

regard unfavourably with that of the Government of the United Kingdom. But I should like to point out that the government of the United Kingdom--which has, of course, recognized the Government at Peking as the Government of China--has not at any time, so far as I am aware, supported the application of that government for membership in the United Nations.

Then the fourth point he made was that we should not intervene in the struggle between the two Chinese governments over the offshore islands. This afternoon the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Balcer), by a process of misinterpretation of remarks of mine which I find to be completely astonishing and almost unbelievable, somehow or other got the impression that our policy was to intervene in the struggle for the offshore islands, and he contrasted our policy with that of the United Kingdom. It has been said more than once--I have said it already tonight and I do not mind repeating it, if necessary--that it is our policy to stay out of this struggle for these offshore islands, and I think that other governments would be well advised to adopt the same policy. I am even bold enough to hope that that will be the policy which will be adopted in due course by all governments concerned.

Then the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart, supported by some of his friends, criticized the United States because the line of defence which the United States administration was drawing was too far from North America. My friend the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), as he will remember, made quite a point of the same criticism. In that part of his speech the leader of the C.C.F. had this to say about the United States, as reported at page 2358 of Hansard:

Why not for a change--

And I think he was referring to me.

--he outspoken about United States policies that are equally imperialist in a sense, not in the same sense as the old imperialism used to be, but in the sense that there is an attempt to control a very large part of the world through bases and by display of arms.

He worried, as did some of his friends, that in that attempt to control, as he put it--and I do not think this is a fair description--the United States Government had extended its front lines of defence across the Pacific Ocean far away from the shores of continental United States.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green) brought up the same point, but instead of criticizing the United States for its faraway defence line, stated flatly that we should follow this example and our first line of defence should be Formosa, as it is for the United States. Well, I think that this whole concept of geographical defence lines used for political purposes is misleading and can even be dangerous. On the one hand, if Formosa is a vital first line position for the United States or for any other far-off country, then it could be argued with great validity that the offshore islands should be