

Supply—External Affairs

Mr. Nesbitt: Don't go down that garden path.

Mr. Woolliams: I want to read now from the editorial the four points the editor makes with regard to policy:

It must decide, once and for all, that Chiang Kai-shek's government cannot continue to claim to be the government of mainland China, which none of his officials has even seen for 15 years. Instead of maintaining this legal myth—rather like the Count of Paris' claim to being the King of France—we should concentrate on protecting the freedom and self-determination of Chiang's stronghold, Formosa. That land must not under any circumstances be handed over to red China.

That is point one. Point two:

It must abandon the folly of trying to keep China's 700 million people perpetually isolated from the normal avenues of trade and diplomatic interchange.

I might pause there. I think the former Conservative government can take some credit for opening up the avenues of trade with China. That policy has been carried on by the present government and it should be extended and expanded.

The more we can engage China in long range international obligations, the less likely it would be to run amok.

Point three:

It should make an imaginative effort to lift the existing disputes between China and the United States onto a higher and different level, which would acknowledge China's right to be regarded, and treated, as the great nation it has always been. While fearing its development of nuclear rockets, we must remember that China invented rockets in the first place—and paper and printing as well, for the Chinese proudly remember that they were highly cultured when the west was barbarian. We might consider such imaginative gestures, for example, as inviting China to join with the other great powers in the exploration of outer space. We must try, in every honourable way, to break through Mao's hatred, to reach the Wong Tsens and the younger leaders of the China yet to be.

Point four:

At the same time we must be prepared for a showdown if the Chinese leaders show increasing signs of preparing for war, and inciting their peoples to readiness for war—if, in short, they clearly move in the direction of neo-Hitlerism. We must not repeat the Anglo-French failure to stop Hitler when there was yet time. We must be prepared, regardless of possible Soviet intervention or United Nations condemnation, to knock out China's nuclear capability by pinpoint-bombing its reactors and arsenals before its power becomes indestructible. Terrible as this alternative is, we must not exclude it from our planning, or fail to warn the Chinese that we do soberly include it. To do otherwise would place America's own survival in jeopardy.

These are the four points and I want to summarize them. First of all, we cannot say that the government of Formosa is today the

government of mainland China because, as the editor has pointed out and as other members have pointed out in this debate, it has not been on the mainland for 15 years. We cannot continue, as I said before, to ignore 700 million people either in the avenues of trade or in the diplomatic field. We must recognize China as a great nation, try to work out international economic and other problems with China and bring her into the community of nations. Above all, we must never let ourselves not be prepared—I see it is six o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Perhaps the hon. member could finish and we might pass this item.

Mr. Woolliams: No. I have a few more remarks to make. I am not going to be long.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): You could do it now.

Mr. Woolliams: No.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, just before the supper hour I had been dealing with the question of Canadian diplomatic recognition of red China. Some questions were posed by the minister and during the supper recess I had a chance to go through my file. I see now that he probably was presenting this matter to us in chronological order.

I am not saying the problem is an easy one. It is one we have to work out with our friends and allies, but I have made myself quite clear on the four points to which I think serious consideration should be given. In fact that is why I objected, and I did it with respect, to the kind of answer I got when I asked the question on orders of the day about the position of the government.

An article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of September 7 by Emerson Chapin of the *New York Times* service, filed from Tokyo, stated:

Paul Martin, Canada's secretary for external affairs, said on Saturday that the Canadian government did not believe in insulating China and was increasing—

—this may be a new word—

—its non-diplomatic relations with Peking "on a modest and reciprocal basis."