

*External Affairs*

Then, our Prime Minister was unrealistic because at the very time he was giving these interviews, only a few hundred miles away in Indo-China there was the worst fighting that has taken place in that war, which has now been going on for seven or eight years. French troops were and still are attempting to defend the fortress of Dien Bien Phu. A terrific battle was being fought.

It turns out too in the speech made yesterday by Mr. Dulles that, at the same time, Red China has been guilty of at least forty violations of the one agreement the freedom-loving nations of the world have with her, namely the Korean truce agreement. This must have been known when the Prime Minister was interviewed in the Far East. If he did not know of those violations he should have.

So I repeat that his statements to the press earlier this month were absolutely unrealistic. What has happened has one very salutary lesson for Canadians both in the House of Commons and out of it, and that is that in dealing with communists it is unwise to say that we will have to give, eventually, what they are asking for. To them—and, oh how often this has been proved in the last few years—to communists, that is only appeasement and an invitation to demand more.

It would have been far more realistic for the Prime Minister or any other minister to confine policy statements to the situation as it is today. That was what was done by the President of the United States—and I hold him out as an example to our own cabinet ministers. He was interviewed six days ago, and I have before me a press report of his statement. The heading is "Eisenhower Says No Change in U.S. Red Chinese Stand". It is dated at Washington, March 24, and states:

President Eisenhower said today that as long as present conditions continue there will be no change in the United States' attitude toward communist China.

And that, Mr. Speaker, was all our Prime Minister needed to say when he was interviewed in the Far East. The full text of Mr. Dulles' speech of yesterday appears in today's *New York Times*. He took the same attitude when he said:

Those responsible for United States policy must ask and answer—

And the question is put in quotation marks:

"Will it help our country if, by recognition, we give increased prestige and influence to a regime that actively attacks our vital interests?" I can find only the answer "no".

I hope from now on members of the Canadian government will not make loose statements in respect of foreign affairs about what Canada "might" do.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, Red China has no claim whatever to recognition by Canada. She stands branded as an aggressor by the United Nations; she has broken the Korean armistice, we still have our troops in Korea prepared to resist further aggression, and she is carrying on bitter warfare in Indo-China today. Let no one be so simple as to believe that the fighting in Indo-China is not being directed by the Chinese communists, and that the troops there are not being supplied either by the Chinese or Russians with equipment and materials of war.

This position is obviously vastly different from when the Soviet was recognized. She was then not at war with anyone. The condition was completely different. In fact the condition was completely different when the United Kingdom recognized Red China in 1949. There were far more reasons for that step being taken in 1949 than there are for any such step being taken today.

In considering this question of the recognition of Red China, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that general recognition would constitute a tremendous victory for communism right across the world, not only in Asia but everywhere else in the world. I was struck yesterday by the report brought back to the House of Representatives in Washington by a foreign affairs subcommittee which had been visiting the Far East. They had certain recommendations to make to their fellow representatives. One of them was this:

The United States should continue opposing recognition of Red China or admission to the United Nations. The subcommittee said it could not discover any benefit recognition would give the West; but that it would be a smashing victory for communism.

I believe that to be a correct statement.

Then, as Canadians, we must remember the position of Canadians of Chinese origin. We have many thousands of these fellow citizens of ours in British Columbia, most of them living in my home city of Vancouver. During the war years their young men enlisted and fought beside our sons. They played a noble part in bringing about victory. The parents at home subscribed to the Victory loans. I think the quota in Chinatown was always filled just as quickly as in any other part of our city. At the end of the war they were blackmailed by the communists in China; threatening letters were written to the effect that if they did not pay so much their relatives in the homeland would be liquidated. These Canadian Chinese went through that sort of terror for many months, and yet all the way they have stood firmly on the side of freedom, not wavering, have had no truck or trade with communists.