

Supply—External Affairs

have now smoked out the minister. The minister did not give us that kind of a clearcut answer on November 17, and that is not long ago.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I did not do so because the next day we had very important consultations, which are now continuing, with certain countries.

Mr. Woolliams: I must have been looking in a crystal ball in order to realize that the minister was going to hold a very important conference the day after November 17, but in any event on that day he had not changed his attitude as he expressed it on May 22, 1964.

With the greatest respect for the minister, who is one of the most senior and respected members of this house, I say that while we enjoy the comedy of his answers at times, I do wish in the future that he would give more clearcut answers to our questions. I think many members of this chamber and members of the press gallery are beginning to realize that the minister's answers are wrapped in such allegory that we do not know what he means. He speaks in a different language, and it is very difficult for us, with some limitation, to understand his answers.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would the hon. member permit me to remind him of the observation of a great British foreign minister who said that, when answering difficult questions on foreign policy, it is desirable to make sure that the opposition is well informed to the point where there will be no danger as a result.

Mr. Woolliams: I appreciate that interjection because we now know exactly what is the policy of the minister when he is answering questions in the House of Commons. It does give us some comfort to know that he follows a deliberately planned move in answering our questions.

In relation to the point developed by the hon. member for Greenwood this afternoon, and also developed by the hon. member for Medicine Hat, I should like to quote a portion of a recent article which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post*, now called the *Post*, which puts the situation into proper perspective and in better language than I could use. It relates to the China policy of the United States. This article confirms the belief that Canada's policy in respect of communist China is tied to the United States China policy. I do not know whether the minister criticized us in this regard when we were in power, but this article certainly does put the situation

20220—650½

in its proper perspective. Several weeks ago I made a statement similar to that contained in this article, although I did not make it in words as well chosen as those used here. The editor of this article states:

It would be matter enough for concern if 700 million people were being systematically taught to hate America—that and no more. Now, however, the paranoiac leaders of communist China have an atomic bomb, crude though it may be. It may take them five years, or even 10, to develop a workable weapons system to deliver the bomb. But we can take little solace from this fact. The Chinese bomb may not have altered the world's balance of terror for the moment; nevertheless, nothing in world affairs will ever again be quite the same.

It is for that reason I asked the questions, to which I have referred, on November 17, 1964. The minister in answering left the impression that world affairs had not altered since he made his speech on May 22. Whether or not he meant to leave that impression, that is the impression that was left.

The editor of this article then continues as follows:

The fateful clock which appears on the cover of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*—the hands showing five minutes to midnight—is now ticking inexorably closer to possible world disaster.

This period of grace, whether five or 10 years, must not be wasted. The U.S. can no longer postpone the scrapping of that patchwork crazy quilt—full of internal contradictions—which is misnamed a "China policy." We must replace it with a coherent policy worked out by the coolest and ablest brains at our command. We can no longer afford to drift, for time is running out. Unless communist China can be brought within the framework of a dependable system of international guarantees—of arms control, nuclear test bans, inspection, and so on—the world may face a new kind of aggressive Hitlerism, its madness reinforced a million times by nuclear power.

In other words, we have no conversation with them, no intercourse with them at all in reference to these matters. They go on in their own way. We have divided the world into two separate parts. So I think it is time to take a new look at this situation. I trust that the minister with his skill will in his negotiations and discussions, whether with NATO or the United States, ably bring this question before these conferences, particularly before the United States, and try to get these views across.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned the United States. I assure him that is being done. The consultations we are now conducting are with a number of countries, including the United States.

Mr. Woolliams: Again I thank the minister, but if he had given that answer on November