

External Affairs

the other day which indicated that the United States, although not recognizing the communist government of China itself, would not oppose the recognition of that government in so far as membership in a United Nations agency is concerned if the majority of the members of that agency voted in favour of the communist government being members of it.

Mr. Graydon: They would not veto it.

Mr. Pearson: They would not veto that position. However, as I understand it, that does not represent any change in United States policy over the last two or three months, because I think that was made clear some time ago. The recent statement of the secretary of state does not, I think, mean that there has been any particular change in that situation.

The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) spoke at some length on the economic obligations of the pact; this matter was referred to by other speakers, and it is indeed an important aspect of the whole affair. He wondered whether we were taking into account, in our plans for national development of our own resources, the obligations which we may have undertaken by article 2. I think I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the obligations that we have undertaken under article 2 are not obligations which would require any special plans for national development, at least until we get more detailed information as to what we will be expected to do as our specific part of this balanced defence. I cannot give any exact information on the point at this time for reasons which I have indicated. When these matters are worked out in detail and the governments concerned come to an agreement as to how they are going to make their special contribution, it may be that we can most usefully contribute, in addition to what we are contributing in other respects at this time, by provision of strategic materials and all that kind of thing; and that may require some special plans on the part of the government. But I think it would be premature to speculate on that point. Certainly until we get more information as to what we should do or might do, speculation would be premature.

Then, departing for a moment from the London meeting, the hon. member for Peel brought to my attention an article in *Look* magazine on Canadian-United States relations; and I think he asked me whether I felt that that article would cause me to modify in any way the statement which I made in the speech in London. I have seen the article in question. It is entitled "Why

[Mr. Pearson.]

the United States and Canada should be One Country", by Mr. George E. Shea, Jr. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that my attention was distracted when I tried to read it, because on the page opposite the article were some extremely interesting pictures of a movie actress called Miss Lana Turner. For my part I felt that those pictures dealt more impressively, more authoritatively and more truthfully with the subject with which they were concerned than did Mr. Shea's article.

Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood): The hon. member for Peel did not see those pictures.

Mr. Pearson: However, I have the manuscript of my London speech, and I should be glad to read from it so that it may be on the record. The hon. member for Peel mentioned it this afternoon but he quoted from an editorial in the *Times*. I should like to put on the record what I actually did say in London on this matter, and it still represents my viewpoint. I said in London:

Do not, however, over here—

I meant in England.

—write us off as a former colony going swiftly through a transitional stage of dominion status prior to becoming a United States satellite. Believe me, that is not true, nor is this the destiny that lies ahead of a country whose future is as bright as any in the world. That future is based on national freedom, on self-reliance and on self-respect. It includes the closest possible co-operation with, but not absorption by the United States.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) this afternoon also referred to the important question of atomic energy, a matter which was of course not on the agenda of our council meetings but which must be in the mind of every person these days. He wondered whether we had made any progress in the last few months in seeking for a solution to this vitally important problem. No progress has been made. Though the secretary general of the United Nations has discussed this matter with the governments he has been visiting in the last few weeks, the difficulty that blocked progress two or three months ago still remains, namely the refusal of the government of the U.S.S.R. to allow its representatives to attend the meetings of the committee of five who are searching for a solution to this problem. The refusal, of course, is based on the fact that the Chinese communist delegate has not been admitted to those meetings.

We here have not been happy about this situation and we have been casting about to see if there is any way in which we could get out of this difficulty. We have been in touch with other governments on that point. So far, however, we have not been successful. It is tragic that that kind of political development