

*External Affairs*

China so far as diplomatic recognition was concerned, but he also had views with regard to that country being seated in the United Nations. I should like to quote from this article:

"Nor should red China be seated at the United Nations", Mr. Robertson said, "because it is not a peace-loving nation and frequently has repudiated its international obligations."

We say, Mr. Speaker, that if we should not recognize China because it is not a peace-loving nation nor should it be in the United Nations because it is not a peace-loving nation, then the question is why should the United States sit with those in the United Nations whom they are consistently stating and challenging as not being peace-loving nations? It does not seem possible for them to have it both ways. They ask us to take it one way for their own particular purposes.

Mr. Robertson is also quoted as saying that the Peiping Red China regime was imposed by force. May we point out that the United States and Canada sit in the United Nations with a number of other nations that achieved their government by force. We think it is only reasonable to ask, in considering this motion, why it is right to sit with nations who obtained their position by force, and yet at the same time say we will not sit with Red China under similar circumstances. This same gentleman goes on to say that United States policy is to strengthen and keep alive the non-communist Chinese government. Are we to refrain from diplomatic recognition of a government responsible for 650 million or 700 million people on the Chinese mainland which has been in power now for about 10 years because it is United States policy to strengthen and keep alive the non-communist Chinese government?

Just where may that government be? There can be only one place to which that refers and that is Formosa and the government of Chiang Kai-shek. Certainly, it seems ridiculous to think Chiang Kai-shek is the Chinese government or has any hope this side of heaven or hades of ever becoming the head of the Chinese government. Reasonable and practical persons everywhere admit that it is impossibility. I think, instead of listening or even thinking of following the arguments set forth for non-recognition, we might be wiser in Canada to pay attention to some of the statements of our own people. I could take a considerable time in setting forth those statements, but I shall not do so because of the shortness of the time allotted for this debate. However, there are two statements that I believe should be mentioned.

[Mr. Winch.]

I do not think anyone is going to call James Muir, the president of the Royal Bank of Canada, a communist. I do not think anyone is going to challenge a man of his position on the ground he does not know what he is talking about after he makes a personal visit and a personal examination. He is quoted as saying in Montreal on February 11:

The Chinese communists want to trade with Canada, says James Muir, president of the Royal Bank of Canada. "But I think our government is asleep."

Mr. Muir, who toured China last summer, said last night Canada could trade with China without officially recognizing the government there, though "we'll have to recognize them sooner or later anyway".

I think it is better soon than later. There is one man from British Columbia upon whom I know we can safely rely. He is one of the greatest educationists in our Dominion of Canada. I am referring to Dr. N. A. M. MacKenzie of Vancouver, who is not only president of the University of British Columbia but is president of the Canadian national commission for UNESCO. Speaking in Montreal as late as March 12 he said that greater understanding must be promoted between the west and the Orient to prevent war. I quote from this press clipping:

He told a press conference the starving, overpopulated Orient looks with hungry eyes to Canada and other western countries where food and land are plentiful.

"They (Oriental countries) will not put up with this situation permanently," he said. "And the alternative to greater understanding is eventual violence."

Words such as these, coming from the president of one of our great universities and the president of the Canadian national commission for UNESCO, are words to which we in this group believe we should give very careful consideration. We believe that it is in the best interests of Canada that we should not blindly follow in the footsteps nor obey the dictates of another country with respect to this matter. I am sorry to say it, but it is my own belief that if the United States were to recognize China tomorrow, this government would automatically do so. It is quite obvious that they are blindly following United States policy, a policy which our people—I mean men such as Mr. Muir and Dr. MacKenzie—say is a wrong one and could lead to violence and war.

In the past we have heard some arguments put forward by the present government as to why Canada has not yet made any move toward the recognition of the Peiping government. We remember a statement made last year by the Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) that the Chinese government would have to expiate its crimes. This leads me