

External Affairs

member in the house. One of my complaints in the last parliament was that when the former prime minister was secretary of state for external affairs he took the leaders of the opposition into his confidence more than he did any of his supporters. I remember he was telling secrets to Mr. Hanson, and to my friend Mr. Graydon, but none of his supporters knew anything about the inner workings of external affairs policy.

Now it is different, and I am glad the leader of the opposition has complained about it because I believe it is a sound policy that he should not have more information than is given to those who support the government. Why should he be given secrets? It would be impossible for the government to give him secrets, because the ministers are bound not to tell what happens in council before policies are enunciated in the house. If a minister were to take the leader of the opposition into his confidence and to tell him what happened behind closed doors in the east block, he would be betraying his oath.

The leader of the opposition has had enough experience as leader of his party and as the premier of his province to know that. Another thing I wish to tell him, and I may hurt his modesty in doing so, is that I cannot conceive why he has quoted with such gusto from Mr. Eden. Mr. Eden is no more than I am; he is a member of parliament. He was more before when he was foreign secretary:

The leader of the opposition occupies a position of trust. His party has appointed him leader, and he now stands as leader of the great Progressive Conservative party. Therefore he is much more in the commonwealth than Mr. Eden could be. Besides that, I give him credit that when he speaks in the house I am sure he is in earnest, and would not have the same motives as Mr. Eden had when he made his statement. Therefore it is not for the leader of the opposition to quote Mr. Eden; it would be for Mr. Eden to quote the leader of the opposition. That is clear; no one could object to that.

We have heard a good deal about the recognition of China and about a pact on the Pacific along the lines of the Atlantic pact. The leader of the opposition makes fine speeches outside the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pouliot: It is better to wait until I have finished before applauding. He makes fine speeches. He spoke the other day to the Dominion United Church men's association in the church hall, and referred to the Atlantic treaty and what it should mean to us. The Atlantic treaty was a good thing and, may I add, was sponsored by the Prime Minister

(Mr. St. Laurent). As there was a failure in what happened at San Francisco, because of veto, and the required unanimity of the United Nations on important matters, it became necessary for those who believe alike to join together and to present a united front for the defence of democracy.

I understand it that way. As the leader of the opposition knows very well, it was the Prime Minister who made that move, which found a response in many countries of the world. Now we have the Atlantic treaty signed by many nations who seek peace.

The leader of the opposition referred to a Pacific pact. Would he sign such a pact if he were secretary of state for external affairs or prime minister of Canada? For instance, would he sign a pact with Japan at the present time? A couple of weeks ago some representatives from Japan came here. They belong to the liberal-minded people of Japan, were well received here, and I believe it was a good thing that they came.

Our minds turn to Australia, a country which is doing well at the present time. New Zealand is in a similar position. A short time ago Mr. Nehru, Prime Minister of India, addressed us in this chamber, and was received with all the honours due him. If there is no pact between Canada and those countries it does not mean that they are not friendly with us—far from it. In addition to India, Pakistan, Australia and New Zealand, there is China. I shall not remind the leader of the opposition of what I have said in the house on other occasions. Perhaps when he was not here he was engaged in other business and did not have time to read my speeches. However, some time before Madame Chiang Kai-shek came to Ottawa I mentioned in the house that all that had been done for China was completely useless because of the mandarins, the men who had exploited the Chinese people for so long.

The leader of the opposition knows that in China thousands if not millions of people die of hunger every year. Naturally those people who were suffering in China were not very enthusiastic when they saw our government and the governments of other countries supplying funds, arms and other materials to Chiang Kai-shek, because they knew that those around Chiang Kai-shek were enriching themselves with that which was to have been given to the poor people. That is a well-known fact. It is not necessary to read all the books that have been published about China. Everyone knows the facts—and those are the facts.

Therefore there was a feeling against the Chiang regime, and the Soongs and all the other exploiters of China. That was the