

There are, I think, two main reasons why this change has come about - two reasons why, in this post-war world, Canadians are concerned, as never before, with what takes place in the Far East - why the Government of Canada has developed and put before Parliament a considered policy in Asian affairs. First of all, there is the obvious connection between events in Asia and the maintenance of world peace and security. The Korean War afforded a tragic illustration of the impossibility of leaving Asia out of account in our collective arrangements. Like Americans, we in Canada have come to realize that, in no part of the world, however remote, can we ignore the act of an aggressor. We know now that a threat to freedom in the East is a threat to our own security. Asia and the course taken by the vast populations of the great Asian countries has come to have a new and critical importance for us in North America.

The second main factor which has brought about this development in the attitude of Canadians, is the change which has taken place, since the war, in the structure and character of the British Commonwealth. Ceylon, India and Pakistan have achieved independence. Largely, I believe, because of the foresight and wisdom of British policy, these new Asian nations have yet chosen to remain within the Commonwealth. So it comes about that our association of free nations, of which the Crown is the symbol, affords an important and valuable link between East and West. There can be no doubt that Canada's sympathetic perception of Asian problems has been sharpened by the rise of these three great sister states which occupy the whole of the Indian sub-continent.

The policy of the Canadian Government in Asian affairs, as in foreign affairs generally, is, as I have said, based on the fundamental Canadian interest in collective security. It is also based on the twin foundation of our own interest in general economic stability and well-being. The specific application of these principles to Far Eastern questions was described by Mr. Pearson in the Canadian Parliament, last January 29, in these words:

- (1) There should be no compromise with Communist military aggression in Asia - as there should be none in other places;
- (2) We should not assume that every anti-colonial, nationalist or revolutionary movement in Asia is Russian Communist in origin or direction;
- (3) We must recognize that social, national and economic forces are at work in Asia which we cannot reverse or ignore without danger;
- (4) Our policy must be on a broader and more magnanimous plane than mere opposition to Communism; so that anti-Communism should not be the sole criterion for claims upon our assistance;
- (5) We should try to convince the Asian peoples that practical democracy can do more for the individual than Communist tyrannical government, through such means as mutual aid and constructive political policies of our own; we should avoid creating the impression that the Western allies are associated in the East only with reactionary