

meeting of the commission before the announcement was made. He was, therefore, instructed to seek clarification at the next meeting of the commission of the action of the acting chairman and to maintain the position taken at Lake Success, namely, that the commission should not accept the advice given to it in the United States resolution or associate itself with the conduct of elections in South Korea only.

Doctor Patterson was further instructed that, if the commission did not support the Canadian view on this matter, he was to state that he could not participate further in its activities until he had received further instructions from his government.

According to a press dispatch from Seoul, Doctor Patterson withdrew from the meeting of the commission yesterday. I have not yet received from Doctor Patterson a report of that meeting, but I expect one at any moment. We have asked him to dispatch it as quickly as possible. I am not suggesting that there has been any undue delay, because these messages come in cipher and he has to do the work himself. He has no staff there to assist him in doing it. If Doctor Patterson confirms that the commission has, in fact, in this manner decided to associate itself with elections in South Korea only, he will be instructed by cable to return at once to Ottawa for consultation, so that the government will have the benefit of his first-hand information in deciding what its attitude should be in the light of the changed situation.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask a supplementary question? Another point I had in mind to ask the minister was whether instructions had been given to Doctor Patterson to walk out and not attend the next meeting. If so, it is to be noted that the Minister of Justice a short while ago criticized those of us who suggested we might walk out of parliamentary committee; he said that it would be following the Russian example.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There were no instructions given to walk out and to refuse to attend any other meeting; in fact the general tenor of the instructions would, I think, be interpreted as contrary advice. The advice was to say that he could not further participate until he had obtained further instructions from the government on the changed situation.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister a supplementary question? There were nine nations on the commission. Were we alone in taking this action, or were other nations acting in a similar way?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I do not know whether all the others were consulted by the vice-chair-

[Mr. St. Laurent.]

man before he made this announcement. Our representative was certainly not consulted. At the interim assembly our view was supported by the representative of Australia.

Mr. GRAYDON: He apparently did not walk out.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Well, I do not know that anyone has walked out. I have asked for a report from Doctor Patterson and I will give the substance of that report as soon as it is received.

POLICY OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RESPECTING
PARTITION OF PALESTINE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALISTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. What is the present policy of the Canadian government with relation to the partition of Palestine as recommended by the general assembly of the united nations on November 29 last?

Right Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The present policy of Canada was announced by the Canadian permanent delegate to the united nations in his statement to the security council on March 3. He indicated that Canada regards it as a paramount necessity that the security council should make every effort toward conciliation under chapter VI of the charter before considering enforcement measures under chapter VII. I quote his words:

Even at this late hour conciliation in our view must be tried, for surely the realization must be growing upon both communities in Palestine that the present course of violence and inflexible resistance against one another can only bring chaos and mutual destruction.

If conciliation efforts should fail it would then be for the security council to consider what action should be taken in regard to the recommendations of the general assembly of the united nations relating to the partition of Palestine. The Canadian permanent delegate stated in conclusion that the position taken by Canada was not to be interpreted as in any way repudiating or abandoning the recommendations of the general assembly. He intimated that this was a matter on which the council should not take a decision until the five permanent members had reported on the results of their conciliation efforts, in which vitally important work they should enjoy the greatest possible freedom without being restricted by any prior decision.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I ask a supplementary question? It is nine weeks until May 15, when the British mandate expires. Has any progress been made with regard to a solution?