

Mr. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one or two questions referring to the Geneva Conference. If I understood Mr. Pearson correctly I think he said the standing of our country and that of Red China at the Geneva Conference would be a similar standing?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Formally we are both there as invited governments.

Mr. CANNON: By that you mean we are both there as invited governments, but I think there are considerable differences which we should point out for the record, one being they are attending at the invitation of Russia, as I understand it?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: That is correct. I think I mentioned that at the beginning of my answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: And we were invited by the United States?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Yes, we are invited by the United States acting for the three foreign ministers—the United States, the United Kingdom and France.

Mr. CANNON: Also our representatives will be representing a government which is certainly recognized by all the other governments while the Red Chinese government will be in the position of not being recognized by some of the other governments at the conference including our own government.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Yes, there is in that sense a very great difference in the position of the two delegations. All I was talking about was their position around the table for the purpose of this particular negotiation.

Mr. CANNON: I just did not want there to be any misunderstanding about that.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I am glad to clear that up.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stick?

Mr. STICK: I just want to state two or three things. Mr. Nesbitt's question did refer to a slip of the tongue by the Prime Minister. Some of us do not admit there was a slip of the tongue. That is the first thing I wanted to say. The second was Mr. Knowles' implications. He asked a question about Canada's position in Indo-China. The implication, as I understood it—perhaps I was wrong—was that our hands would be tied and we would never intervene. I do not think we should tie our hands down to legal definitions. None of us know what is going to happen in this world and if we are going to tie our hands before events take place I think it would be very bad policy. I want to make that statement.

Mr. COLDWELL: If our hands are tied when we are members of the United Nations we would have to come to a decision.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: As I understand it our hands are not tied as members of the United Nations. We make up our mind and when that decision has been made we have certain obligations.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Pearson, I understood you to say that you did not consider that there had been interventions by the Red Chinese troops in Indo-China, although there had been in north Korea; just how do you make the distinction. Apparently, according to your own statement, the Red Chinese have anti-aircraft troops in Indo-China taking part in this attack on the fortress there. Is your distinction there in the matter of members or just how do you base your statement?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I tried to make the distinction—probably I did not do it very clearly in answer to Mr. Fleming's question. There undoubtedly has been Chinese communist intervention in Indo-China possibly from the beginning of that trouble, but that intervention had not taken the form as I understand it of sending Chinese divisions into Indo-China to direct the war