

*External Affairs*

If we recognize China we recognize that government as the government of China, and who then can deny them access to the United Nations? Who then can say that they have not the right to be there as the representative of the nation which signed? We know that Formosa is only a part of China. We know that Formosa is only a small part of the territory embraced under the term "China". It is neither a practical possibility, nor is it contemplated that if there is recognition China will be denied admission to the United Nations. If there is anyone in any doubt, let him read the reports of the speeches of Sir Gladwyn Jebb and the Secretary General of the United Nations in London last Friday, where they, to my surprise, rather took some people in the United States to task for resisting the entry of communist China into the United Nations. Read the speeches and read the arguments, and you will find there is not any doubt that those who are talking of recognition are talking of the entry of communist China into the United Nations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my remarks are directed not alone to any technical form of recognition, and I recognize that there are six distinct forms of recognition as put on the record last night by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) from one of the greatest experts on international law.

Let us not becloud this subject with any legalistic limitations. There may be six types of recognition, but the kind of recognition that is talked about and is thought about is the kind of recognition that would open the door to the United Nations building in New York. Therefore let us consider this subject on that basis, when we express our opinions now as to the course Canada should follow at Geneva on April 26.

Who are supposed to be members of the United Nations? There are terms of membership. Article 4 describes those who are qualified in this way:

Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

Who, in their right senses, could suggest that China at this time is a peace-loving nation? Who, in their right senses, at this time could suggest that communist China can subscribe, in honour, to the obligations contained in the charter of the United Nations?

Oh, but it may be said, "What about Russia, which is a member of the United Nations?" Yes, Russia signed the United Nations charter in June of 1945, at a time when we were fighting in a common cause, at a time when Russia was receiving without stint from Canada, from the United States and from

[Mr. Drew.]

Great Britain, military supplies and equipment of all kinds to help them in that terrible struggle. Yes, Russia signed at a time that we had hopes—not justified by events, it is true—but nevertheless at a time we had hopes that Russia was prepared to act with some decency within the fellowship of the nations of the world.

There is a great difference between expelling a nation already a member, and permitting a nation to enter. Expulsion is practically an impossibility, in any event. But, Mr. Speaker, let us remember this, that if China is permitted to enter the United Nations, and Sir Gladwyn Jebb said it should be permitted to do, and as Mr. Hammarskjöld indicated he thought it should be permitted to do—let us remember that not only does it become a member of the United Nations, but that it becomes a member of the United Nations with unique powers, authority and privileges. It becomes a member of the United Nations with those same special powers possessed by the United States, Great Britain, Russia and France, with the power of veto, and with other special powers giving it immense importance.

Could there be anything that would be more openly declared lunacy than for any person today to suggest that the United Nations is going to be an effective force for peace, and to stop aggression, if we invite into that special forum a nation which at this very moment is a declared aggressor and which has been waging bloody, cruel and frightful war? Not only has China been waging brutal, cruel and bloody war, but it has been defying those international rules which still have imposed at least some limits upon the horrors of war between decent nations.

Who has failed to read with sickening heart the stories printed about prisoners returning from Chinese prison camps, where murder, beatings, starvation and all the horrors referred to already, which came from that twin evil, nazism—who, I say, can read those and then talk about welcoming this nation as a fellow peace-loving nation at this time?

Mr. Speaker, there is another reason why communist China should not become a member of the United Nations under present circumstances, and why it is folly even to be talking about the possibility of that occurrence. When Canada, along with the other nations that signed the North Atlantic pact, entered into that mutual arrangement for defence, they implied—if they did not state in explicit terms—that the United Nations was incapable, under present conditions, of acting to prevent aggression.