

External Affairs

Russia does not win new states with Russians. She did not win China with Russians. She won China with Chinese working under Russian direction. If we are going to win China back we should win it back with Chinese aided by our own forces. If we decide to stand up to Russia where could we attack? I know there are a number of men in this house with considerable military experience, good strategists, and I would like to know where they would attack? Could anyone suggest a better method of attacking than the one through South Korea and Formosa which I have suggested? An attack which would enable us to use the enemy's men instead of our own? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this matter of future military strategy is one which must weigh heavily in our minds whenever we contemplate this question of the recognition of China.

There is another matter to which I wish to give some attention and that is the matter of Chiang Kai-shek. I do not wish to go into much detail concerning this man, but it is surprising to hear the kind of stories that are circulated about Chiang Kai-shek. There seems to be an idea in the minds of a great many people that Chiang Kai-shek was corrupt. As far as I can find he was not corrupt, but it seems to be supposed that because he was corrupt we were entitled to throw him off the mainland and let the communist government in no matter how corrupt it may be. That seems to be the sort of slant we find in the minds of a great many Canadian people. I talked with one the other day and he said: "I cannot be very enthusiastic about Chiang Kai-shek. He is a sort of rotter." Who told that person Chiang Kai-shek was a rotter? The communists in the United States.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Blackmore: Yes. What do we know about Chiang Kai-shek? I have already stated that Chiang Kai-shek was thrown off the Chinese mainland by a conspiracy in the United States. The public in the United States and Canada had foisted upon them a ruinous program in China. In regard to that matter I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members a very fine speech delivered by Senator Owen Brewster of Maine on June 5, 1951. That speech can be found in the records of the United States. The subject of the speech is "A Guide Book to Ten Years of Secrecy in our Chinese Policy." Why secrecy in dealing with China? That secrecy has spread from the United States to Canada.

Mr. Philpott: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the hon. member's time is up.

[Mr. Blackmore.]

Mr. Blackmore: It would have been rather more gracious on the part of the hon. member to let Mr. Speaker point out that fact.

Mr. Philpott: Others may want to speak.

Mr. Blackmore: I notice that the hon. member always gets up whenever I begin to speak about something which the hon. member does not want to hear. Here is a very fine book called "While You Slept" by John T. Flynn, published in 1951. From that book may I quote these very brief words:

The only difference between Russia's war on China and her war on Korea was that in Korea we aided and armed the South Koreans to fight communism, while in China, incredible as it may seem, we actually told the Chinese government to do what Russia wanted—unite with the communists. When Chiang Kai-shek refused, we disarmed him.

I think that would be rather conclusive. That is from "While You Slept", at page 15.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but I am obliged to advise him that his time has just expired.

Mr. Blackmore: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall have more to say about this matter in the future. I want members of the C.C.F. to remember what I said about meeting them straight on when we get into committee.

Mr. A. M. Fraser (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have followed this debate with great interest. May I say how greatly I have been impressed by the high level which has been maintained throughout. I feel that everyone who has spoken in this debate has been fully conscious of the sombre background against which the debate is being held. I refer to the black cloud which arose in the Pacific on March 1, the time of the experiment with the hydrogen bomb. The lurid flash of that bomb illumined, as it were, the thinking of mankind upon the tremendous and terrifying situation in which we find ourselves. We realize, I believe, that for the first time in his history man now has the power to destroy himself and all his works. The seriousness of this situation has been reflected in the high seriousness and tone of this debate.

We are all conscious of the frightening tragedy that would ensue if the hydrogen bomb were used. I think we feel that at all costs we must avert the tragedy of a third world war. But if that tragedy is to be averted, the first essential, in my humble opinion, is that there must be clear and complete understanding amongst the governments and peoples of the free nations. It is for that reason that I should like to congratulate most heartily the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) on the signal