

*External Affairs*

On their part, the Chinese communists insist that these islands are part of the mainland of their own country and that if Chiang Kai-shek's troops do not evacuate them they will be driven out.

The possibility of serious trouble arising out of these conflicting positions is obvious and creates understandable and real anxiety, because the consequences might involve more than the two Chinese governments.

The Canadian position on this matter has been stated in the house, Mr. Speaker. We have accepted no commitment to share in the defence of either Formosa or the coastal islands, or to intervene in any struggle between the two Chinese governments for possession of these offshore islands. Our obligations in this matter arise only out of our responsibilities as a member of the United Nations, and I have stated in this house what those are. We also think that a distinction, politically and strategically, can be made between Formosa and the coastal islands; also indeed between Formosa and Korea. Nevertheless, the fact that we have no commitments certainly does not mean that we have no concern. We have a deep and abiding concern because of considerations which make isolation from these questions wellnigh impossible.

There is first our general concern with peace and anything that might threaten it. Then there is our special concern with United States policy from the consequences of which Canada, a North American country, cannot escape. Finally there is our close concern with anything that weakens—as this question may—that coalition the strength and unity of which, under the leadership of the United States, is at present the strongest deterrent against communist aggression and war.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, only recently, as many others have said before me, that it would be impossible, in my view, for either the United States or Canada to be neutral if the people of the other country were engaged in a major war in which their very existence as a people was at stake, and that in working out our foreign and our defence policies we can never forget that fact. By "we" I mean the United States as well as Canada. I think that is self-evident. It is one of the facts of international life which we, and indeed other countries, have accepted. We in Canada have already recognized that fact by our membership in NATO. We have recognized it also in our North American continental defence arrangements which are and must be, to be effective, on a joint basis and closely co-operative.

Canadians, and I believe Americans also, understand and accept the inescapable interdependence of Canada and the United States in the policies required for our joint security and for the preservation of peace. We cannot, therefore, isolate ourselves from the implications of that interdependence, if either country were ever attacked by an aggressor. If these implications at times cause anxiety on our part, as they do, we certainly would have far greater cause for anxiety if there were no recognition across the border of any such mutual security and defence relationship, or no recognition of our right to make our views known on matters which may be primarily the responsibility of Washington.

There are two main reasons, I think, why the people of Canada do understand and accept this situation. The first is that any war in which we were jointly engaged would be a defensive one. It is inconceivable to Canadians, it is inconceivable certainly to me, that the United States would ever initiate an aggressive war. It is also inconceivable that Canada would ever take part in such a war.

The second reason, as I see it, is that the only aggressive force that threatens us today, or that could commit a major aggression, is communist imperialism. Does anybody believe that we could or should keep out of an all-out struggle precipitated by communist aggressive power which, if victorious, would end everything that makes for free and decent existence?

That, then, Mr. Speaker, is the meaning of the proposition I have advanced, of the inevitability of close, co-operative arrangements with the United States in maintaining the peace and in joint defence against a major attack. This means, as the United Nations and NATO meant, that our right to be neutral has been limited by our desire to strengthen the security of our country and protect the peace. It does not mean, although I have heard it misstated in these terms, that whenever the United States is engaged in any kind of war, we are at war.

Only the other day I was reading an editorial in a Canadian paper which analysed very correctly what I was trying to say in Toronto the other day. After reading that editorial I went on to read a news story about the same subject and over that news story in large red type were these words: "U.S. Wars are ours". Nothing I have said today, or nothing I have said before, means that.

It certainly does not mean that we must participate in limited or peripheral wars,