

*Supply—National Defence*

present time in the hands of NATO forces—except perhaps United Kingdom weapons and I am not sure they have any—are under the single control of the United States authorities. I think that is wrong. If NATO through a decision of its council decides that tactical nuclear weapons are required for defence purposes, and I am talking about tactical nuclear weapons only for defence purposes, then I say this. If the NATO council thinks that weapons of that kind are required, then we have taken the position in our party that those weapons should be brought under NATO control and that those NATO members which now possess them should turn those weapons over to the control of the NATO organization. That is not extending the use of nuclear weapons. That is limiting their use to the NATO organization rather than to individual nations.

**An hon. Member:** To people like Speidel, the former nazi general.

**Mr. Pearson:** If my hon. friend wants to be consistent, he would probably take the position that no German should have anything to do with the north Atlantic organization. If we take the position that Germany cannot associate at all with Atlantic security, Atlantic development or the Atlantic community what do we do with Germany? We drive her into the arms of the people of whom we have cause to fear. If that is the policy of my hon. friends to the right, I should like them to try to defend that policy in this country. That is the kind of policy that in 1919, 1920 and 1921 helped to bring about the nazi regime in Germany. If my hon. friends want a recurrence of that policy, they are welcome to it.

**Mr. Argue:** We just said we did not want a nazi general heading it up.

**Mr. Pearson:** You just said you did not want Germans.

**Mr. Argue:** German generals.

**Mr. Pearson:** That is a far-reaching extension of policy when the party on my right said that they did not want the German republic to take any part in the development of the Atlantic community.

**Mr. Argue:** Nobody said anything like that or nearly like it.

**Mr. Pearson:** It will be on *Hansard*.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order.

**Mr. Pearson:** I think I have made the position of my own party on this matter quite clear and I am very glad of having had the opportunity of doing so. We think the NATO organization should be changed in order

[Mr. Pearson.]

to bring it more into accord with the changing situation. We think that political and other kinds of non-military co-operation in NATO should be stronger and not weaker. We think that the defence policy of NATO should be stronger, not weaker, but that defence strategy tactics and co-operation in NATO should be based not on nuclear weapons but on the building up of conventional forces which will give the European countries protection without the necessity of using nuclear weapons.

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** Mr. Chairman, we have had a couple of very good demonstrations here. We have had a demonstration of Tory policy which is one purely and simply, of thinking back. We have had a demonstration of Liberal policy which goes back even further than that of the Tories. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition had us back almost to the days of bows and arrows for a little while. The Minister of Finance, when making his presentation here tonight, of course, very conveniently forgot or omitted the fact that when he was back 10 years, 12 years or 13 years ago, the C.C.F. supported that position at that time; that the C.C.F. never denied the benefits that NATO may have contributed at that time. But the C.C.F. unlike the minister and the party which he represents, can recognize things as they are now, not as they were 10 years ago, 50 years ago or 100 years ago. We are prepared and willing to accept the facts as they are today, not as they were in the past. This is something that they conveniently forget. They forget that today we are in 1961, not 1951.

**An hon. Member:** What about tomorrow?

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** Exactly; what about tomorrow? If we are going into tomorrow while looking into yesterday, where is it going to get us?

**An hon. Member:** Right where you are.

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** The minister admitted very frankly that article 2 of NATO had never been implemented to date. I should like to congratulate the minister on that admission. It is true that it has never been implemented. It is also true that it will never be implemented as long as we keep looking back and do not look ahead. Surely the minister can realize that. We have had examples in this chamber. We had a Liberal government that looked back 40 years to the time when they promised health insurance. For 40 years they looked back but they never implemented it. It was only when the Conservative government came into office that it finally implemented this promise to which the Liberals were looking back 40 years.