

as was the case in north Korea. Now there is a distinction in degree certainly if not in kind. Until fairly recently we have had no indication of the actual participation of Chinese troops in Indo-China. Now there is a distinction, I believe, between the kind of intervention which took place in north Korea and that which up to the present has taken place in Indo-China, and one indication of that distinction I would think is the fact that the French government had never felt it necessary to refer this matter to the United Nations.

Mr. GREEN: Would you not be more accurate to say there is a difference in the degree of intervention. For example, we read in the press one of the leading Red Chinese generals is taking some part in the direction of the attack on this fortress with Chinese advisers in each of the Viet Minh divisions and that there are transport trucks going by the hundreds from Red China into Indo-China.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: That is what I tried to say. There is a difference in degree, but I come back to the point that neither the French government nor the government of Viet Nam has brought the matter to the United Nations and stigmatized Chinese actions as open and massed intervention and aggression against them. Therefore I think there is a difference between the kind of intervention as well as the degree of intervention in Indo-China.

Mr. GREEN: Are you sticking to your statement that there is no intervention by China in Indo-China?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I never made that statement. I said there has been Chinese intervention in Indo-China of one kind and another for a long time.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is it not a fact you have American technicians and equipment and planes going in on the other side, so in reality you have intervention on the two sides, but France has not brought this to the United Nations, and therefore we have not come to a decision as to what our position is regarding it?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: It is true the United States is assisting the French government and the Viet Nam government in defending themselves against the Viet Minh revolution.

Mr. STICK: At the request of the French and Viet Nam governments?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Yes, and with their very hearty approval.

Mr. COLDWELL: They probably asked for aid on the other side.

Mr. GREEN: Surely there is a very big difference between an attack in the one case and defence on the other. You are not putting Americans and Russians on the same basis?

Mr. COLDWELL: I am not arguing the case, I am just pointing that out for the record.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I have already made that statement.

Mr. FLEMING: Apparently I started something with this subject, which I think I should make clear. I began, Mr. Chairman, by asking Mr. Pearson as to whether this latest information that apparently Mr. Dulles gave yesterday may change the picture, and that is why I asked Mr. Pearson and he was good enough to indicate he would make a search to find out when intervention of the type now being practised by the Chinese, apparently as reported by Mr. Dulles yesterday, first came to the attention of the Canadian government. Perhaps on that point Mr. Pearson could tell us if he has any reason to doubt the accuracy of the factual statement made yesterday by Mr. Dulles that Chinese anti-aircraft groups are actually participating as combatants in this attack on the fortress held by the French troops in Indo-China?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I would not for a minute doubt the accuracy of the statement of Mr. Dulles made before congress. I have no information to warrant doubting it at all, but as I said we will try to get all the information possible.