

Mr. GOODE: May I speak on perhaps a different angle? We talk about this theoretical and psychological offensive—Mr. Pearson does not like the word warfare. What are we doing in a practical way in, let us take Korea? It seems the most important thing we can do there is to take care of our own. We see pictures of orphans seated alongside the road and women walking down the road, hundreds of thousands of them, with bundles on their back; and what are we doing for those people? There seems to be a type of psychological offensive we can use in a practical way if we can show these people behind the Iron Curtain that we are taking care of our own people on our own side with respect to these women and children in Korea.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: A certain amount has been done. In fact if it had not been for the United Nations relief and rehabilitation work there would have been starvation and even greater tragedy in Korea. The United Nations Korean relief agency has done a pretty good job in Korea. I forget what the total contributions have been. Last year we subscribed \$7,250,000 to it, and I think it has spent altogether about \$50 million. But, what it has spent has meant the difference between life and death to a lot of people. The unified command military relief has done much more than that. The U.S. military organization has spent great sums of money on relief, apart from the United Nations relief itself. So I think some of the United Nations have not defaulted in their responsibility in this respect, that is one element in our propaganda warfare in Korea. We are trying to tell the North Korean how the people are looked after in south Korea despite the devastation of war, and how much worse their condition is in North Korea, which is true.

Mr. GRAYDON: I don't want to change the subject if there is anyone else who has a question to ask. But I wanted to ask a question on another matter now.

The CHAIRMAN: You have five more minutes with the minister.

Mr. GRAYDON: I fancy that the feeling of everybody on this committee and in parliament, despite the various views that were expressed in connection with the policy in the far east in this debate—and there were plenty of varying expressions of opinion, perhaps not as wide as one might have expected, but there were some—I imagine that back of the whole thing is a feeling that somehow the free powers ought to have some kind of effective machinery for consultation on all these matters from one end of the globe to the other. We have it in the North Atlantic alliance so far as the North Atlantic union is concerned and I should welcome the same in connection with matters in Korea. It seems to me the one prime matter of the free world now is to have some effective machinery for co-operation of policy at high levels—not low levels, but high levels—if we are going to be able to carry public opinion in all the various units of this free alliance. And it could be done through the United Nations because it is comprised of not only free powers but others that are not free. It could be done through the North Atlantic alliance; but it does seem to me that somehow we will have to develop a free power constructive system on a high level soon in order to keep our whole free power objectives on a proper and even keel. I think that this is going to be more and more emphasized. It has happened in the United States and may happen in some other countries. I am concerned about that problem and I know the minister must be because it is one of the things the Canadian people have in the forefront of their minds now. They would like to have a say in what is going on, no matter where it is all, over the world. They may not hope to have the final say or a major say; it would depend entirely upon what we are able to contribute and what our commitments would be; but I think it is important that everybody at least has a say through