

External Affairs

in October, and this time with General MacArthur's support and approval, it was again turned down, this time by the United States chiefs of staff.

The proposals which the hon. gentleman and others have made are based on the assumption—and I myself think it is a rash assumption—that action of this kind, limited though it may be, would cause the Chinese communists to withdraw from Korea and presumably sue for peace, without bringing about the intervention in this conflict in the Far East of the U.S.S.R. Those recommendations add up to the policy which has been outlined and recommended in other places. Yet in concluding his speech the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra expressed the hope that the Canadian government would "maintain and strengthen the British commonwealth." Surely it should be well known to him, as it is known to other members of the house, that no single commonwealth government has supported the policy advocated by the hon. gentleman and by certain other people in this country and across the line. Therefore I would suggest to him that if he wishes to maintain his usual consistency he will have to decide whether Canada should follow the policy that he has outlined as against Korea and China or the policy being pursued by the other commonwealth governments in this matter, and indeed by the government of the United States.

Mr. Green: May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. Green: In what manner does the minister suggest that victory is to be won in Korea?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: That is a very good question, and I hope I shall be able to come to that before I conclude my remarks. The hon. member seems to me in fact—I hope I am not doing him an injustice—to represent in respect of Far Eastern policy what I might call the more aggressive wing of the official opposition. I am not quite sure how extensive that wing is but it certainly includes the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Browne).

Mr. Green: We do not believe in appeasement.

Mr. Pearson: Yet I find it difficult to believe that the views they have presented so cogently in their participation in this discussion enjoy the official endorsement of their party. Certainly the policy in regard to Asia which they recommended that Canada should adopt seems to me at least to differ

very markedly from the milder, and in my opinion much wiser, policy urged by other hon. members of the official opposition, notably the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) and the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). Therefore I think I am entitled to say that I hope we shall soon hear what is the official policy of the official opposition in regard to this very important question.

Mr. Green: You tell us how the war is to be won in Korea.

Mr. Pearson: Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to consider once again what are our objectives in Korea and how those objectives can be reached. I hope that in doing so I shall be able to satisfy the hon. gentleman's curiosity, if not to secure his approval. A number of members, including the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) and the hon. member for St. John's West, have asked what is the policy of the Canadian government in this matter. In opening this discussion I tried to answer these questions but I am quite happy to try to go over the ground again. I realize that in such a confused situation as does exist in Korea it is difficult to have a clear objective or to see the objective that we have clearly. It is now more important than ever that we should have as exact an idea as possible of what we are trying to accomplish in Korea, along with other members of the United Nations. The Canadian brigade group will shortly be in action, so not only they but every other Canadian will want to know what is their purpose in Korea and what is the policy of the Canadian government in regard to achieving that purpose.

Before I try to answer once again this crucial question, I should like to draw to your attention—this was done I thought very effectively this afternoon by the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Decore)—the advantages which have already accrued to the cause of freedom from the United Nations action in Korea. In the first place, as was pointed out this afternoon, the military danger to many other areas in Asia has been greatly reduced as a result of the courageous and skilful campaign which has been carried on in Korea. Many of the best formations of the Chinese communist army have been committed to battle in Korea and have suffered very heavy losses in the process. As a result, the number of trained troops facing Indo-China, Formosa, Hong Kong, Burma and Malaya has been reduced, and the danger of successful attacks in those areas is now I think less than it was—although of course it has certainly not by any means been eliminated.