

Supply—External Affairs

I am sure that is not what the minister had in mind in answer to questions posed by us just before the supper hour.

An article in the *Montreal Gazette* of September 16, under the headline "Canada Holds Discussions on UN Seat for Red China," written by Arthur Blakely, stated:

Mr. Martin said that he was not "implying" that early action would be taken—this in again refusing to give opposition leader Diefenbaker a categorical assurance that such a policy would be put to debate in the commons before being implemented.

The questions were inspired—

Of course this may be where the minister gets some of his inspiration.

—by a speech which Prime Minister Pearson made to the Atlantic treaty association (Monday) in which he said, in part, "If we expose them (the red Chinese) more to the views of the rest of the world, we might some day expect a more realistic policy from them. The present isolation of China encourages recurring crises."

If the minister really feels that, and I am sure he does, then this is the point I want to drive home, that if we cannot reach a solution, through negotiations and working the problem out with the United States, then maybe what was reported on September 25 will be the action that the government will take.

As I said before the supper hour, when the minister sat over here on the opposition side without having the responsibility of his present portfolio, which is one of the most important, the one closest to the Prime Minister, he stated, I believe categorically, that we should recognize China so that we could widen the avenues of trade with her, negotiate with her diplomatically and thus bring her into the community of nations to discuss those problems common to all the nations of the world.

An article in the *Toronto Daily Star* of September 25 said:

Despite frequent Canadian denials, the United States firmly believes Canada will recognize red China after the U.S. elections in November.

This belief is held at the highest levels of the U.S. government.

I would say that if we cannot work this out with the United States then the question remains, what is Canada's policy in this regard? I am not going to repeat the four points I made before supper hour, as I must pass on to something else, but I emphasize that I believe those points deserve serious consideration by the government. Conditions are not now the same as they were in 1961, 1962, and 1963, and the minister has changed his position at great speed. Between Novem-

[Mr. Woolliams.]

ber 18 and November 19 he changed his known position. His reason was that he held a conference on the 19th, and therefore his answer on the 18th would not be the same as it was on the 19th or the 20th.

I now wish to deal with another subject, the organization of American states. It was my privilege to attend the civil rights conference held in Mexico City in 1959-60 and at that time met and talked to the representatives of various Latin American countries. It was about that time that the late President Kennedy, speaking in this House of Commons, pressed for Canada to become a member of O.A.S. At that time the minister sat on this side of the chamber, and he said the Conservative government of the day should see to it that Canada became a member of the O.A.S. in the interests of the security of this part of the hemisphere and so that we might all work together. However since he has assumed the responsibility of the external affairs portfolio no such action has been taken.

We are now a long way from the cry we heard during election time when he said it was a time to excite the daring and test the strong. The Liberals are very daring and strong when in opposition, but they seem to become a little more moderate when they get into positions of responsibility.

Though the criticism the minister offered at that time may have been strictly for political expediency, the fact remains that he made a statement at Banff—I have not got the press clipping with me—in which he categorically said we should be a member of the O.A.S.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I did not say that.

Mr. Woolliams: That is the general feeling.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I said that Canada's ultimate destiny was a closer association with Latin America.

Mr. Woolliams: Ultimate destiny is not a destiny of 60 days, 120 days or 180 days. This ultimate destiny might be in 1984, but by that time the O.A.S. may have taken on a broader scope, or our destiny may lie with the whole world, not just with a geographical group. Had we been members of O.A.S. we might have been prevented from opening up avenues of trade with China and Cuba, and I do not see how we can recognize China and still follow the United States and the objectives of the O.A.S. I would like the