

one I assume opposes or opposed at the time the armistice, and no one in this house opposes the invitation to the Geneva conference. It may be that the hon. member for Prince Albert has some mental reservation about the wisdom of this conference. He is quoted as having said in Toronto, according to the Toronto GLOBE AND MAIL of March 9, that the Red Chinese attendance at the conference in Geneva is a victory for Russia. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the case; because China will not be in Geneva as one of the five great powers, or after recognition, or even as an invited power. Indeed, it is hard to imagine Mr. Dulles, Mr. Eden or Mr. Bidault agreeing to a proposal for a conference at Geneva, if it were a victory for Russia.

Red China will be at that conference in Geneva because we cannot negotiate a peace in Korea without her attendance. Whether we can do it with her attendance remains to be seen.

On February 2, 1951, I said in the house referring to the Chinese Communists:

They should not think that they can bludgeon or blackmail their way into recognition of the United Nations.

I still feel that way, and also feel that Peking should not be granted diplomatic recognition merely because they signed an armistice in Korea or have agreed to go to a conference in Geneva. But that does not mean that we will not negotiate with this government now in authority in China, when we should do so, or with any other communist government when it is necessary to do so.

We have accepted this invitation, and I hope the Canadian delegation will not follow any course at Geneva or take any action there which would justify the gloomy forebodings expressed last Friday by the Leader of the Opposition, based upon impressions - and as I see it erroneous impressions - that he had received from press quotations. We are not carrying any umbrella to Geneva, nor are we brandishing a bomb either.