

government we would want them to have, but that we would have to deal with the government they had as a matter of fact, the government that was in control of the forces that were participating in the happenings that were causing such tension and such anxiety in the international field. That is what I meant. That is what I should have said in words that could not be mistaken or interpreted in any other way because I think that with such a statement there would have been little or no concern and little, if any, controversy about it in this country or anywhere else.

I am not going to read to the house the many editorials that have been published, but I take one that appeared in the Ottawa Journal of March 12, 1954, which, in part at least, I think would be fairly representative of what was and would be the feeling of the public generally in that regard. The editorial is entitled "About Recognizing China". It reads in part as follows:

"A Tokyo dispatch now quotes Prime Minister St. Laurent as saying with respect to recognition of communist China that 'it is only the common sense, realistic approach that allied countries eventually deal with communist China as the government in effective control of the China mainland.'"

This is better, more sensible, than what Mr. St. Laurent was reported to have said earlier at Seoul, namely:

"I do feel that some day we are going to have to be realistic. We are going to have to admit the present government of China as the government the people want."

I feel quite sure, in spite of my respect for the journalists who were there and who were doing their best to report what they heard and what they understood, that I did not put it that way because I never had it in my mind in that form. It was the contrary form I had in my mind, that in spite of our dislike of communist or totalitarian governments we could not expect to have the kind of government we wanted. It would be the kind of government--and I must have said this--that they wanted. I should not have said "they wanted". I should have said the kind of government they had actually in control of the forces we are opposing. The article goes on to say--and I think everyone would agree with this:

"No country can ever know with certainty whether the government possessed by some other country is the government its people want. And the fact is that Canada now recognizes any number of countries without being at all sure that their government is what their people want. There is Russia, and Czechoslovakia, and Poland, and Spain; possibly others.

"What Canada does, and must be compelled to do, and what all other countries must be compelled to do sooner or later, just because it is the only sensible practicable way, is to recognize the government of a country which is in effective control--which exists in fact."

I would not go quite that far because I would now be very chary about using the word "recognition". It has for so many different people so many different connotations. There is what is sometimes called the concept of legal recognition. Others refer to it as diplomatic recognition. I think perhaps it is better to use some other word that cannot have so many