

External Affairs

the second part of it, I do not know but I rather think he did acquiesce in what I wanted. I know that I am only a bit of a two-by-four and that my pressure is not very much.

An hon. Member: A splinter.

Mr. Pearson: Oh, no; the hon. member's pressure is very high.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Hansell: Let us remember this, however. If there is enough pressure coming from a lot of little people, it makes a lot of weight just the same. We are delighted that the Prime Minister had a pleasant trip and has returned; and from the way the debate has now gone, I am quite certain that Red China is not going to be recognized, as far as Canada is concerned, in the United Nations.

An hon. Member: He did not say that.

Mr. Hansell: I do not know what he said if he did not say that.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to your attention a few remarks that have been made by another distinguished gentleman who has travelled around the world on a similar mission to that on which the Prime Minister travelled. I refer to Senator Knowland, who is the leader of the United States senate. I want to give to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the house, one or two reflections by Senator Knowland given in an interview with the editors of *U.S. News and World Report*, a magazine that is indisputably one of the most authentic ones published in the United States today. This quotation is from a series of questions and answers in an article entitled "Nehru Doesn't Speak for Asia". The article is highly enlightening. I am going to read only a few extracts from it. Senator Knowland was asked this question:

Q. Do they criticize us—

Meaning, of course, the United States.

—for not wanting to admit Red China?

That is to the United Nations. This is Senator Knowland's answer:

A. Yes, I think it's been pretty clear from both the public statements and the private manoeuvrings of India's representatives in the United Nations that they think our policy is wrong, and they have a belief apparently that, by placating the Chinese communists, by appeasing them in this regard, they may then not press for further conquest in Asia. I think this is a mistaken policy because I think that the more weakness that is shown in the face of the communists, either Soviet or Chinese, the greater the demands will become upon ourselves and the rest of the free world.

Then there is this question:

Do you think you made any impression upon Nehru with your views?

[Mr. Hansell.]

For the sake of brevity I am going to abridge the answer, but it does not destroy its context. The answer is:

. . . I do think one great mistake that we of the free world would make in regard to India would be to consider that Nehru is the spokesman for all of Asia. I do not believe that this is a correct analysis of the existing situation in the Far East. Certainly Nehru does not speak for the Republic of Korea. He does not speak for Japan. He does not speak for free China on Formosa. He doesn't speak for Thailand, Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia and he certainly doesn't speak for Pakistan. All of those countries I visited . . . I don't believe that Nehru speaks for the Philippines either . . . Most of the leaders in Asia, those whose nations are outside the iron curtain and who are determined to remain outside the iron curtain, feel that the Nehru policy would ultimately be fatal to free institutions in Asia and would ultimately lead to all of Asia's going behind the iron curtain . . . I don't believe that it's realistic for Nehru to think that, if all the rest of the world went behind the iron curtain, the ruthless men in the Kremlin would respect his desire to be an isolated island of freedom in an otherwise totalitarian world.

In answer to another question he said:

But he apparently, for some reason, believes that this neutralist policy that he follows may ultimately cause the Chinese communists, and presumably the Soviet union, to postpone, if not completely eliminate, thoughts of further aggression. There are very few people in Asia who have had firsthand contact with the communists who believe that this is anything but a naive outlook when you're dealing with the Kremlin or with Peiping.

There, Mr. Speaker, you have something from a man of some considerable repute who travelled the world to talk with the leaders of some of the nations of the world as to the part that we of the West should play with respect to our attitude towards China and the Far East. There are many who are attempting to say that the Mao Tse-tung government will play its own role without any dictatorship from the Soviet. Here is a question he was asked on that point:

What do they think in the Far East about Red China's leader, Mao Tse-tung, becoming another Tito?

This is the answer:

No, they don't think that that is likely. The general feeling out there is that Mao Tse-tung is a willing and enthusiastic ally of the men of the Kremlin. He may be a junior partner, but they feel that his policies and those of communist China are going to parallel, in the foreseeable future at least, the policies of the Soviet union.

With respect to collective security on which the Secretary of States for External Affairs touched the other day, I should like to read what Senator Knowland's reply was because to my mind it is extremely revealing. I would not read these questions and answers if it were not for the status and position of Senator Knowland who, as we all know, is