

*External Affairs*

accept without reservation. However, that does not dispose of the concern that is felt.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) on an earlier occasion called our attention to the fact that the Prime Minister had used words similar to those which had been used on this occasion. It is true that those words had a distinctly different meaning in one particular aspect. The Secretary of State for External Affairs pointed out to us that the Prime Minister last year had used words that did not speak of the government which the people wanted but which spoke of recognition in other terms. I am referring to the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs on March 8 last, as reported at page 2748 of *Hansard*. That was at the time a question had been asked with regard to these words which had been reported and which spoke of the government that the people wanted. The Secretary of State for External Affairs said this:

That is a press quotation from the Prime Minister's statement in respect of the recognition of the communist government of China. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said almost exactly the same thing in Ottawa on June 12, 1953, when he spoke on the same subject. He said then:

"We have got to be realistic on such problems and be prepared to deal with those who represent the nation over which they exercise authority."

Mr. Speaker, that statement has been given to us as one interpreting the position of the Prime Minister. But since the Prime Minister has left the matter—and I use the word in no way offensively—in the same situation as that in which Mr. Dulles' statement apparently originally was, namely in a state of some ambiguity, let us see what the Secretary of State for External Affairs has been saying on this subject. He was noticeably silent on this subject yesterday, but he has not been silent on it recently; he has made a number of statements with regard to this subject. I therefore think it would be appropriate to examine what he has said, bearing in mind that this discussion arose in relation to Canada's position at the conference that is to take place in Geneva on April 26. Amongst other statements—and there were other speeches dealing with this subject—the Secretary of State made one dealing with it in Washington on March 15, one at Chicago on March 19 and one in Windsor on March 22. In Washington he said this, and I quote his words according to the press dispatch:

There is no question of recognition while the Korean war is unsettled, . . .

In Chicago he said that we would be prepared to consider recognition—and I use the words in quotation marks that were in the report—"if there are no new aggressions".

In Windsor—and again I quote the words exactly as they appear in the report—he said:

If Red China adopts a conciliatory attitude at the Geneva conference in April, Canada might take a new look at the situation.

Then he added these words:

"And remember, . . . that conference is to be about Korea."

Mr. Speaker, these statements are certainly not open to the same ambiguity as were those of the Prime Minister yesterday. I of course refer back to the words of the Prime Minister which were placed on record as recently as March 8 by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. They do not appear to be ambiguous, because the Prime Minister had said:

We have got to be realistic on such problems and be prepared to deal with those who represent the nation over which they exercise authority.

In those words there is no question of consent; the words used were "the nation over which they exercise authority".

I should just like to place on record certain words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in addition to those I have quoted, from the press reports dealing with those speeches I have mentioned. In the press report of the speech made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in Washington on March 15, he said this:

. . . one of these days there will have to be another look at the whole question, with a decision to be based on our national advantage and international advantage. That doesn't mean any probability of recognition at this time.

Then in Chicago on March 19, according to the Canadian Press dispatch of March 20, the Secretary of State for External Affairs had this to say:

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 take another look at that problem—a more realistic, less emotional look.

Then on March 22, just four days ago, in Windsor, according to another Canadian Press dispatch the Secretary of State for External Affairs had this to say:

"Realistic doesn't mean that we will recognize Red China tomorrow, or refuse to recognize her a year from tomorrow"—

That is the end of the exact quotation.

—he said, commenting on a suggestion that recognition of the Peiping regime would be Canada's only "realistic" course of action. If Red China adopts a conciliatory attitude at the Geneva conference in April, Canada might take a new look at the situation. "And remember", Mr. Pearson added, "that conference is to be about Korea".

If the Reds are willing to give assurances that their aggression in Korea is a thing of the past, and