

"I believe that this island should be neutralized while fighting is going on in Korea."

I then went on to say this:

"It does not follow, however, that if and when the Korean conflict can be ended satisfactorily, we should refuse to discuss the future of Formosa within the context of international agreements that have already been reached concerning it, and indeed within the context of the United Nations Charter."

There was therefore certainly nothing new in that part of the statement I made in New York. Indeed, there was nothing new in that statement at all in so far as Canadian foreign policy is concerned.

The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), speaking immediately after me in that discussion on external affairs in May 1951, did not take exception to any of these statements. In fact, I believe he did not even mention Formosa in that discussion. I therefore think that I now have the right to ask the spokesman of his party what their policy is with regard to these matters. Do they disagree with what I have said in this House on these matters to which I have just referred, things which I have said more than once and which indeed I repeated in New York? Or do they on the other hand, take their stand on the concrete statement made in this House on May 7, 1951, in the course of the debate on external affairs, by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra, who during that debate said--and there is nothing ambiguous about this or about some other parts of his statement--as reported at Page 2785 of Hansard:

"Then I believe we should insist that Formosa must not be turned over to the Chinese Communists."

And he made no qualification of that statement. That is an arguable position but we on this side of the House consider it to be an unwise position. I would therefore be interested in learning--and I am sure we shall do so later in this discussion--whether his party agree with that position, that notwithstanding previous declarations in regard to Formosa, that island should not be permitted to become part of China so long as a Communist Chinese Government is in power in Peking, irrespective of whether that government is committing aggression in Korea or elsewhere.

I would say at once that that is not the position of the Government, and we think it would be rash to adopt such a rigid policy in a world of such rapid change. We think it to be wiser to hold open the question as to what will be the best solution for Formosa when the aggression ends in Korea. In that respect we subscribe to the principle laid down by the United States Secretary of State before a Congressional committee on June 1, 1951, when Mr. Acheson said:

"The President has stated that we are not prejudicing the future of Formosa. That is a matter which should be decided, he said, either in connection with the Japanese Peace Treaty--"

Where, incidentally, it was not decided.