

taken under the United Nations charter to cooperate in resistance to aggression. That was the basis of intervening in Korea and that basis does not exist at the present time in Indo-China.

Mr. BALCER: Mr. Dulles said that the Chinese, if they go a little further are apt to produce an action which might not be confined to Indo-China. Would that action mean that the United States would bring the matter before the United Nations, or would that mean direct intervention right away?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I have no idea what that might mean. After all, it is not the United States that is primarily concerned in this matter although certainly the United States is very "importantly" concerned. But the member of the United Nations who has primary concern in this is France. Whether retaliatory action of that kind would be taken and in what form, and whether it would come to the United Nations beforehand for consideration, I cannot answer because I do not know what was in Mr. Dulles' mind. Mr. Dulles has emphasized on more than one occasion that one of the advantages of this policy of retaliation is to keep the enemy guessing as to what form retaliation will take and I am quite sure that he has had some success in his remarks yesterday in that regard.

Mr. PEARKES: I wonder if Mr. Pearson could tell us the position of the Nationalist government in China, the government in Formosa, because it seems to me that they are a very distinct power. Are they still members of the United Nations? Are they attending this conference?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: China is a member of the United Nations. The Chinese representative, the man who sits in China's seat at the United Nations, is a representative of the Nationalist government of China which has its headquarters at Formosa. But the Chinese Nationalist government was not invited to the Geneva conference or to the Korean political settlement and that was in accordance with the United Nations resolution. I suppose the reason the Chinese Nationalist government was not invited to the Geneva conference was that it was not essential to the conclusion of the Korean political affair, nor had its forces taken part in the Korean operations on the United Nations side which was the basis of our representation.

Mr. PEARKES: Their forces have been operating, have they not, against the mainland of China and thereby contributing something towards the Korean situation?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Well, we have heard stories about raids occasionally by the Chinese Nationalist forces on the mainland. Every clash between Chinese Nationalist forces and Chinese communist forces contributes something.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Knowles.

Mr. KNOWLES: I want to make further reference to and to ask about Mr. Dulles' speech yesterday. May we take it from what you said a moment ago that Canada is not involved in any way in Indo-China?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Not legally or formally.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes, I understand, from a legal or formal point of view, but is there any other treaty or commitment?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: No, we have no commitment that I know of in respect of Indo-China, that is, no formal or legal commitment apart from our membership in the United Nations and our acceptance of the United Nations charter and our obligation to play our part in resisting aggression. But when I say that we have no formal legal commitment or obligation, that does not mean that we are not aware of the importance of what is going on in Indo-China and what it means in the struggle between communist forces and the forces on our side.