

*External Affairs*

to the organization of China, and one that may not have been as democratic as ours in practice, but one based upon a series of projected reforms that had to be continually delayed due to the interminable warfare with the communist armies. Now that he is doing that reform gradually in Formosa, you will say: "it means nothing, it is a small part of the country and he did not do it on the mainland when he was there". But how could he start doing it on the mainland when he had to fight all the time the communist armies over the northern parts of the country?

There are two main points of view concerning the recognition of communist China and its admission to the United Nations. The first is that of those who express wishful thinking or who will stand only on principles and do not want to admit the facts. That is a tempting attitude for good people and nice people to take, but is it a possible one to take for any length of time? You will say it is not right to deal with a bandit, a thief or a murderer or to enter into an agreement with him, that it is compounding a felony. That may be true, but the history of the world shows many such things that have been done, even by men in a higher place than that of ministers of state in a democratic country. They are those who oppose the admission of China or even its recognition. I have the text of a petition signed by prominent conservative Americans—they are mostly Republicans but there are a few Democrats—and sent to Washington opposing any recognition of China or displaying any weakness toward China. There are some things that may attract a lot of people to that school of thought. They say:

Its admission would destroy the prestige and the position of the United States and of the free world in Asia. The countries of that continent which still resist communist aggression or infiltration would be discouraged by the cynical surrender of the free world to expediency and appeasement and the betrayal of the ideals of the United Nations. The Asian nations, in turn, would then make fatal compromises with the communist bloc.

That is all right. All of that is right, so it gives you ground to think twice before you go ahead. Another point that they make—one of the two points that I think are good—is this:

The admission of the so-called Chinese People's Republic to the United Nations would encourage subversive totalitarian movements in the free nations of the world in the expectation that their success would be sanctioned by the free nations which still survive. Thus the danger of a new war would be vastly increased by the rewards offered to aggressors.

I have other such declarations. But, Mr. Speaker, there is also a second school of thought. Mao's government controls the forces who were helping the North Koreans

and they are the ones who are helping in Indo-China. Therefore they are the only ones who could—if they should be sincerely willing to do so—ensure peace in the Far East since they have been supporting the offenders, and "supporting" is a mild word. This is a practical point of view and may be the only one to be considered in the last resort should they give any appearance of doing what I stated earlier I hoped, namely consolidating their own position internally instead of furthering communist expansion abroad.

What I have in mind is this. I do not think it is right for anybody at a given moment like this, when we are not faced with a decision, to come out categorically and say "We must recognize" or "We cannot recognize" and that the government must state its policy to date or what it will do maybe six months or a year from now. If you review the history of the world I think you will find that what I am saying makes sense. It has been proven time and again that you have had to negotiate with this or that nation, without liking it, but in order to prevent bloodshed.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) say that he wanted the assurance that there would be no recognition on promises; and he talked of bloodshed in Korea. There is also bloodshed in Indo-China, as he pointed out. Could it be possible that one day that bloodshed would be stopped by meeting these people—as we will meet them in April—across the green table? Could something be gained by it? That is the ultimate end. That is the ultimate aim we should have, namely to prevent a state of war from continuing and spreading. I would not say that the end justifies the means, although a lot of people have practised that policy, even in high places in the hierarchy of the world. But in this case it might be so, and it has proven good on many other occasions in the world.

I thought it was strange to hear the Leader of the Opposition at one moment comparing Churchill and his V-for-victory sign with Chamberlain and his umbrella. When the Leader of the Opposition spoke of this being another Munich and that we would see the gentleman coming back with the umbrella, I was surprised to hear the man who—and rightfully so—must admire Mr. Churchill, comparing him with the man with the umbrella. I want to refer to the statement, as it has been quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, as having been made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and which commenced in this way, "If China by a conciliatory attitude at Geneva