

so many views expressed by so many different people it is difficult at times to tell what the view of the United States government really is. Fortunately, we have not the same system in our country. Here, we have collective responsibility on the part of the cabinet and consequently we know from time to time where the government stands on these important matters.

I, too, join with others in regretting that the Berlin conference was not more successful in bringing about a peace treaty for Germany and in bringing peace to Austria. I agree that it is essential that Germany shall sooner or later be unified. I agree also it could not be unified on the basis suggested by the Soviet union. One of the first prerequisites to the unification of Germany is that the German people should be able to choose their own government freely in a democratic way. I believe that goes almost without saying. I hope that the forthcoming conference at Geneva will bring some real results. My criticism of the government from time to time has been one that I am going to repeat this afternoon.

I feel that from time to time the government does not take a sufficiently positive attitude in connection with some of these matters. We seem to drift along. Before the first world war, and at least to some extent before the second world war, we rather blindly followed the foreign policy laid down in the United Kingdom. It seems to me we have got to beware now lest in our friendliness for the United States and our admiration for the people of the United States we allow ourselves to be in the position of a follower of United States external policy. I believe we have to beware lest we fall into that trap. It is so easy, with a country with contiguous boundaries and in some respects with the same kind of institutions and approaches to problems, to follow along rather than from time to time take a positive position and be outspoken. The Secretary of State for External Affairs did perform a useful service both to this country and the democratic nations when he spoke at Chicago recently and made the statements and the criticisms that he made there.

May I come at once to this question of the recognition of China. Hon. members know that in 1949, before the Korean aggression, our view was that we should have recognized the fact there was a government in control of the mainland of China. It was at that time the United Kingdom and India both recognized that fact. I was under the impression then we were about to do the same thing, but we did not do it. Then aggression occurred in Korea a few months later. I quite agree that when there was a Chinese army

actively fighting in Korea the recognition of the government at Peking was out of the question at that time. Now, however, an armistice has been signed and we are going to negotiate with that government. We are going to negotiate with their representatives.

If I had been building up the case for the recognition of this new government of China, I could not have done better than the Prime Minister did this afternoon. He marshalled all the arguments in favour of the recognition of the government of China because as he said, whether or not we like that government—and I do not like its ideology—we have to recognize as a fact that is the government with which we have to do business. It does control the mainland of China. How it controls the mainland of China is a different question. From time to time we have recognized revolutionary governments. Some of them have been communist governments, and as an example I cite the government of the Soviet union.

You have a government in control of the Chinese mainland, with its teeming millions, with whom we are going to negotiate at Geneva, and yet we say we do not recognize the fact that government is there and in control. While I think we should make it abundantly clear that we do not agree with the ideology or the method of achieving power adopted by that government, nonetheless we recognize we have to negotiate with it and we recognize that government is a fact, whether or not we like it. Consequently, without approving of the government, its ideology or anything else connected with it, and having to negotiate with it, I think that by inference negotiation is a recognition of the fact that it is the government of the mainland of China. I thought this afternoon the Prime Minister built up a very strong case for recognition and then he rather shrugged his shoulders and backed away from it.

Let us hope that the danger of the extension of the war in Asia is lessening. Let us hope that the tension in the world has decreased. I believe there are signs that it has. It seems to me that anything Canada can do to reduce the remaining tensions, and they are many, we should undertake. It was for that reason that I rose this afternoon to ask the Prime Minister about the reported statement he had made concerning United States military aid to Pakistan. After all, the position in India was quite clear. Mr. Nehru and the government of India were alarmed lest this might be an armament of Pakistan that would cause greater tension between the two countries, though not necessarily leading to hostilities between them.