

first case, a meeting of the Security Council, arises over the fact that the Chinese Communist Government is not a member of the United Nations and now refuses to participate in a United Nations meeting at which China is represented by the Chinese Nationalist Government. The main difficulty in the second case, a conference outside the United Nations, is, I think, that it would be premature at this juncture, even if it were possible to get the two Chinese governments into the same room.

Although efforts that have been made have not yet resulted in any solution, we do not need to despair or abandon these efforts, which as I have said are taking place through diplomatic channels. What has been accomplished has revealed indications on the communist side of at least a desire to avoid all-out war.

In the age of the hydrogen bomb a readiness to negotiate may be inspired not by love but by fear. Whatever may be the cause, there is some reason to hope that all the parties concerned may at least be looking for a solution which they could dare to accept. If this is the case, then it would be great folly to miss any opportunity for negotiation which might present itself; even worse folly to destroy all such peaceful possibility by falling back again on the use of force. If a settlement could be reached over this most acute of all recent disputes, the free world might conceivably find itself in a position from which it could proceed, even if slowly, laboriously and fitfully, to establish a framework of peace and political stability in the Far East. The search for that peace and stability may require strong defences, but no solution will be found merely by putting a sterile reliance exclusively on those defences. That is one reason why I should say a few words about the disarmament discussion which is taking place in London at the present time, and concerning which some questions have been asked in this house.

As hon. members know, there is a sub-commission of five powers, and Canada is one of them, now meeting in London to discuss the limitation of armaments that are now ironically called both conventional and atomic weapons. That sub-commission of five is meeting again after having met last spring as a result of a United Nations Assembly resolution last fall with which my hon. friend the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) had a great deal to do. That meeting in London is taking place in the awful shadow of the hydrogen bomb, which should be incentive enough for achievement. Hon. members will recall that last spring four-power proposals were put forward for limitation of armaments, atomic and conventional, by stages, with effective and complete control and inspection at every stage.

I cannot say much about what is going on in London because those meetings are being held in confidence; and although Pravda in Moscow, the organ of the Soviet Government, has today given a contentious and distorted account of what is happening there and has broken the confidence to that extent, I do not propose to follow that example. I can say, however, as I said the other day, that while the lack of progress is discouraging that is no reason why we should call off the negotiations. It is far too early to say yet that these negotiations must