

*Supply—National Defence*

My hon. friends have made reference to article 2, sometimes known as the Canadian article. When the NATO treaty was drafted, the Canadian delegation did play some part in getting this article put into the treaty. It is quite true that we have not been able to implement article 2 over the years as we had hoped would be possible. There is no doubt about that. The Minister of Finance has already stated that we have been disappointed in that respect. In recent weeks we have been discussing in this house an organization for European Atlantic economic co-operation and development. This will be a wide organization covering all the European states, except one or two and we may—I put it no higher than that—be able to do in it what we have not yet been able to do under article 2 in NATO. If we can do that I will be quite satisfied because this organization would be performing every economic co-operative function of article 2.

However, there is more in article 2 than economic co-operation. There is the desirability of political co-operation amongst the Atlantic countries. Until more progress has been made on that score, action in the direction of the political co-operation, all that we had hoped for under NATO will not be possible. However, is that any reason why we should scrap the whole organization at this time as my hon. friends to the right would do? I agree, as I have just said, that changes are required. I have no doubt that changes in the structure of NATO to make it a more effective organization in the face of the new dangers, the new threats and the new opportunities are being considered. I hope that is true. Anything I say tonight about NATO will not preclude me, when the time comes, from putting forward the ideas which I think will improve and strengthen NATO. But this is not scrapping it.

If NATO does not move in the direction of a stronger politically co-operative organization, in the direction of greater unity rather than less unity, it may well be that NATO will disappear. It may be, too, that if NATO becomes only an organization for military co-operation—

**Mr. Martin (Timmins):** As it has.

**Mr. Pearson:**—that just is not true and no statement can make it true. If NATO does become only an organization for military co-operation to meet a military danger, then of course NATO will disappear when the danger disappears. We should, therefore, try to find a broader, deeper foundation for NATO than merely military co-operation. But believe me, Mr. Chairman—this is where we disagree with my hon. friends to the right—the need for defence co-operation still exists. They would

scrap NATO, but I would not scrap it. I would not scrap it. I would make NATO stronger rather than weaker, even as a defence organization. I do not want to withdraw from collective security on an Atlantic basis. I do not want to withdraw from any organization which makes it possible for free countries to stand together and, within even a limited area, do what they can to discharge the collective security function which is recognized in the charter of the United Nations. I do not want to withdraw into isolation or neutralism. I do not want to weaken our support for the United Nations. But none of these things would prompt me to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization at this particular time.

The hon. member for Assiniboia, perhaps in the hope of strengthening his argument, talked about NATO nuclear weapons. This brings up one of the changes that I should like to see brought about. Perhaps it is being considered in NATO at the present time. I think it is important to make the North Atlantic organization, as a defence organization, much stronger in conventional forces than it is at the present time. Then, the organization would not have to rely on nuclear weapons for defence against every aggression, no matter how regional, no matter how limited, or how small it might be.

As I understand the purpose of this particular amendment it is to strengthen, perhaps in a small way, the conventional forces of NATO. I think this is important. As long as the NATO countries in Europe feel that they have no alternative but to use nuclear weapons against aggression, no matter what kind or character of aggression, I think that NATO is weaker rather than stronger. There may be occasions arise when it would be very difficult indeed for anyone to press the nuclear button and if that were the only button that could be pressed, we would be subjected to grave peril indeed. I want to see the conventional forces of NATO not weakened but strengthened. I want to see NATO rely less and less on nuclear deterrents and more and more on the strength of the NATO countries to withstand aggression without using nuclear weapons.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is very sound defence policy. I think it is a good policy in other respects. It will make NATO and the European countries less dependent, for instance, on the United States and nuclear weapons than they may be at the present time. There are three members of the NATO alliance that have nuclear weapons now, the United States, the United Kingdom and France. So far as NATO forces are concerned, and I speak subject to correction, all those nuclear weapons which are in Europe at the