

*North Atlantic Treaty*

organization is. It is based upon partnership. Greece and Turkey will accept all the obligations as they will enjoy all the privileges of membership, and we are happy to have them with us in that capacity.

The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), who is not now in his seat, indicated that inside the North Atlantic organization there may be growing up a sort of inner group of members who were dominating the organization, and he suggested that the organization was losing the basis of equality on which it was founded. I assure the house that that is not so. Naturally in any organization of this kind, any international organization which has as its members states so far apart in power and responsibility as the United States of America and Iceland, some members will have to accept greater responsibility than others, and some members will exercise greater influence than others. That is obvious, and in the circumstances it is probably desirable. But around the conference table we are all equal, and no one attempts to dominate anybody else. In that respect I might say the North Atlantic council is in pleasant contrast to some other international committees which come to one's mind.

On other matters not so closely related to the protocol the hon. member for Peel was inclined to be constructively critical about what had been going on. He contrasted the willingness of the government to accept these new commitments in a new area in the Middle East—and it was to that I believe he was referring, if he did not actually say it—to our indifference or our coolness with respect to the meeting of commonwealth countries called not so long ago to discuss defence in the same general area. He felt there was some inconsistency between the two positions. I do not believe there was any inconsistency. We have been discussing this matter of the admission of Greece and Turkey for many months. We have contemplated alternative arrangements which did not seem suitable. We have come to the conclusion that this is the best way to effect the greatest defensive strength in our alliance. We have accepted them wholeheartedly.

But that does not necessarily mean that our military commitments as such will extend to that area in the same way that we have accepted such commitments in western Europe. It might well be—and I am not dogmatic about this, because it is dangerous as well as unwise to be dogmatic in these matters—that the military commitments for that part of the North Atlantic treaty area—it is difficult to think of the eastern Mediterranean as the North Atlantic area—it might well be that the military commitments out

there and the military planning and the military arrangements there may not involve for Canada the same kind of participation or planning as is the case in western Europe.

Then the hon. member asked me if we were contemplating any further extensions of the North Atlantic organization. My answer to that is that so far as I know we are not contemplating any further extensions at this time. It is true in a sense that by extending the area of our commitments to the eastern Mediterranean we are getting away from the geographical concept of the North Atlantic pact. But, in the strict sense, the North Atlantic pact never was a regional scheme so much as it was a scheme for collective defence under article 51 of the United Nations charter.

There is no reason in theory, although there may be arguments against it in fact, why an association of this kind should not ask into its membership any member of the United Nations which wishes to accept the price of membership under article 51. I am not suggesting that this should be done, and I am not suggesting that what the hon. member for Peel called an encirclement of the globe by these collective security arrangements under article 51 will take place. But there is nothing to prevent it if in the future it is desired that it should be done in the interests of national security and in the interests of peace everywhere.

Then at the end of his speech the hon. member asked me four or five questions about the operations of NATO itself. He was curious about the Canadian relationship to what has been referred to as the T.C.C. report. He indicated on the basis of a press dispatch—and I am not quarrelling with him for this—that that report showed we had not met our commitments as a member of the North Atlantic organization.

I would like to assure the house, Mr. Speaker, that no such interpretation of the T.C.C. report would be justified. I can assure the house also that we are meeting our commitments under the North Atlantic pact, and that we will continue to do so. The T.C.C. report—I tried to explain it this morning, although possibly not sufficiently—was in the first instance a document drawn up by three of its members who were chosen by the twelve to be their executive committee. It was a report which went into the question of military requirements and the resources of the various countries which could be devoted to meeting those requirements.

There was a military section of the report—a screening and costing study, it was called—