

There was a discussion of budgetary arrangements for NATO generally and there was an estimate made by the experts who worked with us on this committee as to how much these proposals would cost. They will cost a considerable amount. They include such items as exchanges of students and that kind of thing. But I am not in a position to give exact figures in that regard at the present time. They will not cost much in relation I might add, to our total defence programme. ...

That is the survey which I was anxious to make of our results at Lisbon. That is what we tried to do at that meeting. Summing up, I would merely say that our military goals in NATO must remain--and we all agree on this--the minimum necessary for defence; and they must be reached, if possible, in such a way as not to prejudice the economic and social stability of those countries which are not yet strong enough to sustain the high costs that would be entailed by too large a military programme--costs which might have been much lower before the war and much easier for them to undertake then. I am thinking now particularly of the European countries.

We must not sacrifice and we are not sacrificing our social, political and economic objectives to an exaggerated and false emphasis on armaments. I believe that there is nothing exaggerated, false, militaristic or provocative in our plans or our programmes. The burden of carrying out these programmes and these plans has, I think, been quite fairly distributed. But we must also remember that in attacking NATO the Communists have concentrated on two things, and they are the enemies of NATO. They have concentrated on the danger of German rearmament and the unnecessary militarization of the West, with its consequential unnecessary tax burden, which they allege is being forced on the rest of us by United States power policy. By this propaganda they hope to isolate Germany from the West and, far more important, they hope to isolate the rest of us from the United States. I suggest that we in this country, as elsewhere, must be on our guard against these divisive and dangerous tactics and must do our best to defeat them.

This Government feels strongly that we must continue building up steadily and unprovocatively in NATO, and in accordance with realistic programmes, the strength necessary to neutralize and to defeat, if we are forced to fight it, Russian Communist aggression. We think that this policy remains the best deterrent to war, and we are not weakening in our support of it. We also recognize, however, that the menace is more than military. It might also express itself in economic and social strains which will at once be exploited by the Communist conspiracy--a conspiracy with agents in every land and designed to undermine and to destroy our Western Christian civilization which is based on human freedom, co-operation and tolerance and then to replace it by totalitarianism, autocracy, and a brutal police state.

I believe that we made good progress at Lisbon in the organization of collective security. I think the decisions we took there were wise and realistic. I hope that we shall all be able to agree in this Parliament to support these decisions and to move steadily ahead to achieve our objective of a peace which will mean something more than merely the absence of war. A NATO policy based on a programme of adequate but no more than adequate defence, on the desirability