

*External Affairs*

the press reports of interviews given by the Prime Minister on this particular question.

The first is a dispatch contained in the *Montreal Gazette* of March 7 from Seoul, the capital of Korea. The heading of the article reads in this way, "Bound to happen sooner or later." Then the dispatch goes on:

Prime Minister St. Laurent flew into Korea today from Manila after telling reporters there Canada must "sooner or later" recognize communist China.

There are two further significant paragraphs:

Before leaving for Manila on the last lap of his global tour, Prime Minister St. Laurent was asked about relations with communist China.

"We have got to be realistic," he said. "Sooner or later we would be bound to recognize the government that the people want."

That was quite a startling statement, but the Prime Minister repeated it when he was interviewed at Seoul. I have here a dispatch of March 8, the following day, which is entitled, "St. Laurent backs China recognition, world must be realistic on reds, says Prime Minister."

The dispatch reads:

Canada's Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent declared today he believed all nations of the free world in time will have to be "realistic"—

And that word appears in quotation marks.—and recognize the government of communist China. Prime Minister St. Laurent, in Korea on a world tour, said, "I do feel that some day we are going to have to be realistic. We are going to have to admit the government of China is the government the people want."

And when he had left Korea and gone to Japan he was interviewed again. As a result we had a report in Canadian newspapers with the heading "St. Laurent Repeats 'Let's be Realistic'; 'Reds have Effective Control of China'." The article was from Tokyo and said:

Canada's world-travelling Prime Minister spoke out again today on the controversial question of Red China, telling reporters at a press conference that, "it is only the common sense, realistic approach" that allied countries eventually will deal with communist China as the government "in effective control of the China mainland."

Now, you will have noticed that in each of those interviews the Prime Minister used the word "realistic"; he repeated that we have to be realistic about this question. Unfortunately however that is exactly what his own statements were not. I submit they were completely and utterly unrealistic, and for these reasons:

In the first place, recognition of Red China has been in recent months and is today the top communist objective. It was what one might have expected, as a result of the Prime Minister's interviews, that only a day or two later every member in the House of Commons

[Mr. Green.]

received a letter from the Canadian peace congress which, as we know, is a communist organization in our own country. This letter was dated March 16, 1954, and was addressed "To members of parliament, on the occasion of the Prime Minister's return from his world tour". In it we find this significant sentence:

At the outset we wish to state our full support for the Prime Minister's statement that the government of China is going to have to be recognized.

That was the immediate reaction to his statements by the communists in Canada.

He was also unrealistic because at that time there was propaganda being put out by communists all over the world about the Geneva conference which is to be held next month. The propaganda was that Red China must be recognized, and the fact that she was going to sit in on this conference showed that she was to be recognized. Yet, while this very question was in the forefront of international affairs, our Prime Minister, while in the Orient, made the statement that freedom-loving nations had to be realistic, and that sooner or later they would have to recognize Red China.

Now, on this question of what is to happen at Geneva: Just about two weeks before the Prime Minister was interviewed Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States, had taken great care to point out to his own countrymen and to the world at large that the fact that Red China was to be at this conference in Geneva did not mean that she was to be recognized. Incidentally Mr. Dulles said yesterday in the United States that the Geneva conference is not to be a five-power conference at all. Red China is not to be there as one of the five great powers.

I have here a report of his address on February 24. This report reads in part as follows:

In a country-wide radio-television address, Dulles dismissed as "without basis" any fear that agreement to the April 26 meeting implies diplomatic recognition of Red China. The Chinese communists, at Russia's urging, will be seated at the Geneva conference, which will discuss the future of Korea and seek to attain peace in Indo-China. Dulles assailed critics who have contended the seating of Red China at Geneva means the opening wedge toward United States diplomatic recognition of the Peiping regime. Such criticism, Dulles said, tends to give the communists "a success which they could not win at Berlin."

He was referring, of course, to the previous conference. It continues:

"The communist regime will not come to Geneva to be honoured by us but rather to account before the bar of world opinion," he said. The secretary said this was made clear in the Big Four agreement at Berlin last Thursday which proposed the Asiatic peace conference at Geneva in Switzerland.