

*External Affairs*

to Canada, and on March 10, 1943, that Mr. Dana Wilgress presented his credentials as Canadian minister at Moscow. It was in 1944 that the status of the two missions was raised to that of embassies.

But, sir, what are the consequences of recognition? Let us not forget how very important and far-reaching these are. Here is the way Oppenheim describes them at pages 132 and 133:

Among the more important consequences which flow from the recognition of a new government or state are these: (1) it thereby acquires the capacity to enter into diplomatic relations with other states and to make treaties with them; (2) within limitations which are far from being clear, former treaties (if any) concluded between the two states, assuming it to be an old state and not a newly-born one, are automatically revived and come into force; (3) it thereby acquires the right, which, at any rate according to English law, it did not previously possess, of suing in the courts of law of the recognizing state; (4) it thereby acquires for itself and its property immunity from the jurisdiction of the courts of law of the state recognizing it and the ancillary rights which are discussed later—an immunity which, according to English law at any rate, it does not enjoy before recognition. (5) It also becomes entitled to demand and receive possession of property situate within the jurisdiction of a recognizing state, which formerly belonged to the preceding government at the time of its suppression. (6) Recognition being retroactive and dating back to the moment at which the newly recognized government established itself in power, its effect is to preclude the courts of law of the recognizing state from questioning the legality or validity of the acts both legislative and executive, past and future, of that government; it therefore validates, so far as concerns those courts of law, certain transfers of property and other transactions which before recognition they would have treated as invalid.

And, sir, in our time, added to these would be, of course, inevitably as the next step, admission to the United Nations. And if this communist regime at Peking is admitted to supersede the nationalist government of China there, it means that they step automatically into a permanent seat on the security council, and acquire the veto. And as the Russians have used the United Nations as a sounding board for propaganda, it just means double the voices of propaganda in that council.

I submit, too, that the Peking regime is not eligible to be admitted to the United Nations. Chapter II, article 4, of the United Nations charter makes this stipulation:

Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

Can it be said that this people's regime at Peking represents a peace-loving state, when they have been denounced as aggressors? No; I submit to you that they are not eligible. And yet, if they were recognized,

[Mr. Fleming.]

this inevitably would be the next step. For, if you recognize this people's government, what answer have you to them when they apply to supplant the nationalist government as the representative of China at the United Nations? It would be a triumph of aggression, a triumph of the aggressor who holds a pistol at the head of the United Nations.

And, sir, whatever may come out of the Geneva conference, let us have the assurance that Geneva will never be permitted to become another Munich.

I leave this subject of recognition of the Peking regime with this one remark: I accept what the Prime Minister said this afternoon; we are not making a judgment for all time. But we look at the existing situation and we are, I hope, making a clear and firm judgment on that situation as it exists today.

Finally, a word about trade. Trade can be an aid to peace. There is no reason why we should not, like Great Britain, trade with Russia on one condition, and that is that no strategic material be allowed to come into the hands of the Russians. We have noted what has been said at Westminster of late about the keen desire of the British government to extend trade with Russia, in the hope that that will help to bring about more peaceful relations. The statement was made by the Hon. Derick Heathcoat-Amory, deputy trade minister, in Great Britain only two days ago that the British market is "wide open to Russian grain, timber, metals and manganese ore." The newspaper article goes on to say:

Speaking in debate on east-west trade, he said it would be "very helpful if larger quantities of grain could be made available."

Well, while I am sure we will have no wish to put any obstacles in the way of trade between Great Britain and Russia, which may make a contribution to peace, I hope we will not be slow or tardy in making a just claim, on behalf of Canadian grain producers, to the British market for our grain.

Finally, whatever may be said about trade in the world today, there must be no weakening in the proscription of trade with this aggressor government of China in the matter of strategic materials, or anything that could be of assistance to an aggressor nation. We must watch vigilantly any attempt to whittle down the category of strategic materials.

These are grave days in which we live. The time may come when we may look back on these days as those in which important decisions were taken which contributed much to better relations, and the building of sounder foundations for peace in the world. But, Mr. Speaker, in all that we do, let us be realists; let us keep our powder dry when dealing with those who, unhappily, respect only force.