

External Affairs

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the stands taken by my leader in connection with the question of the recognition of China, the question of technical aid and assistance to undeveloped countries, the extension of the Colombo plan and also urging every proper development of the trade and cultural relations of all countries. I endorse the remarks he made concerning the hydrogen bomb and his appeal to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) to urge that no further bombs be exploded until we have an opportunity for consultation between the countries concerned.

When the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden), I think it was, asked a question of which he had given notice—and I understand it was considerable notice—concerning the hydrogen bomb, I was rather surprised that the minister in question simply replied that he would take it as notice of question. Regardless of what has been said in this house by various speakers concerning the public concern over the future experimentation with the dropping of hydrogen bombs, I also notice that Washington just goes ahead and seems to do just what it wants to do, without any consultation or without informing us of what is being done. We hear about it afterwards.

I have been greatly interested to note that there is a sharp difference of opinion between the Progressive Conservatives and the C.C.F. with respect to this question of the recognition of China. In fact, our recognition of China has been taken, by the benches on the right, somewhat as a sinister affair according to some of the remarks that have been made by various speakers, particularly the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew), the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) and, this afternoon, the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green). What interests me is that the Progressive Conservatives in this house apparently hold a quite different point of view on this question from that of the Conservatives in the British House of Commons. When this matter has been raised previously, as it was, I think, when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, his answer was, "Oh, yes; Great Britain expressed those opinions prior to the Korean war". But that is not so. I want to quote briefly from an article which appeared in the *Vancouver Sun* of Friday, September 4, 1953. It clearly indicates that the government of Great Britain today takes a very different point of view towards the recognition of China at this time from that which the Progressive Conservatives take in this house. Strangely enough, the C.C.F. group in this

house are much closer to the Conservative government in Great Britain on this question than are the Conservatives in this house. I will quote briefly from this article. It is entitled "U.K. Wants China in UN When Time is Ripe" and reads in part as follows:

Admission of Red China into the United Nations is advocated by the United Kingdom as a matter of practical diplomacy. In no way does it involve approval of communism.

That is our point of view. To continue:

The British position is held despite the fact that London has maintained relations with the Red regime in apparently difficult and unrewarding circumstances.

Recently Minister of State Selwyn Lloyd made a statement at Westminster which clarifies the United Kingdom attitude and touches upon the present situation in China. Excerpts follow.

These are excerpts from the minister's speech. And by the way, I should like to say that when it comes to a question of foreign affairs and I am in doubt I, as one of those who believe in building unity within the commonwealth, as does this party, would rather seek advice from the parliamentarians of Great Britain who have had such long experience in foreign affairs and have such great balance, than refer to Mr. Dulles day after day, after what he has done recently. Quotations from the minister's speech are as follows:

The point of principle is made perfectly clear, that Her Majesty's government believes that the Central People's government should represent China in the United Nations.

The issue, therefore, is one of timing.

It is a matter for discussion, not necessarily for public discussion, but we have again and again indicated that as soon as the armistice occurred this was a matter which would have to be considered between us and our allies.

I would say categorically that I regard the signing of the armistice as having advanced this matter.

While the Tories of this house are trying to push it backwards. To continue:

It has certainly brought us one stage further forward.

I will state all the points which seem to affect the matter . . . First of all, there is the question of the observation of the armistice agreement itself. It is an exceedingly complicated agreement. Speaking frankly there is ample opportunity for friction between the parties to it; we sincerely hope that it will be honoured on both sides in good faith, but there is a great deal of opportunity for friction, and we have to see how the situation develops.

Then under the terms of the armistice agreement a political conference has to be set up, and until we see what progress is made at the political conference, with the very thorny problem of Korea, we cannot know whether the armistice is going to be permanent. We have to see how the political conference shapes.

I do not say for a moment that we have to wait two, three or four years, but we have to see how the discussions take place, and whether there is really on both sides the degree of good faith which will make a success of the armistice. That will be shown in the course of the political discussions.