

been one of recognition by Tibet of Chinese suzerainty. China in its turn has recognized the right of the Tibetans to govern themselves under that suzerainty. The Chinese communists claim all they are doing is trying to exercise or to secure formal recognition of a right that they already have. The situation has been clouded by the fact that Tibet is not a very strong country militarily or economically, and is not able to defend itself, and its government is, shall I say, rather unusual. It is ruled by the Dalai Lama and priests, whose rule have been challenged by another Lama, Panchen Lama, who, I think, has been living in China in recent years. This situation may be considered as justifying some anxiety in India, but I would not like, on the basis of the information I have received, to suggest that it is as alarming as the situation in some other parts of the world.

Mr. STICK: The passes from Tibet into India go up to an elevation of close to 15,000 feet. From the standpoint of an army invasion there would be more fear of danger through the Burma road. There would be a danger of ideological influence there, but from a military standpoint it would be impossible to do anything.

Mr. GOODE: Well, what about considering it from the standpoint of landing fields, Mr. Minister? Have you any idea of what can be done about having landing fields there?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: The operation of a landing field in Tibet would be very hazardous, and I speak again without much knowledge on the subject. I do not think Tibet could be considered as a very promising place for a landing field in the hands of a hostile air force. I really think, as Mr. Stick has said, that there would be more danger from the Burma road area and that part of Asia bordering India in the north, Assam especially.

Mr. MACNAUGHTON: I understand there was a treaty between the Tibetans and the Chinese. Has that treaty been scrapped?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I do not know whether it has been scrapped. I do not know what arrangements have been reached between these two governments.

Mr. GOODE: You do not view the situation as too serious at the moment?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I would prefer to say there are more alarming situations in other parts of the world.

Mr. HIGGINS: What is Canada's attitude with regard to the participation of communist China in the Japanese peace treaty?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: As I think I said at the first meeting, or some place, we do not feel it would be realistic to invite the government in Peiping to participate in the signing of a Japanese peace treaty while we are fighting against the soldiers of that government in Korea. But if the Korean conflict could be brought to an end and an honourable arrangement made, then we would consider the question of Chinese communist participation in the peace treaty as at least an open one.

Mr. HIGGINS: India has joined with the United Kingdom at the present time in this request; is that not correct?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: The United Kingdom has not I believe committed itself to that extent about Chinese participation in the peace treaty. The United Kingdom policy in that regard is, I think, that they would prefer to postpone any decision until a more propitious moment.

Mr. HIGGINS: It has been so reported in the press quite recently.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: I saw those reports too and I think they were a little exaggerated. The United Kingdom certainly had expressed in no uncertain terms its disinclination to agree to the Chiang Kai-shek government being a signatory to a Japanese peace treaty. There are one or two other matters