

*Supply—External Affairs*

into carrying on these tests as the result of the initiative taken by the Soviet union. I find in that statement a contradiction of what is said to be government policy with regard to a test ban in which the Secretary of State for External Affairs believes.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs did not carry on with the corollary to this problem of banning all tests. No indication was given of the position of the Canadian government with regard to nuclear weapons in Canada. Our position as stated by the Leader of the Opposition is clear. At the present time we do not believe this country should accept nuclear weapons in Canada. What the situation in the future will be will have to be determined by events. It is not because we do not want to see our forces in Canada equipped in the most efficient manner, but because we realize the danger of the diffusion of nuclear weapons. When we think of the situation that now confronts us in Berlin, and assume that that situation passes over without the holocaust that could ensue, our minds should be directed to what could happen if there were more than four powers in possession and control of nuclear weapons.

I note in passing that the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to nuclear weapons in Canada is to be read with the statement he made on August 5, 1960, which can be found on page 7607 of *Hansard* of that date. He said:

If, for instance, the United States needs, and if it can satisfy us that the need is justified, certain facilities on Canadian soil, and if we cannot or do not desire for reasons which seem good to us to ourselves provide these facilities and the services that go with them, then I do not think we should refuse to make the necessary political agreement with our neighbour, as has been done in the United Kingdom. But they should be in clear terms which will always recognize our own sovereign right of ultimate control.

If such an agreement were to extend to the use of air bases in Canada, as is the case in the United Kingdom, although the agreement there is under reconsideration at the present time, I suggest that any such agreement for the use of Canadian bases, and I think this is important, should only be on the condition that we have complete information about every United States flight from every such Canadian base, and that we have a veto over every such flight off that base if we consider it necessary on policy grounds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned NATO. We must recognize that the weaknesses of the United Nations in terms of its powers of sanction have created a necessity for the freedom loving nations to be bound together in a defensive alliance. Canada had much to do with the establishment of that alliance. This alliance is not perfect, and certainly it does not satisfy us in so far as

the pursuit of economic objectives is concerned. We might well contemplate, however, what would have been the situation in the world, in the light of present events, if there were no NATO. I strongly support the position of the Secretary of State for External Affairs with regard to the maximum amount of unity we must have in NATO. I support him with regard to the proposed constitutional arrangement of executive power by four or three of the nations. There must be equality of authority in NATO. I fully subscribe to that view as expressed by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I think we ought to make it clear in the interests of the peace of the world and of the interests of our own security, that we recognize NATO as an essential defensive alliance against aggression. There is no condition, and there must be no condition as we see it in this party, to our membership in NATO. Strong political opinion on a very high level in this country was expressed during the course of the summer months as to the kind of condition which should be imposed on NATO if Canadian membership in that organization is to continue. I noticed that a political group that met in this city after the Social Credit party had its annual convention said, *inter alia*:

The New Party believes that the extension of nuclear weapons to any further states and alliances threatens disaster to the world. It therefore opposes Canada's troops being supplied with such weapons at home or abroad. At present, except for those nations which have independently developed atomic capacities, neither NATO itself nor its members individually possess or control nuclear warheads. Should they do so, Canada must make it clear that it cannot remain in the alliance.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I take issue with that statement. This statement would be an invitation to the Soviet union to recognize the possibility of NATO becoming disorganized and seriously disunited. There can be no condition attached to the alliance in the face of the present situation that confronts us. I make this statement because I believe, while we must do everything we can to avoid war—I have indicated I believe this strongly and I hope sincerely—we must recognize that perhaps the most effective way of avoiding it is by displaying a measure of common strength, a measure of common strength that has been forced upon us by the aggressive intentions and initiatives taken by the Soviet union.

I should like to summarize my views as to what should be our attitudes with regard to the current situation. First, there should be complete realization of the totality of the Soviet challenge and the retention of power perspective; second, absolute firmness in our