

Supply—External Affairs

17, 1964, I would have been happy and the opposition would have been happy and we would have known exactly where the minister stood. The minister has referred to conferences. He must have known where he stood. A man of his experience just did not wander into a conference. The conference must have been arranged. A date must have been set for the conference to carry on these discussions. He had to be briefed and he must have been briefed at the time he answered the question on November 17, 1964, at approximately three o'clock in the afternoon. He is not going to lead us to believe for one moment that after three o'clock on November 17 he briefed himself for a full discussion of the matter on November 18 and was able to change what he said on November 17 to what he has told us today, and that all that happened on November 18.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): You are being hard on me.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not believe for one moment that the minister wants me to accept that version and I tell the minister right now I will not accept it, and I know he never really intended me to because his manner of answering questions sometimes leaves us wondering what he really means. In fact, as he himself has said, when he reads his own answers he is not able to understand them.

Having referred to the editorial, I would say there are certain things that probably should be done. Maybe these are the things the minister discussed. Maybe these are the things that the minister should have said in his statement today were being considered in reference to China. But let me finish this quotation:

It is possible, of course, and devoutly to be hoped, that the achievement of even a crude atomic weapon will bring to communist China—as it has already brought to the United States and the Soviet union—a sobering sense of responsibility.

I pause there. I was very interested in the view of the hon. member for Greenwood that it is rather shocking that we should have waited until they got such a weapon before considering negotiating with them. I agree with him in that regard. It seems to me that we have been a little naïve and certainly immature. That country has now moved into the upper class, the aristocratic class, so far as knowledge of nuclear weapons and the ability to use them is concerned.

It is paradoxical but true that communist China, without atomic weapons, could take greater risks of major war than either the United States or the Soviets—knowing that both these powers were

[Mr. Woolliams.]

restrained by this very sense of nuclear responsibility. China now loses this curious immunity, for her sense of dwindling time will make both the United States and the Soviets more inclined to risk a showdown with China now.

What is the editor saying? I think it can be summed up in this way. We have to change our attitude with reference to Chiang Kai-shek's government. We cannot believe they are still the government of China when none of them has visited the mainland for 15 years. We cannot believe this is the government that we must deal with at the present time. If you have 700 million people living as one nation and with internal and external sovereignty, surely we must give them proper avenues of trade and diplomatic recognition. That is the second point.

Let us not fool ourselves. We have recognized China. Whether they have had a communist government or whatever government they have had, we have recognized China for a long time as a great and powerful nation, but we must recognize them as taking their place alongside the other large nations of the world so they can be brought into the avenues of trade with other nations, and so that they can be brought into these conferences which the minister dealt with this afternoon.

Miss Jewett: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Woolliams: Certainly.

Miss Jewett: I was wondering whether that was his view in the year 1960, because I remember reading a contribution he made by way of interjection in a debate of that year, I believe, which suggested he was much opposed to recognition of communist China.

Mr. Woolliams: I will answer that question when I am through my remarks. I have been reading *Hansard* lately and I find that at times when I speak I get carried down the road by people asking me questions. I get off the subject and the chairman has to bring me to order. Therefore I should like to complete my remarks as I prepared them in my office, rather than speaking off the cuff and be taken down the avenue. I say this nicely to the hon. lady because I respect her.

Miss Jewett: Why don't you answer?

Mr. Woolliams: I will at the end of my remarks, and if I do not you remind me.

Miss Jewett: Yes or no.