

P.M: Well, we are not a member of any military alliance with India and, therefore, we would not have any automatic role. If the United Nations were seized of the conflict and the Security Council decided on some actions, and if peace-keeping operations were indicated, I am sure that somebody would think of Canada as volunteers. We have been in every other peace-keeping operation barring one, I believe, since the United Nations has been set up. But this is so hypothetical that I think the simplest answer is that I hope it doesn't happen and if it does, don't count on us, brother. I should say that it is our policy when there is a war going on to suspend trade of a strategic nature with all countries involved.

Q. Sir, in view of your developing relations with China, could we ask you to evaluate Chinese threat to the free countries in Asia?

P.M: Well, I have been trying to do that by my discussions with Asian leaders both on this trip and on my previous trip to the Pacific rim countries last May. I don't think I can contribute anything very substantial to the field of existing knowledge on this. I can't easily see why a country like China with the teeming population that it has and with very great problems of development in its own country, would of itself be inclined, anyhow at this stage of its history, to spend too much of its energies, strength and people on territorial pursuits outside of its own frontiers. That is about all I can say. I can't too easily see China creating a navy to come and land on the shores of India or of Pakistan or of some East African country.

Q. Sir, in the Asian countries, we think that the Chinese want to subvert this area through infiltration and other things. They are already doing that on the northern borders.

P.M: Well, there is a question of a border dispute of course between your two countries, but I am inclined to think that the Chinese have not much to gain by trying to subvert order in the various countries of Asia by relying on the overseas Chinese because all they result in doing is creating communal hostility between the native populations of those various countries and the Chinese populations, and this is a disservice to the Chinese cause and therefore, it seems to me, it is counter-productive. Now, it is obvious that that phenomenon known as Maoism is a cause

of subversion not only in other parts of Asia but indeed of Europe and America, and I think it is quite obvious that the leader of the Chinese people, Mao Tse Tung, is a believer in permanent revolutions and I believe that as a matter of ideology, he is trying to export that revolution. But, this is very different from military aggression.

Q. Regarding the question of South Africa, Mr. Prime Minister, your views on arms supply to South Africa, this intended arms supply by Britain you have explained very clearly and you are opposed to (I assume that is based on this racial question) the policies of the South African government. Now I understand your government still promotes trade with South Africa. Don't you see that there is some contradiction in your position?

P.M: Yes, there is a slight contradiction, but it is part of the Canadian approach to trade in all parts of the world. We have never taken the position that we would only trade with those countries that agreed with us, in ideological or in political terms. We have traded with the Soviet Union at a time when many Western nations felt that that was the ultimate crime. We have traded with China, long before we recognized the People's Republic of China. We have traded with Cuba, which subscribes to an ideology which is completely foreign to ours. We have traded with dictatorships in various parts of the world. We view trade as not only in the interests of our population but we view it also as a link between countries which is not to be broken without dire consequences. One of the reasons why we have early believed in trade with the other countries that I mentioned, even at a time when it wasn't a popular thing to do, at least on our side of the Atlantic, is that trade is a form of communication and we felt it was useful to keep these links open. Now, our position in South Africa is the same. We don't agree with the apartheid policy there; we have supported the decisions taken in the United Nations to condemn apartheid; we have applied the sanctions that were decided in the Security Council against Rhodesia, but we have not gone beyond that. We have done what I think practically every other country in the world—I believe India is an exception, but probably a solitary one—we have traded with South Africa and indeed with other countries with whom we were in disagreement. I might add what you well know, that many Black Afri-