

Supply—National Defence

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question on the amendment?

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Chairman, before I conclude my few brief remarks on the amendment I should like to turn for a moment to certain statements made by the Minister of Finance last night. As found on page 3445 of *Hansard* the minister said:

Let me ask the committee to consider one or two facts in this regard. First, think of what Europe was like—

That is clear proof out of the mouth of the minister himself that although we should be looking ahead with regard to this matter, he is actually looking back ten years. The minister also made another statement with which I should like to take issue at this time. As found at the top of page 3446 he said:

—that Canada can withdraw, live unto herself and take the attitude of a pious nation that has no great concern with the problems of other nations a little closer to the areas of aggression in the world today?

I think this is very unfair on the minister's part. There was nothing in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Assiniboia or in the remarks he made that indicated in any way that the intent of this party is that Canada should withdraw unto itself, as the minister said. The hon. member for Assiniboia stated very clearly and distinctly, and I reiterate, that there is nothing either neutralist or pacifist about the stand of this party on this matter.

There is another point with which I should like to take issue. It is found in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, who tried to give the house his interpretation of our intentions. As found on page 3448 of *Hansard* he said:

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.

There was nothing in the remarks of the national leader of the C.C.F. party, the hon. member for Assiniboia, that could give rise to such a comment. There was an interjection by one member of this group who objected to the fact that people like Speidel, a former Nazi general, were playing such a prominent role in the NATO forces at the present time, but that has nothing to do with the German republic. Apparently this party, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, has just as much suspicion of the Nazis as we had 20 years ago when we were fighting. To rectify this distorted version of what the amendment means I should like to deal with it specifically.

What it means is that our concern is not sectional. Ten years ago the situation in the world was such that the world was dominated by two giant powers, and at that time this

party fully supported NATO. We took our place where we felt we should be. Today, however, we see a third force growing in the world which is becoming stronger and stronger every day. It is a force of uncommitted nations who do not have too much patience with either of the two giants who dominated the situation ten years ago.

We have noticed, Mr. Chairman, that this new group of emerging nations has strongly resisted any attempt to line upon either side. These uncommitted nations are not in NATO or, in fact, in any other military regional alliance of this sort. These new nations are desperately in need of leadership and assistance, such as a country like Canada can give. This is the reason we moved this amendment. We feel we cannot go on any longer shutting our eyes to the facts of life.

We believe in collective security, but we believe in it on a universal scale such as the United Nations and not on a regional basis such as we have it under NATO. Times change, and we feel that if we are going to keep up with the times we must reappraise our position from time to time. Before I close, I should like to give a brief illustration of just how much times can change. I should like to refer to some excerpts from an address given by Professor Watson Kirkconnell at the 1960 maritime universities student parliament in Halifax. I see the hon. member for Halifax is here, as well as the hon. member for Trinity, and I believe they were both present at the time the professor gave this address.

Professor Kirkconnell was speaking of how times do change and he said:

The vagaries of the press in these matters are aptly satirized by a recent strip in the *Chicago Tribune*:

1898: Those bad Spaniards who have bull fights.

1904: Those dirty Russian bullies, jumping on those fine little industrious Japanese.

1914: Those horrible Germans, those fine, friendly, simple-hearted Italians, those helpful Japanese allies.

1941: Those dirty and cruel Germans and Italians, those fine simple, kindly Russians, those nasty Spaniards who are cruel to animals, those fine, dependable, honest Chinese, those heartless and brutal Japanese.

1951: Those dirty grasping Russians, those fine Italians, those brave and hard-working Japanese, those industrious and brave Germans, those fine Spaniards, those treacherous Chinese.

This excerpt shows how quickly things can change, even within a short period of ten years. We would like to restate that this amendment does not represent a negative move so far as we are concerned. We feel that this is the only right, positive move that we can make today if Canada is going to take its proper place in world affairs.