

*North Atlantic Treaty*

parliament as to what Canada's policy is going to be in connection with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

There are a number of vital questions which I think the minister ought to answer before this debate draws to a close, because the signing of international protocols and agreements is one thing, but following them up with decisive and effective action is another. I must say that I was disappointed—in fact I could go much further than that and say I was extremely disappointed, as I know many people were—to read in the newspapers of December 12 last that Canada was one of eight North Atlantic Treaty Organization members which seemed to have been weighed in the balance and found wanting so far as carrying out our commitments was concerned. I think that news, sufficiently widespread in its dissemination, must have been a very poor advertisement for Canada in other countries throughout the world. I believe the minister ought to clear up that point before we close this debate this afternoon. I, for one, did not like to see this country entering into obligations unless it was prepared to carry them out, both in the spirit and in the letter.

I believe there is nothing worse than a country that talks big and does not act as big as it talks. I am not suggesting we are in that position, but I do suggest we might perhaps get into that position if we were to follow along the lines suggested in the newspapers of that date. Immediately after that news came out, that we were asked to boost our contribution from 5 per cent to 10 per cent, if I recall correctly, there were a number of other nations who were in the same position. There were Norway, Denmark, and Italy, to name three that come to my mind. Those three nations did something at once to increase their contribution in order that the execution of their commitments might parallel the commitments themselves. I feel that at this time we ought to have an answer to that question from the minister.

In addition to that there are several questions of which I wish the minister would make a note, and so that we shall save the time of the house I shall not elaborate upon them. Our position would become quite clear if these questions were answered. One of them is, how many months is this organization behind schedule now? There has been a good deal of talk that NATO is behind schedule by something like a year in what it was originally set up to do. We ought to know if it is behind schedule, and if it is how far it is behind and what the chances are for picking up the slack. We ought to know if it is true that the arms output

of some of the NATO members is down almost to a trickle because of a shortage of money, material and equipment. We ought to know what steps are being taken to prevent the possible break-down of NATO plans for defence, and what progress NATO is making in fitting in political and economic plans with the integrated military pattern. I should like to ask the minister if any beginning has been made with respect to the proposal I made in a speech earlier this session in connection with the setting up of a national development and production board for the purpose of trying to assess and appraise what we had in this country to back up our commitments to NATO and for our own national economic expansion. I should like to know whether or not further consideration has been given to that plan, because I have felt it is something that deserves consideration.

I should like also to ask the minister, in view of the fact that there have been reports of our commitments not having been met, to indicate whether or not that is correct. If it is correct to any extent, will he say what position the government is taking with respect to picking up that slack in the near future as well? I shall try to complete what I have to say before one o'clock, but I should like to ask the minister to comment upon an article—no doubt he has it in his files, too—with respect to the other than military aid which this country may be asked for at Lisbon, or perhaps has been asked to furnish. As the minister knows, there is a line of demarcation between the military and non-military aid. I believe it was the *Financial Post* that referred to the fact that we might be asked to send wheat and some other products to these countries. Will he state whether or not this kind of mutual aid, which apparently is being incorporated into the NATO structure itself, carries the judgment of the government and whether they intend to deal with it before the meeting at Lisbon? May I just ask the minister one more question? In any of the commitments which the government may be contemplating, what share of Canadian agricultural or industrial products is likely to be earmarked in such a program for the United Kingdom? Is this to form a part of the discussion between Prime Minister Churchill and the government in January of next year? I think we ought to have from the minister, if he can give it at this time, all the concrete proposals the government has in mind presenting to the Lisbon meeting in February designed to increase the tempo of the NATO plans.

I should like to close my remarks by saying that in the accession by protocol of Greece and Turkey I believe we are taking one more