far Eastern questions. I do not accept any such counsel of despair; and I hope that the Indian government, on second thought, will not do so either, and will continue to participate in the work of negotiation and conciliation, to which it has already made such a magnificent contribution. We in this government will do what we can, in any way open to us, to assist that work, and to prove that the prophets of impending calamity are wrong. And events may, I think, work in our favour along this course. I am even bold enough to think that the Chinese government in Peking will come to realize before long that the true interests of the Chinese people cannot be served now by an alliance with Russian communist imperialism, as they could not be served in the past by Russian czarist imperialism.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I return from Asia to our own western and north Atlantic world. Here we are now entering the period of greatest danger in the months ahead. Our hope of coming through this period without war lies in the growing collective strength, military, economic and moral, of the free world. If we increase that strength, and use it wisely, we do not need to fear. There are in the hearts and minds and souls of free men qualities which can never be matched by slaves. If we use them we shall accomplish our own salvation. If we do not, but give way to smug complacency on the one