

That is, meetings of the atomic energy group consisting of the permanent members of the Security Council plus Canada.

--has been held up by the Soviet refusal to participate as long as the Chinese delegate represented the nationalist government. However, there is reason to expect that the meetings will again be resumed shortly when this difficulty has been overcome.

That was a personal statement of General McNaughton with respect to the composition and the hearings of the atomic energy group, an agency of the Security Council of the United Nations. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that in those statements General McNaughton was not referring in any way to discussions on this matter by the Canadian government. General McNaughton has not been informed of, nor is he indeed greatly concerned with, such discussions. The meaning of his statement is quite clear. He was talking about a group appointed by the Security Council to discuss atomic energy questions. The composition of that group and the representation of China on that group would be determined by a decision of the Security Council of the United Nations. General McNaughton apparently thought at that time that there might be added to the five members out of the eleven of the Security Council who have recognized China, one or two others; that this would change the balance in the Security Council and might thereby make a change in the composition of the atomic energy group. But General McNaughton could not have been referring to Canada in that connection, because Canada is not now a member of the Security Council and would not be concerned in any such change in it.

In our discussion the other night the leader of the opposition devoted some time to "recognition" in international law. In discussing the question he quoted from a recognized authority in that field, Professor Lauterpacht. It seems to me that there has been a good deal of confusion in people's minds as to what is meant by recognition, and I think this might be a good opportunity to clear the matter up so far as I am able to do so. It is of immediate importance now in connection with this particular problem of China.

In considering this matter we must distinguish between recognition of a new state and recognition of a new government. The two things are quite different. Under recognition of a new government we must distinguish between de facto recognition and de jure recognition, between implied recognition and express recognition. We must distinguish between recognition of a government whose authority has been challenged and is still under challenge, and recognition of a government whose authority is no longer being challenged by any alternative form of government. Then finally we must distinguish between recognition on the one hand and diplomatic representation on the other--this is quite a different matter, although the two things were certainly confused, I thought, the other night.

In connection with China we are dealing at this time only with recognition of a new government, not recognition of a new state. In deciding whether recognition should or should not be given to a new government certain criteria--certain conditions, if you like--have been laid down by authorities on international law, such as Oppenheimer, Brierly, Jessup, Lauterpacht and others. But these conditions, of course, have never been, and were never meant to be, applied rigidly and without exception. I mentioned some of these criteria in my statement last December when I was talking about this Chinese question. I said then that if the