

*External Affairs*

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, the minister apparently is not quite as clear about what I am advocating as I was about what he was advocating. He was advocating an extremely cautious policy of doing nothing at the present time but keeping all considerations under examination so that when the time to do something arrived the right thing would be done. I am making certain proposals which will help the minister in the achievement of that policy and perhaps go a little further, so that if this situation has to be faced at the next assembly of the United Nations—as undoubtedly it will—perhaps Canadian policy will have been considered in the light of the policy of certain other friendly countries and perhaps a careful and constructive attitude may be adopted. I am trying to suggest that it is not going to be easy to avoid a decision on this matter much longer because—and this is a most important consideration—the events in Korea which made recognition out of the question up to a few years ago no longer have much bearing on this particular problem.

Perhaps when the time comes when we discuss this matter on the estimates, in the light of the advice I have given the minister perhaps he will be a little bit more concrete and perhaps I will also be a little bit more concrete.

**Mr. Smith (Hastings-Frontenac):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Pearson:** The minister indicated that at the last assembly not much was done to carry out the idea which I know he has very much in mind as a great many of us have. I refer to the idea of taking advantage of the experiment which has been so successful with respect to the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East in order to establish something of a permanent organization on which, if the emergency arises in the future, we can arrange United Nations intervention more speedily and perhaps more effectively than would otherwise be possible. I had hoped that this could be done, and none of the arguments that have been put forward that I have been able to discover, seem to me to be valid. I am not now suggesting any great international army. That would be out of the question. I am not now suggesting an international police force which would be able to stand up to any national aggressor if that aggressor was determined to commit an aggression. I am thinking of the kind of force which proved to be so useful in the Middle East and which might be required again—it might even be required one of these days in Berlin or some other

danger area—to police a settlement which has been reached and which cannot be policed by national forces.

If that is to be done—and when the crisis arises and when the emergency takes place, the people down in New York say, "That is a great idea; let us do it"—why not prepare for this situation in advance by setting up a small permanent organization in New York for which those governments which so desire would earmark certain forces which would be trained and made ready for this particular purpose.

The minister has said that at the United Nations people are worried about the variety of situations that the United Nations may have to face. That is one of the reasons that we should have this kind of permanent arrangement because it would be flexible and I am sure it could be made adaptable to the kind of situation which he has in mind. We on this side had hoped, as I am sure had the minister, that at the last United Nations assembly something could have been done. If we do not soon take advantage of the situation created by the first successful United Nations initiative in this field the opportunity may be lost and it may not recur for a long time. I know a proposal was made at the last assembly and it was extremely discouraging that nothing could be done about that proposal.

I think I know the main reason for the failure of the secretary general's proposal. Once it ceased to be the proposal of the secretary general—that great and objective man—and was taken up by the United States of America—and I can speak perfectly frankly about this matter because all this information has appeared in the press—that fact aroused all the suspicions on the other side of the iron curtain and it even aroused in the minds of people in uncommitted nations some doubts which would not have been there if it had been either on the initiative entirely of the secretary general or the initiative of a delegation of a middle or smaller power. I therefore hope that in spite of this setback at the last assembly, perhaps some progress may be made at the next one.

The minister had a good deal to say about nuclear disarmament, and those of us who have been following these interminable discussions at Geneva, which seemed to start off in an atmosphere of hope, have some right to feel discouraged. It does not seem to me that there is much likelihood of achievement as long as it is recognized, as it now seems to be recognized by everybody in the discussions, that there must be some ironclad system of inspection and control, and as long as the Russians will only accept it at the price of having a veto over the control agency.