

## NATO

at large as a peace keeping force if we were not a member of NATO. This is particularly true of the developing nations, many of whom are in direct conflict with old colonial powers in NATO, and Portugal is a good example, or fear involvement with the United States or the Soviet Union. If any of us were members of a developing nation and we were asked in all seriousness, would we prefer to deal with a Canada which shared its military intelligence with Portugal, Greece and the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States? Of course, the answer is no, we would not like to be in that position, but would like rather Canada to be independent.

Canada, as a non-member of NATO, would be free at the United Nations to criticize equally the two dominant powers in the world. When we rightly criticized the barbarism of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia it would have had more meaning to the rest of the world if we had also previously joined the thousands of United States citizens who condemned their country's invasions of the Dominican Republic and Viet Nam. Such freedom to criticize, of course, is not nearly so likely to come from fellow members of NATO.

Finally, on this point of withdrawal from NATO, this does not mean we would be unwilling to aid in the defence of our old allies if one or all should be attacked. A tactical mobile force, as suggested by many members of this house from all parties, could be made available to the United Nations and would be available to halt or check aggression anywhere in the world, whether in western Europe, southeast Asia or some other spot. Canada should be proud to make such a contribution.

The second foreign policy objective that Canada should follow has to do with assistance to the developing nations of the world. As has been said so many times, two thirds of the world's population lives in poverty. They are poor in health, in education and in housing. One of our main foreign policy objectives should be to do what we can to change this situation. I was pleased to note the Prime Minister's intention to take this objective seriously. However, answers to questions on the order paper by the hon. member for York South revealed very clearly that one of the great things that Canada emphasizes, our great assistance to developing nations, is a myth. The answers reveal very clearly that Canada's record is poor in this regard as compared with what other less prosperous industrial nations are doing.

By withdrawing completely from NATO and simultaneously changing our military requirements, it is possible to make massive reductions in our military expenditures. One expert, principal Escott Reid of Glendon College, York University, estimates in all seriousness that we could cut our military budget of \$1.8 billion by half. Even if his estimate is exaggerated and we could not reduce it by that amount, it is certain that millions of dollars could be cut. We would then be able to contribute millions of dollars more to the poor countries of this world, to our friends in the Commonwealth, our friends who are members of the United Nations and our more recent friends in the Francophone world.

A third objective is the fostering and protection of democratic societies. Somewhere in the NATO charter there is the commitment to the protection of democratic societies. What a sham this is, Mr. Speaker. Should we not speak the truth? Portugal is a fascist country. Greece is a fascist or at best a quasi-fascist country. According to Andreas Papandreou, a respected senior member of the former democratic government of Greece, the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States was a very important instrument in establishing the new régime and removing the old one. Are we not hypocrites when we condemn the brutality and rape of human values by the Russians in Czechoslovakia but turn our eyes away from the same violence in Portugal and Greece? Once again, let me say that membership in NATO restricts our capacity to speak and act in defence of democracy.

The next objective or goal is maintenance of national sovereignty. Since the birth of nation states, one of the central goals of foreign policy has been to preserve national sovereignty. Militarily this has meant guarding one's borders. If we consider our geographic position and modern weaponry, it becomes appropriate to ask whether military defence is at all relevant to Canada's sovereignty. Who is going to attack us? Are the Russians likely to send troops over the North Pole? Is the United States likely to send troops to cross our southern border? Could we stop either country if it decided to do so?

We should completely abandon any futile attempt to defend our borders. Instead, we should be thinking very seriously about ways in which our geographic position can be used to avoid the most serious danger facing mankind. I refer, of course, to nuclear war. Should we not be devoting intellectual energy to devising schemes for preventing a first