

NATO

now not only an economic colony of the United States but are rapidly becoming a military satellite of that country. This is in spite of the promise of the Liberal government last year given by the former prime minister and former secretary of state for external affairs that nothing would be done about renewing the NORAD agreement until this house had an opportunity to debate it. The present Prime Minister did renew NORAD and it has not been debated in the house. There has been no opportunity to debate it.

● (4:30 p.m.)

According to reports we are getting from Washington we are now being tied up with the airborne warning control system, about which we have been told nothing. The statements of Defence Secretary Laird indicate that consultation has been going on about the A.B.M. system, about which we have been told nothing. More and more we are being tied into the American military juggernaut.

The Bomarc missile bases, about which the Prime Minister railed in 1963 and bitterly criticized his predecessor, are still there. If the Prime Minister, instead of the glowing phrases that he used today about peace and security, wants to prove to this house that he is sincere, he will start by carrying out his own proposition that the nuclear Bomarc missiles be removed from Canadian soil.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Canada's major contribution, in addition to its defence of its own territory, lies in two areas of international activity. The first is that we ought to take a much more active role in the work of the United Nations, because with all its structural weaknesses, its emergence as a world arbiter offers the only real hope for lasting peace and the rule of law in the world. Canada should assume an active role by joining with other middle powers in bringing conflicts to this world organization for resolution. We should have brought the question of Biafra to the United Nations long before this, and also the question of Viet Nam. We should be pressing the United Nations for the admission of Mainland China to that body.

I am glad the government is now going to try to seek diplomatic relations with Mainland China. It is going to be hard to recover the 20 years that the locusts have eaten and to explain to the Chinese why we opposed again and again their admission to the United Nations. We could prove our good faith by heading the forces in the United Nations that

are seeking to give Mainland China the right to sit in that important body.

Of course we should always be ready to supply peacekeeping forces because we in Canada are in the position that our forces would be acceptable in many parts of the world, particularly in new, developing countries, whereas peacekeeping forces from some of the great powers with colonial backgrounds would not be acceptable. That is the kind of role Canada should be playing rather than trying to imitate some of the great military powers, which we do so poorly.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think our second contribution in the realm of international affairs should be to help cope with the growing gap between the wealthy nations and the two-thirds of the world where people live in the direst poverty. The greatest threat to the peace of the world today lies in the widening disparity between the "have" nations and the "have-not" nations. The greatest threat to the peace of the world lies in the poverty, ignorance and disease which are all too prevalent in two-thirds of the world. Some of the billions of dollars spent on armaments over the last 20 years would have gone a long way to resolve this problem.

Today the Prime Minister almost brought tears to my eyes when he talked about the need to help the underdeveloped areas of the world. But talk is cheap. Paying lip service to helping the hungry people does not cost very much. People are judged by their deeds. By their fruits ye shall know them. That is how we judge men and that is how we will judge the government. The government pledged itself to increase its foreign aid to one per cent of our gross national product by 1970. Now that target has been pushed back until 1975. The government has not even spent the full amount appropriated by parliament each year to help underdeveloped areas.

As Mr. Escott Reid pointed out in an article recently, there are two deterrents in the world. One is a military deterrent to stop aggression and the other is a deterrent against anarchy by helping to feed the hungry, clothe the naked and lift up the fallen, but we spend six times as much on the military deterrent as we do on foreign aid. Mr. Escott Reid pleaded, and I share his views, that the time should come in Canada when our total deterrent costs ought to be in the neighbourhood of \$3 billion. We ought to be able to reduce our military commitments to \$1 billion and spend \$2 billion on aid to help fight disease, ignorance and poverty wherever