

External Affairs

of fact in China. That again is something that I should not have put in exactly that language. We should keep an open mind as to when if ever conditions may be such that it will be in the interest of peace and stability in the world to recognize diplomatically whatever government happens to be in control of the forces of China.

That I think is the preferable position; but in the meantime whenever there does appear to be an opportunity to remove some of the tension from the international situation by discussions, by meetings and by discussions like that which are called for April 26 in Geneva, I think it is only realistic to feel that the government which is in fact in control of affairs in China has to be there if there is going to be anything accomplished that will produce beneficial results.

Mr. Coldwell: Will the Prime Minister permit a question? There was one other matter which caused some concern when he was overseas and that was the reference to the armaments and the supplying of military aid by the United States to Pakistan. There seems to be a conflict in the reports and the inference there was that the Prime Minister gave his approval to United States military aid to Pakistan.

Mr. St. Laurent: I refused to express any opinion. I said that as far as we were concerned no such question could arise, because we had pledged to the NATO organization everything we could do in the form of aid and forces to maintain peace in the world, and that no government that expected to remain the government of Canada should ask for more than had been pledged by us to the NATO organization. I did also say that I felt quite satisfied in my own mind that the aid provided, or that might be provided, by the United States to Pakistan was not designed to be used against India, and that I felt quite sure that had there been any impression that it was going to be used against India there would not be one per cent of the United States people who would have supported it.

Perhaps there is one other point. I do not know that it was raised in our press here—I have not seen it—but there was a question put to me about conflicting reports on something I said in Tokyo as to the neutrality of India in the event of a war there. What I did say was that I did not know whether, in the event of a war, India would remain neutral or not, but that if they did not remain neutral I would expect that they would be on our side rather than on the side of our enemies.

Now, there was another report, and it was an erroneous one, possibly made in good faith. My hon. friends here know the atmosphere of

press conferences. It was reported that I said I did not think India could remain neutral in the event of war. No matter what I may have been thinking, I did not say that. I said that I did not know whether India would remain neutral or not in the event of war, but if India found that she could not remain neutral I would expect that she would be on our side and not on the side of our enemies.

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): In reference to the speaking appliance that is in front of me, I do hope that we in this parliament will not decide on broadcasting the sessions of parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I do not think we ought to have the debate drift toward that particular subject, and I would ask the hon. member to please co-operate in helping the engineers of the Tannoy company to see what the experiment is worth.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I do not think there would be very much debate on that subject, having regard to the reaction of the house.

I want to refer first to the debate that took place on external affairs on January 29 and which terminated at the close of the sitting that day. Because the debate terminated that day only six hon. members were able to participate in it. I do not intend to repeat the questions that were asked by me on that occasion, some of which were answered today by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson), and some of which were not. The questions that were asked then were; first, what was the nature of the discussions, if any, that took place before the announcement by Mr. Dulles of the retaliatory policy? I think Canadians generally will agree with the attitude taken by the minister that we in Canada will not accept any policy automatically that another nation may enunciate unless we have been consulted. I believe that the minister's declaration that Canada is entitled to be consulted represents the attitude of the Canadian people. Canadians have a right to be consulted. The United States is in the position of a captain of a ship. As with a ship junior officers have the right to be consulted, and their views considered before decisions which may affect the crew as well as the captain are made. I think that with the rather lengthy summary by the minister of the effect of Mr. Dulles' speech on massive retaliation and in the explanation within the last few days, given by Mr. Dulles, many of the fears that were in the minds of Canadians have been removed.

Secondly, there was the question of the recognition of China, to which the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) made extended