

*External Affairs*

**Mr. Drew:** I am not incorrectly interpreting the report. I am certainly not incorrectly interpreting the report.

**Mr. Pearson:** It is a completely wrong impression.

**Mr. Drew:** I am certainly not giving a wrong impression of the words. I am giving the words themselves. Let me read the words again if there is any such suggestion. If the minister is not correctly reported then let him say so. He has not said so at any time yet, nor has he suggested it. These are the words attributed to him in quotes from his speech in Chicago:

There is a strong attitude against recognition of that red China regime in the United States. But we in Canada are a little more cautious. We feel that if there are no new aggressions in the near future we should have another look at that problem—a more realistic, less emotional look.

Again I repeat, in view of the interruption, the statement attributed to him in the Canadian Press dispatch from Windsor on March 22:

If the reds are willing to give assurances that their aggression in Korea is a thing of the past, and that they are ready to take an honest line in international affairs, he said, Canada must consider following Great Britain's lead in recognizing the Peiping regime.

If those are not correct reports, then by all means let him correct them. If they are correct reports, Mr. Speaker, they represent a position which I, for one, in this house personally hope with all my heart will not be expressed by Canada at Geneva on April 26. It is with that hope that these statements are being made. Nothing that has been said so far in this debate by the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Prime Minister gives us any reassurance in relation to those words.

What about Indo-China? There is no reference to Indo-China in this statement. Do these statements, by the exclusion of Indo-China, mean that so long as assurances are given in connection with Korea our government is prepared to consider recognition, even if the war in Indo-China continues? I hope there will be no suggestion of that. I hope it will not be forgotten that, distant though the relationship may be, there are young men from France fighting in Indo-China today who have blood relatives in Canada who have been fighting the same communist evil in Korea within these past few months. I hope it will not be forgotten that France, our historic ally throughout the great struggle of the past for the freedom we now seek to preserve, is engaged in a deadly and terrible conflict with armed forces which could not remain in the field for a single

day if they were not supported and maintained by this communist government in Peking.

No, Mr. Speaker, I will welcome the assurance of the Secretary of State for External Affairs that he said something that was not contained in this report. I will welcome assurances from him that when he emphasized the fact, and took pains to emphasize the fact, that the conference was only for Korea and that if there were assurances in regard to Korea recognition might be considered, the government of Canada will not go to Geneva and offer any hope to the Peking government that there can be any thought of recognition while this costly struggle in Indo-China is carried on with its support.

Let us remember also that when we talk about recognition we are not speaking about the fact that we recognize the reality of the existence of a communist government in Peking, as the Prime Minister said yesterday. Let us remember, when we talk of recognition in its diplomatic sense, we are talking about formal recognition of a government whose armed forces have been fighting against ours, which has been declared an aggressor and which is anything but a peace-loving nation by present standards.

There is another thing that has not been mentioned by the government but which was mentioned by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) in his very comprehensive and forceful examination of this subject yesterday. Recognition of the communist government of China means entry into the United Nations. Do not let the Secretary of State for External Affairs or anyone else in this house suggest it can be otherwise.

It cannot be otherwise, for one very simple reason. The United Nations charter was signed by nations. Men appended their signatures only as the individuals charged with the responsibility of speaking for a nation that was represented there. It surely is not without significance that when we look at the charter of the United Nations, signed with such solemnity in San Francisco on June 26, 1945, the first name to appear in the long list of signatories is that of China. It is not the nationalist government of China, not the Peking government, not the republic of China, but just China. Then are appended the names of those who signed under instructions of the Chinese government in those days. There can only be one China, just as there can only be one United States, one Britain, one France, one Italy and one of every other nation whose representatives signed there.