

*Supply—National Defence*

attached to NATO in fact makes, and whether, if we should withdraw this small force, it would have any material effect on the military position of the NATO countries.

One of the main reasons why the former national leader of the C.C.F., Mr. M. J. Coldwell, and the members around him in the house at that time, including myself, supported NATO and supported it in subsequent years, was that we felt that article 2, under which there was to be economic assistance and economic aid to other countries, would be implemented. As a matter of fact, we have now come to the conclusion that article 2 of the NATO treaty was little more than a sop to those people who believed that economic aid within NATO should be promoted. It has been demonstrated beyond any shadow of doubt that article 2 within NATO is dead.

One needs only to refer to the necessity of setting up the O.E.C.D. which we in the C.C.F.-New Party group in the house were very pleased to support. We feel that so far as economic assistance and economic stability are concerned the O.E.C.D. is in a better position to bring this about successfully than was NATO because there are a larger number of nations involved and because other nations such as Finland and Yugoslavia, we understand, are prepared to associate themselves at least to some extent with O.E.C.D. We are encouraged that President Kennedy of the United States made it clear the other day that there will be very definite changes in the United States long term foreign aid program, and that part of this foreign aid program would be channelled through the O.E.C.D. We think that all of these things suggest that NATO is becoming more and more clearly a military force and nothing else.

We are not neutralists; we are not pacifists. We take our position with the democratic and the free nations of the world, but we do question whether the expenditures that we make through NATO are the most effective means of playing our responsible part in providing a measure of stability in the world, in supporting free institutions and the United Nations.

We think that in this day and age and at this time Canada would be better advised to dissociate herself from regional military alliances, improve her conventional force at home, make that conventional force at home strong and mobile and, as a matter of national policy, make our forces available to the United Nations for police work at any time. Let us not be in the position in which we found ourselves not so many months ago when Canada was asked for some 200 technical personnel for assistance in the Congo.

[Mr. Argue.]

It took us a very long time to gather this technical force together. We think that greater emphasis on such a force at home in readiness for use by the United Nations would be the best role for Canada to play at this time.

To make the position of the C.C.F. party clear to hon. members I should like to quote a resolution passed at our last national convention held at Regina in August 1960. It reads as follows:

We believe that Canada must at all times give vigorous support to the United Nations, and constantly promote the strengthening of the authority of the United Nations. Our objective should be to make the United Nations eventually into an effective world government with sovereignty over all international affairs. The actions of the United Nations in the Suez crisis and now in the Congo point up the role which it can play to preserve the peace. That role must be strengthened, particularly in the fields of international economic aid and world disarmament. Since NATO has become a purely military organization, Canada should immediately withdraw from NATO in favour of promoting peaceful economic and cultural activities through the agencies of the United Nations.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the policy statement that I have just outlined and believing that Canada can play its most constructive role in promoting the peace of the world, in bringing about stability and in encouraging the growth and strength of free institutions by strong conventional forces at home, we feel that the large sum of money now spent on NATO could better be spent on conventional forces at home and in providing economic assistance to underdeveloped countries.

The other day figures were brought down in the house in answer to a question of mine which showed, as recorded at page 2994 of *Hansard*, that the estimated direct costs of Canadian forces committed to NATO in 1961-62 would be \$455,545,000, or an increase of some \$47 million over the present fiscal year. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I should like to move that item No. 708 be reduced to \$1.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Mr. Chairman, I think it is well that the attitude of the C.C.F. or New Party in relation to NATO should be thus exposed to public view.

First of all, let us think for a moment what the amendment means in proposing that the item be reduced to \$1. It means that Canada would now be called upon to make a default under its NATO obligations, obligations solemnly and faithfully undertaken, and Canada, a country with a proud record in the fulfilment of its obligations honourably entered into, would now be invited to become a defaulter. I do not think that will commend itself to the Canadian sense of honour, in the first place.