

*External Affairs*

every United Nations assembly does. But I got the impression that this was not one of the more stimulating and constructive meetings of the United Nations.

I note also, and this has a bearing on what the minister said about Red China, that when the question of whether the United Nations assembly would discuss the admission of China came up, it was supported this time by 32 delegations—I believe that was the number. This was many more than had taken that position in the previous assembly. The motion was opposed by Canada and the majority of the delegations.

The minister had a good deal to say this afternoon about the recognition of communist China. I am not quite sure from what he said just where we stand on this very important matter, and perhaps that was the purpose of most of his observations. I do not want to be unfair to him, but I will say that I feel he nailed our colours firmly to the fence in regard to this matter. Perhaps, however, the nail has been moved up a few notches toward the top of the fence. I should like to ask him a few questions in a friendly and constructive vein. I do not know whether or not he will be able to answer this one, but how long are we going to be able to support the United States position, because it is a United States position, that this question cannot even be talked about at the United Nations.

The reason given by the Canadian delegation for not supporting this motion at the last assembly was that discussion at that time could not help and might hinder the settlement of the very dangerous position which had been created in the Chinese offshore islands. Perhaps by the time the next meeting of the assembly occurs things will be reasonably quiet out there and that reason will not be present. I got the impression from listening to the minister this afternoon that he thought there had been a change in the picture in so far as the position of the Chinese communist government is concerned. Certainly that position, in my view, is not now the same as it was a few years back when Chinese aggression in Korea was an obvious reason, even if there had been no other reason, for preventing diplomatic recognition and membership in the United Nations. The minister indicated that the technical and legal criteria which generally govern diplomatic recognition of a regime had been materially fulfilled at the present time. In this regard it is interesting to quote a paragraph from a book written by Foster Dulles called, "War or Peace", published in 1950. At page 190, Mr. Dulles gives this assessment of the situation in regard to recognition:

If the communist government of China, in fact, proves its ability to govern China without serious domestic resistance, then it too should be admitted to the United Nations.

He went on further:

However, a regime that claims to have become the government of a country through civil war should not be recognized until it has been tested over a reasonable period of time.

It does not seem to me that these observations have been followed, either in the first sentence in respect of China or in the last sentence in respect of many Latin American countries.

The other day I noticed a statement bearing on this question by Mr. Walter Robertson the assistant secretary of state in Washington, who is perhaps the strongest opponent of any form of diplomatic recognition of the communist government of China. He said that, nevertheless, if there is to be any international agreement on disarmament or any aspect of disarmament which requires international control and inspection—the minister mentioned this this afternoon though not quite in the terms I am using now—Red China would have to be included in that agreement and discharge its own obligations in that regard. This raises a question at once. How could Peking be asked to accept and carry out any such obligations, take part in control and inspection, which we rightly claim to be essential, and yet be considered as unrecognizable. It does, to say the least, present a dilemma.

The minister said that one of the obstacles to recognition was the fact that from the point of view of the Asian countries it would look as if we were deserting them in the face of communist Chinese subversion and pressure. The fact is, however, that most of these Asian countries have themselves recognized the communist government of China. I recall that when the Prime Minister was using that same argument during his tour in every case he had to use it in a country which, while strongly anti-communist, had recognized this particular regime. We really do not, therefore, solve many of our problems it seems to me with that particular argument. I am not sure whether the minister referred to the United Kingdom, but he said that some countries which had recognized communist China had not been treated very well by the Chinese communist government after recognition. No doubt, he may have had the United Kingdom in mind, and that is quite true. This has a bearing upon the action which this government should or should not take.

Diplomatic recognition of the Chinese communist government would be pointless, and I think worse than useless, if it were not followed by support for Chinese communist admission to the Chinese seat at the