

Supply—External Affairs

fervently hope for a solution and we should all work for a solution to eliminate the tragic suffering. However, I suspect that the historian writing in the year 2050 will regard the tragedy of Viet Nam as being in fact overwhelmed in importance by the tragic neglect of the underdeveloped world in our day and generation and the resulting contribution we will all have made to the forces of hunger, frustration, anger and catastrophe. I suspect that the historian of the future will note how ready we all are to protest in righteous indignation when we see some act of injustice perpetrated in another part of the world. No doubt our indignation is usually well placed and perhaps sometimes it does some good. No doubt it often makes us feel better, and it costs so little to protest in comparison with doing something effective to reduce the causes of desperation and incipient violence in the world.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say at the outset that I was very happy to hear the words of the Leader of the Opposition and the emphasis he has put on the importance of increased economic or external aid. I agree with him that we are not doing enough and I hope that his words and the views of this house will be translated into a larger and more effective system of external aid. Some of my colleagues may discuss this matter further. I wish to discuss two matters of great importance at this moment in international affairs, and I refer to the NORAD treaty and the war in Viet Nam.

To deal first with perhaps the less important of the two, the question of NORAD, the government has indicated quite clearly its intention to renew the NORAD agreement which expires in May of this year. The other day I was questioning the Secretary of State for External Affairs during a committee meeting about what commitments Canada would be involved in by reason of the renewal of the NORAD agreement. The minister suggested, I think not before the committee but in a speech he made later, that those who questioned the need for Canada to unite with the United States in a joint scheme for defence against the manned bomber were irresponsible. Without, I hope, being at all offensive to the minister I want to throw the charge of irresponsibility right back at him. I cannot imagine anything more irresponsible than the course being pursued by the minister and, the government at this present time.

The government proposes to involve the Canadian people in a continuing expenditure

[Mr. Stanfield.]

of approximately \$140 million a year on an anti-bomber defence. I know very well that the minister says that NORAD does not involve Canada in any actual or precise commitment. This no doubt is legally correct, but this country and this house are entitled to something more than mere legal quibbling. Of course the minister knows that the renewal of the NORAD agreement involves a moral obligation to continue the present anti-bomber defence and probably a new system of anti-bomber defence which may be substituted for the present system at the instance of the United States. Yet this lame duck government proposes, without any attempt to consult parliament, to impose an onerous burden on the backs of the Canadian people. A conservative estimate of that burden is \$1 billion.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Chairman, I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to convey the impression that the government does not intend to put the matter before parliament. This question was asked of the Prime Minister by my hon. friend and he said that the government had to take its responsibility but that it would submit its policy to parliament, as we would always do in respect of these matters.

Mr. Winch: As a *fait accompli*.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, the minister will have the opportunity to answer me. I do not regard what he has said as a question. If he wishes to ask a question I would rather he do so. If he does not I hope he will make his speech later. I have only so much time to present my point.

In answer to the minister's comment let me say in all seriousness that of course the government will come to the house after the *fait accompli*, after the new agreement is signed, and say that they want a vote of confidence on foreign policy. Assuming that we are not prepared at that time to turn out the government, the house will be bound to accept what has been done in its name. I suggest it is irresponsible on the part of the government to commit us to this type of expenditure or treaty, binding us to a \$1 billion burden in the future, without first of all fully explaining the matter to this house. The government has failed to do this.

The minister pretends it is obvious that there is a continuing threat from manned bombers; yet neither he nor any member of the government deigns to discuss whether or not there is a real threat. The former minister