

Supply—External Affairs

tions would be apparent. I have that speech before me, Mr. Chairman, and I read it carefully again today. In the first place, I should like to suggest to the minister that this speech is now somewhat outdated. In fact, I think I could go so far as to say it is badly outdated because there have been some very profound changes in the international political situation since May 22.

We have, for example, the change of leadership in Russia. If you look at the speech made by the minister on May 22 you will find that he referred more than once to the relationship that was developing between Russia and China and expressed the opinion that this might lead to some development that might be desirable in so far as the western world was concerned. I do not want to be unfair to him. He did not suggest that the differences between these two great nations were necessarily good for the possibility of peace in the world, but it seems to me that much of what he said on the question of the admission of red China to the United Nations was predicated on developments coming out of this relationship.

Now we have a new leadership team in Russia, but I do not suppose its attitude has crystallized to the point where we can draw conclusions on whether or not the present relations between China and Russia will continue. Another point is that there has been a change of government in Britain. That may not significantly change any of these things, but there have also been important developments inside China itself, in particular the explosion of a nuclear device. We cannot completely discount that matter when thinking about the recognition of China in the councils of the world.

During the period prior to the United States election we did not press the minister too hard during question period because we realized it would be awkward for him to make positive statements at that time on what Canada intended to do to give effect to these matters. But now that election is over, and the fact remains that we have these sentiments being expressed by the two people most qualified to speak on behalf of Canada with respect to external affairs and international relations. Whether these were trial balloons or not, we have now reached the stage when we ought to have further explanation on what the government intends to do.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would my hon. friend permit me to ask a question? He referred to the statement I made on May 22, and I believe a careful analysis of that state-

[Mr. Olson.]

ment will reveal it has current application. I would be very interested to know what he thinks about the suggestion made in that speech on protecting the interests of Formosa and the steps suggested towards that end.

Mr. Olson: It might be well if I quoted from that speech. As recorded at page 3479 of *Hansard* for May 22, the minister said:

Realizing the dangers inherent in Chinese isolation, Canada has, like a number of other western nations, encouraged increased contacts in the commercial and cultural fields with China; and I think this policy has been wise and has met with success.

Further on he said:

Canada has opposed resolutions calling for the expulsion of nationalist Chinese representatives and their replacement by representatives from Peking.

He also said:

Canadian representatives at the United Nations have made clear the Canadian desire for an equitable solution which would deal adequately with the Formosa problem and at the same time bring mainland China into the main stream of international affairs.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): But it goes on to talk about taking steps to protect that position.

Mr. Olson: I believe the minister wants me to quote this paragraph:

Recent developments have revived interest in what could be described as a one China, one Formosa solution. To achieve such a solution would require above all the co-operation of the parties immediately concerned; but a practical and equitable solution along these lines has not so far proved acceptable either to Peking or to Taipei.

This still does not answer the question of whether the government is now prepared to take positive action, either by initiating or supporting action initiated by another member country, designed to seat red China in the United Nations. From the speech which the minister made on May 22 it is perfectly clear Canada has expressed a desire for closer contact with communist China. I am not at all arguing that point, but I am saying there must have been some follow up action anticipated by the government because of the statements made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister during the latter part of September and in October.

A number of times I asked the minister whether any members of the United Nations had indicated they wanted the admission of red China included in the agenda for the meeting of the general assembly. So far the minister has not answered.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes, there is a proposed resolution by Cambodia.