

account of himself on behalf of this country in deliberations in almost every capital of the world.

Speaking about Formosa, may I remind honourable senators that the members of the United Nations, in their deliberations at Cairo, agreed to hand over Formosa to the Chinese. I have long thought that it was an error on our part and, in particular, on the part of the United States, to champion General Chiang Kai-shek, a man who is now one of the most discredited leaders in Asia. If I wanted to find out something about a member of parliament or a senator I would make inquiries in the place from which he came, and where the people knew him best. I say this because I have found members of the House of Commons and some senators criticizing me in private talks because I have made, or was going to make, derogatory remarks about General Chiang Kai-shek. But I am one of those who for some years have made a kind of study of Asiatic affairs, and I know people who have lived in Asia and gained experience there. I criticized very severely in the House of Commons the remark made by the then Speaker of that house when he called Madam Chiang Kai-shek "the immortal". I could not understand a man whose native land was Scotland putting anyone on that pedestal, especially a person like Madam Chiang Kai-shek.

Honourable senators, Formosa is just like a keg of dynamite at the present time. On the one hand is Great Britain, recognizing communist China; and on the other hand is the United States, or General MacArthur bolstering General Chiang Kai-shek. I only hope that President Truman's admonition of General MacArthur is not too late. General MacArthur's actions resulted in many repercussions, not only in America but also in Great Britain. For the benefit of honourable senators I am going to read one or two paragraphs from what Peter Inglis just wrote from the London Bureau.

As far as Formosa is concerned, the British attitude is that a commitment by a member of the United Nations to defend the island permanently—as distinct from isolating it from the present war—is not a tenable policy, either from the member's point of view or from that of the United Nations. Britons hope that Mr. Truman realizes this and will not allow himself to be dissuaded by political pressure.

To continue:

Properly, therefore, Formosa today belongs to nobody. A peace treaty could give it to China, or hand it back to Japan, or put it under United Nations mandate.

That the island has become the last piece of territory held by the former Chinese Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek (which Britain no longer recognizes) is, in the British view, unfortunate but irrelevant.

And, to conclude:

Chiang, in this view, has no more right to claim to control Formosa permanently than the Peking government of Mao Tse-tung, which Britain recognizes as the government of China, has the right to try to seize Formosa by force of arms.

From the British point of view, the acceptability or otherwise of Chiang or any other Asiatic leader as an ally should be judged by how he looks to the people of Asia and not by how he looks to Westerners.

I wonder how many honourable senators have delved into the history of China or of Russia? I wonder if honourable senators realize how many millions died under the regime of General Chiang Kai-shek, while he was building vast mansions at the expense of the poor people? Perhaps honourable members will not agree with me, but I hold to the view that the people of China endured all the suffering from hunger they could under the corrupt rule of General Chiang Kai-shek, and that it was their right to revolt if they saw fit. I am afraid that by our bungling, our hesitation and our support of the wrong people, we may very well throw that greater part of China, which is under the Chinese communists, right into the hands of the Soviet. There is no feeling of love between the Chinese and the Russians, and I am hoping that out of this all there may come in China another regime such as that of Tito. This would certainly act as a great bulwark against the spread of Soviet Russia. I trust that those in charge of diplomatic affairs will survey the entire situation before making any definite decision about rushing to support Formosa.

A proposal was made in the other house a few days ago, and although it may have been made in the interests of the Canadian people, it was to my mind a most foolish one. The speaker suggested that Canada should be ready at all times to send a force to any trouble spot in the world. Do honourable senators realize just what a proposal of that kind would mean, and just how dangerous it would be? There are many danger spots in the world today. I have mentioned Formosa, but what about Indo-China? If trouble breaks out there, are we to be prepared to send troops without knowing whether the cause of the trouble will be an endeavour to maintain French imperialism in that country? I hope we do not accede to the proposal made by the honourable gentleman, because in my opinion to do so would be both foolish and fatal.

Coming back to Formosa, I may say that the British and French, from long world-wide experience, do not allow any of their generals to make diplomatic decisions. Those countries found out long ago that it is wiser to restrict military officers to military matters and to leave diplomacy to diplomats or to