

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I would not like to comment on Mr. Dulles' statement.

Mr. GARLAND: I refer to his radio broadcast to the nation.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I recall it. It is true that the Chinese communist government is not there as one of the inviting and sponsoring powers. Whether you think China is there as a big power depends on your interpretation of the words "big power". The Chinese communist government has authority over a lot of people at the present time and its participation is certainly essential and probably will be powerful at this conference.

Mr. Dulles is trying to make it quite clear that the legal position of the Chinese communists at this conference is not that which the Chinese government might claim for itself. That is about all I can say about it. Now, what was the other part of your question?

Mr. GARLAND: I was wondering what other matters would be discussed?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Oh yes. The agenda of this conference covers only two things, Korea and Indo-China. I have no knowledge of any other subject that will come up for discussion at this conference. They might take advantage of the persons and delegations present to talk about a lot of things. I do not know what will be discussed there, but, I think the United States government has made it quite clear on its part that it is there to discuss two subjects and two subjects only.

Mr. GARLAND: What other matters could conceivably come up?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I would hate to have to say that nothing else could come up. They might talk over anything that they wanted to talk about. There will be large delegations there from the larger powers and they will have experts of every kind. I understand the Chinese communist delegation is bringing about 150 to 200 in delegation.

Mr. GREEN: The Chinese are participating but not as a sovereign power?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: Mr. Low asked if I could give him the real reason that the French government had not submitted the Indo-Chinese question to the United Nations. I would not like to suggest whether there was any difference between the real and the ostensible reason. Perhaps the best way I can answer the question is to try to get a statement of the French government with respect to its own position in the matter. We will have that at the next meeting.

Mr. BALCER: In his statement to the House yesterday Mr. Dulles was reported as saying that what the Chinese were doing now in Indo-China was awfully close to what he called an action which might produce retaliation from the United States, or an action which might not be confined to Indo-China. What would be your opinion of an action by Chinese armies in Indo-China which would meet with Mr. Dulles interpretation of a necessity for retaliation? Actually right now the Chinese are shooting down French planes and so on. What is the difference between that and actual participation by a Chinese army?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: There is certainly a difference of degree if not of kind between Chinese intervention as alleged yesterday by Mr. Dulles, and that type of intervention which would mean the movement across the border of a mass of Chinese forces under Chinese command and formally taking part in the war. I think there is a distinction in degree as to what kind of intervention by the Chinese would justify the kind of retaliation that Mr. Dulles was hinting at yesterday. But I could not express any opinion on that. This is a kind of peripheral conflict which, important though it may be, should require consultation before any action of that kind is taken between those who are involved in the action.

Could I come back in that regard to the importance of the United Nations in this matter? So far as our obligation in Indo-China is concerned it arises because of our membership in the United Nations and the pledges we have