

Supply—External Affairs

of the security council, but at the same time they recognized that if such forces were under the control of the security council the Soviet union would be under obligation to support them and, for the first time so far as I know, they recognized that these forces would have to be contributed by the nations that were not permanent members of the security council, in other words the smaller nations. As I understood it, they were ready to recognize the value, for the first time so far as I know, of peace keeping forces financed by the United Nations and composed of units made available by other than the great powers. It seems to me this is a recognition, of the value of peace keeping forces. It is quite inconsistent with the view often taken by the U.S.S.R. in the past which insisted that under article 7 of the charter such forces must be those of the great nations. The new Soviet attitude, has not to my knowledge been adequately explored.

The minister referred to nuclear strategy and got into some sort of debate and questioning with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. In respect of that matter I want to say to the minister that it may well be that he can justify what he said, namely that this government adopted that nuclear strategy in order to fulfil commitments made by an earlier government. But I remind the minister that a review of that was promised, that a suggestion of renegotiation was made—

Mr. Douglas: Promised.

Mr. Brewin: A promise of renegotiation was made, my hon. friend reminds me—and that instead of that we merely have a continuation of this sterile, dangerous reliance upon a strategy based upon tactical nuclear weapons. This is not a defence debate and I do not propose to enlarge upon my reasons for saying that, but I should like some clarity, if that is possible, from the minister with regard to whether within the councils of NATO this government proposes to seek not to add more to the tactical nuclear strategy but to withdraw from central Europe this massive confrontation of tactical nuclear power which I suggest the best opinion, in Europe as well as on the North American continent, recognizes to be a positive danger to peace rather than the reverse.

In the long run we will only solve these problems through detente, through disarmament, but we have to ask ourselves these questions. Are the policies propounded and put forward by this country frank and clear enough and are they fully designed to ease

the dangers to world peace in the present situation? I will be happy if the minister will elaborate on some of the things he has already said, and satisfy the house that in these fields Canada is really doing all it can and not just floating along with the tide.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Chairman, we appreciated the information contained in the remarks made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs a few minutes ago when he spoke about the problems that had developed within the NATO alliance and the efforts that were being made to resolve those problems. So far as this party is concerned, we express the hope that these efforts and deliberations will in fact result in success, at least to the point where they keep NATO in the strong position it has been for the very vital purposes to which other hon. members have referred this afternoon.

While we appreciated the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, we were somewhat disappointed at the lack of information concerning the matter of recognition of red China and also with regard to the financial difficulties that have arisen in the United Nations recently. I think we in the house have a right to know what the attitude of the Canadian government is going to be respecting the matter of recognition of red China by this country, and its admission to the United Nations, particularly because of certain statements that have been made recently by the Prime Minister and by the Secretary of State for External Affairs himself. He has made public pronouncements on more than one occasion over the past few months to the effect that we could no longer tolerate, although that is perhaps too strong a word, the exclusion of the People's Republic of China from the councils of the world. I do not have the press reports or the exact date here but early in October the Prime Minister indicated in a speech that it was his feeling it was desirable at this time that some way should be devised of having direct negotiations with this very large country.

On a number of occasions during the question period members of the house, including myself, have asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs what the Canadian government proposes to do about giving effect to these opinions that have been expressed. Each time he has referred us to his famous speech of May 22 last. He has stated that the opinions he expressed at that time were complete and that if hon. members would read that speech the answers to their ques-