

Supply—National Defence

to the infrastructure has been reduced about \$1 million. Does he refer to the infrastructure alone in this regard?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Yes, in this coming fiscal year.

Mr. Pearson: Would the minister tell the committee what is involved in the other part of this item, the NATO military budgets? What are the other military budgets involved in this item?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The additional payment to the military budget is \$580,000.

Mr. Pearson: I may be wrong, but the figures I have here at page 22 of the supplementary estimates show that our contribution to infrastructure and NATO military budgets totals \$540,000. The minister has now stated that the total contribution to the NATO military budgets is over \$500,000. There must be some mistake there.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, here are the figures in detail: the expenditures to February 21, 1961 on account of military budgets amount to \$13,656,000, leaving an unspent balance of \$844,000. With current requests of \$1,384,000, there is a further requirement of \$540,000. The \$740,000 is made up by two additions required. The first is direct procurement, \$200,000; the second is the NATO budget, \$540,000, totalling \$740,000.

The figure that I gave earlier of \$1,384,000 is made up of three items. The first, contribution to SHAPE for forward scatter system—\$380,000; the second, additional payment to the military budget—\$580,000; the third is the first quarterly instalment of the adjustment in the contribution to infrastructure—\$424,000, making the total of \$1,384,000.

Mr. Pearson: I wonder whether the minister could tell us what form this procurement for mutual aid takes which amounts to \$200,000? I understand this is a supplementary figure. Could he give us the total figure for procurement for mutual aid for NATO this year and indicate what is involved in that procurement. How much of it, if any, is the transfer of military equipment, and how much is for the purchase of new equipment for the NATO forces?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): So far as Canada's share is concerned, the main budget contained a figure of \$300,000 for direct procurement, and to that it is now proposed to add \$200,000 making a total requirement in respect of direct procurement of \$500,000.

Mr. Pearson: Does that mean that our mutual aid contribution to NATO this year will be half a million dollars for direct procurement?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Yes.

Mr. Pearson: Could the minister give any indication of what is covered by this item for direct procurement? What are the items of equipment involved?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Perhaps I can provide that answer later.

Mr. Pearson: I can understand the difficulties involved in getting the details, and perhaps the minister will procure this information for us later. Could the minister now compare this amount of half a million dollars for mutual aid direct procurement with what it was five years ago?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I will be glad to secure that information and communicate it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Benidickson: Could we leave this item open?

Mr. Argue: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words regarding this item on behalf of the C.C.F. new party group in the committee, and as the national leader of the C.C.F. movement.

NATO has had a long and memorable history and we believe, has in the past been an important force in the stabilization of world conditions. We do think that world conditions are changing and that in these changing world conditions we should re-assess our position in NATO. Europe is stabilized, and the nations of Europe have made a very excellent economic recovery. It has been the policy of the C.C.F. party, and the policy of the Canadian government to this date—but government policy now seems to be shifting as far as Canada is concerned—to prohibit atomic weapons on Canadian soil.

The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation has gone further in this regard. We have a definite policy not only of opposing the spread of atomic weapons to Canadian soil, and to other nations but being placed in the hands of Canadian troops anywhere in the world. Therefore we oppose, and will continue to oppose in the future, any move to provide atomic weapons in general to NATO forces. We are fully aware that certain NATO powers have atomic weapons and that atomic weapons are under the control of the United States commander in Europe. This is a further reason why we think our role in NATO should come under review at this time.

If one makes the assumption, which I do not think is an accurate one, that NATO has only conventional weapons, that NATO is merely a force which has the use of conventional weapons, then it also can be questioned on this ground as to what military contribution our small conventional force