

*The Address—Mr. Pearson*

special interest in the progress toward freedom in that area which the French government are seriously sponsoring, and for which I think they deserve our gratitude. We must be concerned, however, over the long continued disturbances in Viet Nam. I hope that these will soon be ended. I feel that the recent ratification by France of the agreements which it had entered into with the three Indo-Chinese states is a commendable step forward in the attempt to restore peaceful and stable conditions in Indo-China. I believe there is good reason to expect that these agreements, which set up three autonomous states within the French union, will provide a means by which the national aspirations of the people of Indo-China will be met.

More particularly we wish the government of Bao Dai every success in its efforts to bring unity and freedom to Viet Nam in the face of a serious communist menace, which has become a greater menace because of the political support it is being given by the U.S.S.R. and communist China. We recognize that only under the autonomous government of Bao Dai has Viet Nam at this time the opportunity to acquire freedom and unity and stability.

Then we came to the question of China, which also caused much discussion. In my review on November 16 last in this house I made some observations concerning the nature of the communist revolution in China, and also about some of the great underlying mutual interests which would always serve as a bond between the Canadian and Chinese people, regardless of such changes in government as might take place in China. I spoke also about the factors that had to be taken into account in weighing the question of recognition.

Since then four commonwealth governments—the United Kingdom, India, Pakistan and Ceylon—and a number of the western European governments, have accorded *de jure* recognition to the Peiping regime. At Colombo there was a frank and useful exchange of views between those commonwealth governments which had not recognized the Peiping government—Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Canada—and those which had. There was also discussion of future relations with China. From our point of view it was very helpful to have the points of view of the Asian members of the commonwealth on these questions.

The fact that some governments have recognized the new regime in Peiping and others have not has created an awkward situation in the United Nations and other international bodies; one which may become even more awkward in the not too distant future.

The Soviet delegations, in an exhibition of childish arrogance, have now withdrawn from United Nations bodies until such time as the representatives of the Peiping government are admitted in place of the present nationalist representatives. This is a form of pressure which, of course, we can only condemn, and care must be exercised to see that the precedents which are created in dealing with this change of government in China do not give rise to further and greater difficulties in the future when analogous problems may have to be faced elsewhere in the United Nations.

This whole question of recognition of the Peiping government is now before the government, which is giving it active consideration in the light, among other things, of the report that I have made to the government, on our recent discussions in the Far East. At the moment I can say no more than that on this question.

We also had a pretty thorough discussion of the question of a Japanese peace treaty. Hon. members will recall that during my review of external affairs on November 16 last I said that, in spite of the difficulties to be overcome in convening a Japanese peace conference, I thought there might be even greater dangers in its indefinite postponement, and I hoped that another effort might be made to push forward with that conference. Since that time I have had an opportunity to discuss this problem at the Colombo conference, and also during my short but very interesting visit to Japan, where I talked about it and many other subjects with that most distinguished American, General Douglas MacArthur. As a result of those talks I am now more impressed than ever with the need for seizing every opportunity that might lead to a satisfactory early settlement with Japan. The occupation of Japan has continued now for more than four years. During that period the physical demilitarization of Japan has been thoroughly accomplished. Indeed, the act of stripping away from Japan her overseas possessions was itself a drastic curbing of Japan's war-making capacity. The punitive and preventive side of the occupation has, I think, been virtually completed. The Japanese have made many changes in their domestic legislation, in compliance with allied directives of the eleven-power Far Eastern commission which meets in Washington. They have subscribed to all orders of the occupation regime, and have taken the steps which were demanded of them.

I do not mean to conclude from this that the Japanese by now, in the course of four years, have completely changed their habits of thought, their approach to politics, and