

External Affairs

The distinction must be asserted between recognizing a government and entering into diplomatic relations with it. No state is legally obliged to enter into and maintain diplomatic relations with a state or government which it recognizes. On the other hand, it cannot enter into full and normal diplomatic relations with a state or government which it does not recognize.

Recognition of a new governmental authority, accompanied as it must be by automatic withdrawal of recognition from its predecessor, necessitates an invidious decision which, in relation to old friends, may be distasteful and not free from anxiety. But decisions of this nature are unavoidable. They do not become easier by dint of being postponed.

Then he adds this:

It may be of importance, in the case now before His Majesty's government—

That is, recognition of China.

—to reassure public opinion that the decision at which they have arrived is not arbitrary or intended to minister to what may be a transient advantage, but that it is in accordance with principle and with the practice of enlightened nations, including that of our closest friend and ally.

The reference there is to something he said a little earlier in the same article in regard to the historical background of the United States with respect to the recognition of revolutionary governments. Apparently the London *Times* agreed with this view that China should be recognized because of the conditions laid down in this article, and because of the necessity. Indeed I have here a report which appeared in our local newspapers as an Associated Press dispatch dated London, January 7, the day after the British government granted recognition to the new Chinese government. These are the main points in the dispatch: The British press, in a chorus of approval, greeted Britain's recognition of the new government of China. All papers, including Labour and Conservative, gave approval. Lord Beaverbrook's *Daily Express* termed the recognition wise. The London *Times* said Britain was accepting a communist regime in China as she already had done in Russia, but would resist any attempt by the Chinese government to enforce communism on other countries.

Thus we see that in a country with long experience in international matters and the way these things are done in the field of international affairs, all the newspapers from the London *Times* through to the *Daily Herald*, the Labour paper, welcomed recognition and approved of it. Consequently I say that under international law, and in the interests of their own nationals, this recognition was granted.

This afternoon the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) referred to the article by Mr. Anthony Eden which appeared some ten or twelve days after recognition had been granted. But note this, for it is on the record: If one reads Mr. Eden's article, one finds that what he was criticizing was not the recognition of China as such, but the timing of that

[Mr. Coldwell.]

recognition. He was deploring the fact that all the commonwealth nations, indeed all the nations with interests in the Pacific, did not act together. As the leader of the opposition indicated when he read the article, and as the Secretary of State for External Affairs pointed out in his speech, Mr. Eden stated that recognition was inescapable. It had to come. The only criticism he made was of the timing of that recognition. Mr. Eden thought a common policy should have been agreed upon. I know that for a long time that had been the position of the British Conservative party. They had always thought that there should be an imperial foreign policy, which would be controlled from one central point. None of the commonwealth nations, at least in the last 25 or 30 years, have felt inclined to co-operate in sending representatives to one point, or in the setting up of any organization, which would bring about a common foreign policy of this description.

I am certain of this, that the people of Canada would not have wanted to have this parliament approve of the establishment of a super-cabinet to deal with foreign policy on an imperial basis. I feel that this is a relic of the old plea for an imperial foreign policy, an idea which, fortunately or unfortunately according to one's viewpoint, was discarded long ago. As a matter of fact, even if we liked the idea, it is not possible to put it into effect now, because our economic and geographical circumstances are so different. A policy that is suitable for the United Kingdom would not necessarily be suitable for Canada. Certainly, as we have seen, it would not be acceptable to the new republics of the commonwealth, India and Pakistan. In my opinion it is far better to have the type of commonwealth association we have, an association of free peoples and free governments, than it is to have something rigid, because in time it would break, and we would find ourselves with no real association at all.

Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Coldwell: Yes.

Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Am I not right in understanding that what Mr. Eden meant when he spoke about common action and agreed strategy, was not merely a reference to the nations of the commonwealth but would include, among others, the United States?

Mr. Coldwell: Yes, but what I am saying is that probably it is again a reflection of the old concept of the British Conservative party. May I just say this, and I was going to add it because I have a reminder in my notes, that the proposal he made in January was wider than agreement among the commonwealth