

External Affairs

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.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada. These are the words of the minister charged with the first responsibility for external affairs. These are the words of the minister who speaks for the government and must speak for the government with regard to external affairs. Therefore, even though there be some ambiguity and even though there be some variety in the explanations of the approach, we have this definite statement as reported in the press. Of course I recognize that I am simply repeating a Canadian Press dispatch, and I would point out that these words in the dispatch are a summary of what he said:

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.

These words have a reminiscent sound. Who will forget that tragic figure, umbrella and all, getting off the plane which had returned from Munich? Who will forget that tragic and earnest figure, that sincere man, so hopeful that he had done something for peace, so completely dedicated to the task and yet so misled in what he had done? Who will forget the picture of Chamberlain getting off the plane on returning from Munich? Who will forget his words—"peace in our time"? Who will forget his assurance that Hitler had told him that he had no further desire for territorial aggression? Who will forget how short a time after that it was that the world was plunged into a bloody and dreadful war, not entirely without some relationship to the fact that the German government thought that there was going to be no stopping of the step by step appeasement of their further demands for still more territory?

No, surely so soon after the last war we are not going to forget that if there was one thing about which everyone was agreed in 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945 and in the years that followed it was that appeasement did not bring peace but was one sure way to invite a tyrant to start a war. That was what everybody said. We all said it and I think we all believed it. I believe it today and I think there are many others who do. I think that by every sign of encouragement offered either to the Kremlin or to their associates, from which they might be led to believe that further territorial aggression will be possible without any active measures being taken, we are indeed actually increasing the prospects of war.

[Mr. Drew.]

I use the word "war" and not "aggression". It was cruel, terrible and bloody war in Korea, and it was the government of Mao Tse-tung which was responsible for that war. It was the troops of Mao who were fighting our young men only a few months ago. When we talk of recognition of the government of communist China, let us remember that we are talking of recognizing a government whose hands are still red with the blood of young Canadians and young men from other lands who went to Korea to defend a principle as well as a territorial area within that tragic peninsula.

Surely we do not need to be in any doubt about the fact that China will give assurances that it will not start any other aggression. Yesterday we had placed on the record the statements of Lenin and the advice given by the communist teachers that no deception, no dishonesty, no misrepresentation should be avoided if it will serve the purpose of communist activities. That was an instruction given to those weak-minded people who were inclined to follow the course of honour. These instructions were given to communists who had made the mistake of acting as decent men and women. They were told they must not be misled by any restraint of decency of that kind, that they must lie, that they must deceive, that they must misrepresent as part of the great world struggle of communism.

Certainly the government of communist China will give assurances that there will be no further aggression. One of the reasons I am speaking in this debate, on a motion that we all support, is to raise my voice, which I am certain is not a voice speaking alone, against any possibility of Canada saying at Geneva that there will be recognition only upon the basis of some assurance by communist China which has been declared an aggressor by the United Nations. That is the purpose of these statements. That is the hope with which we present our arguments, that they may have some impact on the thoughts of those who have the responsibility for representing us on that occasion. I most certainly am not in any way going beyond the bounds of the words used by the Secretary of State for External Affairs when I say that the words attributed to him in the press reports to which I have referred leave a clear and unmistakable impression that as long as the communist government of China gives assurances that there will be no further aggression then Canada may take a more realistic and less emotional outlook.

Mr. Pearson: That is a completely wrong interpretation.