

Supply—External Affairs

And he has certainly had plenty, Mr. Chairman.

To do less is to acknowledge that the U.S. is a sanctuary for ruffians wanted in other countries.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I again bring to the attention of the minister that I have discussed this question with people in the labour movement who are very interested in it. Other questions in Canada directly related to this will have to be decided in the near future. I told these people that I would bring these facts to the attention of the minister. As I say, I congratulate the minister for protesting immediately the decision of Dean Rusk and I urge him to do what he can to get at the truth behind this unusual situation.

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Chairman, I have only a few comments on the estimates of this department but since it is about 30 seconds to six may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask my hon. friend and hon. members generally whether they would be agreeable to sit for a little while into the dinner hour?

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, we should have some understanding about this. What does the minister mean by "sit for a while during the dinner hour"?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Sit until seven o'clock, say, and then come back at eight.

Mr. Knowles: No. We want to hear the minister under favourable circumstances.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is why I want to finish tonight, Mr. Chairman. Can we listen to the hon. gentleman and then adjourn?

Mr. Schreyer: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, it is immaterial to me what we do. However, I understand that these matters have to be arranged by unanimous consent and I do not know whether other hon. members wish me to proceed now.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think they have agreed to listen to you.

Mr. Schreyer: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the mood of the committee correctly I am to proceed at this time.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Schreyer: It is perhaps a little awkward to make my remarks on the estimates of

this department when every minute I am speaking I will be keeping hon. members from their dinner. Therefore I will try to make my remarks as brief as possible. I wish to commence by saying that within the next 18 months I presume that the government of Canada will be giving consideration to NATO matters and to NATO policy generally, particularly since this alliance terminates next year its twentieth year of existence and the treaty is due for renewal.

• (6:00 p.m.)

I am one of those who feel that the NATO alliance has served a useful purpose up to now and certainly did serve a useful purpose during its first few years of existence. At that time the threat was clear and present. It was real. Everyone knew from where it came. The capability of the countries of western Europe to meet that threat was very limited and demanded the kind of action that was taken in 1948-49 with the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It should be understood, however, that even then, in the light of conditions as they existed at that time, certain intelligent, articulate and capable spokesmen of the western allies—I refer in particular to George F. Kennon of the United States state department—felt that the establishment of the alliance was unnecessary and that it would prevent the normalization of relations in western Europe. As I say, I feel the alliance could easily be justified from the first day of its existence almost to the present time, but its continuation does become disturbing when we realize that in Europe more than anywhere else in the world conditions have changed considerably since the early fifties. But despite the changed political situation the member states of the alliance appear to be clinging to the old myths and neglecting the new realities which exist.

I am not advocating the withdrawal of Canada from the alliance as part of its foreign policy, nor am I suggesting that our membership should not be renewed. I am suggesting it is time for a critical reevaluation and review. Perhaps we should renew our participation in the alliance on a different basis, on the basis of having our troops stationed here in Canada. We understand from the minister representing the Department of National Defence that Canada is seeking to develop a special role for its military, one based on a high degree of mobility. If we are serious about this it seems to me it would