

North Atlantic Treaty

that free nations will join to defend freedom is in itself the likeliest way to prevent the possibility of war at any time.

I do hope this may be only one step in a progressive incorporation within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of those nations which share common ideals of freedom. It may well be that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will be the only reality unless the United Nations ceases to conduct its meetings in terms of unreality. I continue to hope that the United Nations may fulfil the dreams of those who signed the charter at San Francisco in 1945. I do not believe, however, that anybody is placing the brutal facts before our eyes if they can feel confident that meetings which are used so largely for purposes of spreading communist propaganda and for throwing challenges to the western world in the terms that are used by Vishinsky and his associates can hope to fulfil the great purpose for which the organization was created.

Nothing I have said suggests that we should cease to hope, but I do think the time has come when it is necessary for all the signatories to the charter of the United Nations to remember that there is a provision therein for the exclusion of any nation which does not observe the undertakings of the charter. While that time may not yet have arrived, most certainly members of the United Nations should not let events proceed to a point where the United Nations loses the sanction of integrity and of clear purpose simply because of its unwillingness to face the reality of the Russian course.

May I pass from that to say that I would hope, no matter how brief it may be, we may have some comments from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott), because he too had some part in the discussions related to this subject and, as has already been pointed out, the financial arrangements are part and parcel of our support of our partners in this great enterprise. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) is of course unable to make a direct report as he is now outside of the country.

Before I sit down I wish to refer briefly to one aspect of the problem which can never at any time be separated from the consideration of this subject. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization must depend for the success of its efforts to preserve peace upon the combined military power of the nations which are members of that organization. I do not think it would be in keeping with our responsibility to end this session without reference to the disturbing situation which

was disclosed by the few meetings of the committee on defence expenditures. In the *Financial Post* of December 22 there is a chart which shows in a very clear way the difference between the commitments for defence requirements and the amount that has actually been spent from April, 1950 to the end of November, 1951.

I would commend to the consideration of every hon. member the graphic illustration of these figures which appears on the front page of the second section of the *Financial Post* of December 22. It will be seen that the amounts spent in relation to the commitments during that period are in most cases proportionately very small. Having said that, I wish to make it quite clear that I recognize that some considerable part of the amount represented by commitments will take some time to complete. Nevertheless, having regard to the fact that the chart covers a period from April of 1950 to November of 1951, and realizing that the expenditures represent for all practical purposes the amount completed, because payments are made upon delivery or very shortly afterwards, it would be wise to see what the situation is with respect to some of these things that are of such very great importance in the defence of Canada. In the case of aircraft the estimated value of the commitments over that extended period is \$788,600,000, and the amount spent is \$157 million. It should be recognized that the amount spent does not represent aircraft in service in a great many cases because much of that expenditure is for aircraft which have not yet been commissioned for active service.

I am not going to go through the whole chart because it is there to be seen and to be quickly understood, but I would point to the figures on small arms. Commitments for small arms, rifles and machine guns of different types, amount to \$25,200,000 yet the amount spent is only \$1,200,000. That indicates a very dangerous delay in those weapons which are the basic weapons of defence for our land forces. After all, it is frequently said that the infantry is still the queen of battle, and that in the end it is the infantry upon which we must rely. No matter how effective our air or other forces may be, it is the infantry which completes the task, and these are the basic and essential weapons of the infantry. We did not get very much detailed information in the committee on defence expenditures because we met so late in the session and only for a few meetings, because of the decision of the majority of the committee that we would not meet more often. Nevertheless, there is information which I think every hon. member of this