

Supply—External Affairs

that those who did not like a multilateral force should suggest some other clearcut alternative. Would the minister make it absolutely clear again, if he speaks about this matter, that Canada is not supporting the multilateral force? I urge him to do so because the subject needs clarification, and because I think Canada's full weight should go in a different direction.

The multilateral force is a device intended no doubt by the government of the United States to deal with the problem involved in a possible extension to West Germany of an independent strategic nuclear force. After all, if Britain and France have good reasons for wanting an independent nuclear force, so may Germany.

The multilateral force, as I understand it, is a device proposed to prevent the nuclear rearmament of Germany. In my view, as far as I have been able to understand, the multilateral force has no military value, and its political value is more than dubious. In fact my own view is that the participation of West Germany in the multilateral force is likely only to increase the urgency and desire for independent control. The purposes of allied control of the strategy of NATO are not served adequately by this multilateral force.

Will the minister inform us whether he intends to put the full force of the policy of the Canadian government behind the effort which I understand is to be developed by the new prime minister and government of Great Britain, to see whether it is possible to work out within NATO, not only a more rational strategy which would not primarily depend on tactical nuclear weapons, but in addition a form of consultation which would make it clear that the whole alliance is deeply concerned with a strategy which is to determine the fate of Europe? It would be interesting to hear the minister clarify where Canada is going to stand on these particular points in the councils of NATO.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I made it very clear that Canada has no intention at the present time of joining the multilateral nuclear force.

Mr. Brewin: Would the minister go one step further, and I do not ask him to do so now, and tell us the reason behind that attitude? We need some public enlightenment on matters of this sort, because they are being discussed and are very complex, and relate to the whole field of NATO strategy. Would the minister tell us what he thinks is the alternative? He has said that it is not good enough for us just to say we do not like

[Mr. Brewin.]

the multilateral force. May I ask the minister to inform us of at least the lines along which he is thinking about the problems of NATO, and how he believes the problems involved in the controlling of nuclear forces can be solved if the multilateral force is to be rejected by the alliance?

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one other matter, the matter of peace keeping forces, and I want to take the opportunity we now have of discussing international affairs to say once again that in our view one of the greatest contributions Canada could make, probably the greatest, is in the field of contributions made to peace keeping forces through the United Nations. I would be less than fair if I did not congratulate the minister and the government upon the part Canada has played through them in the past, particularly in Cyprus, under considerable difficulties. I want to say further that in that particular field of peace keeping I hope this tremendously worth-while development in international affairs will not be dissipated by the financial difficulties discussed at the United Nations. It seems to me the minister himself said on one occasion that, while no one can be certain of these things, if it had not been for the intervention of peace keeping forces in Cyprus we would very likely have had a war between two allies in NATO, which might well have escalated into a major conflict. If this is so, and I believe the minister is right in saying it is so, then it seems to me important that the public in Canada and the public throughout the world should recognize that the very minute contributions, financially speaking, that we and other nations have made to peace keeping forces have in fact been a major element in preserving the peace of the world and that any further contribution we may be called upon to make in this field is not only the right thing to do but the essential, the wise, the intelligent thing to do on the basis of self-interest as well as idealism and consideration for the future.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I have been a little disappointed and surprised—I would ask the minister to deal with this point at some time or other—to see that the move, as I see it, that the Soviet union made toward recognition of the importance of peace keeping forces under the United Nations in the statement made on July 10, 1964, has not been more fully explored. The minister is very familiar with that statement. In that statement the Soviet government maintained its insistence that peace keeping forces under the United Nations should be under the control