

moral considerations involved and, in the case of a ruthless communist regime, these considerations inevitably must have a bearing on our attitude. But the decision remains predominantly a political one to be taken on the basis of enlightened self-interest, as in many other cases where we have recognized totalitarian regimes.

It should not, however, be assumed that Canadian recognition of the Peking government—even if it were to be granted at some time in the future—would extend to the island of Formosa. As we see it, the legal status of Formosa is still undecided and no step taken vis-a-vis the communist regime should prejudice that issue. In particular, we would not be a party to any action which handed over the people or the government on Formosa, against their will, to any mainland government, let alone to a communist Chinese government.

We condemn the cruelties and tyrannies of the Peking regime, and we continue to hope that the Chinese people will one day be governed by a more enlightened government of their own choice.

But, we must accept the fact of communist control of mainland China. That is one thing we cannot fail to recognize with the corollary that in certain circumstances and in our own interests we may be obliged to deal—as we already have been obliged to do—at Geneva and elsewhere with that government in respect of certain problems which cannot be solved without it. Nor should we, I suggest, base our policy on the likelihood of the nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek returning to power on the mainland. Furthermore, the anomaly of that government representing China at the United Nations, with a veto that can block any action desired by 52 other members, is becoming increasingly apparent. I believe also that we should accept no commitment to intervene on behalf of the nationalist government in the struggle for the Chinese off-shore islands. Our view on this matter has already been made clear in this House, outside this House and in the United States.

As for Formosa, the only commitment—and this also has been stated in the House—we have is that which might arise out of our obligations under the charter of the United Nations. So far as diplomatic recognition is concerned, we should from time to time review the position in the light of conditions; of our interests and of the views of our friends and allies. However, I believe we should not get ourselves into such an inflexible position that a change in policy, if it were considered to be wise and necessary, could be brought about only with maximum difficulty.