

*North Atlantic Treaty*

similarity between the foreign policy of the old czaristic regime and the present foreign policy of the Soviet.

Through all the years one of the great plans which the Russians of yesterday had in their minds was to find an open warm water port for their commerce and shipping to the south of their land and into the Mediterranean. That has not changed. I believe we are taking today a step that is not provocative, a step which does not involve so great a risk, and one which I think will help rather than hinder the cause of peace in that area. When we talk of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization I think we have an obligation to the people of Canada whom we expect to support it to the limit once parliament has taken certain courses of action concerning it. I remember saying, when I came back from San Francisco, that I believed it was important that we should have the people solidly behind whatever we are doing in external affairs to the fullest possible extent because, as I said then and repeat now, in my opinion you cannot have a just, lasting and permanent peace unless it be in every form and fashion a people's peace.

I want to repeat those words again on this resolution because the minister spoke a few moments ago of it as being only a question of an extension of area. The extension of the area is pretty important. It is much more than just a detail to be considered along with the extension of the principle itself. For that reason Canadians must not enter into the additional commitments with their eyes shut. They must know the complications and implications involved because it is a serious business no matter how we may look at it. It means that we are at war if even the easterly province of Turkey is invaded. In this sense the protocol creates for Canada the most far-flung obligations of a direct nature that she has had in her entire diplomatic history. I am not saying, because it is the most far-flung diplomatic commitment in our history, that we should in any way be afraid to risk it. I have already said we are in favour of it, but I think it raises problems which the people of Canada must understand, and as a result of understanding will give just that much more basic support in the years that lie ahead.

It raises more problems than simply those on the military front. If I may say so, it raises problems on the political and economic front. I believe the house should be told by the minister at this time what are the full implications on the political and economic fronts as well as the military front as the result of the admission of these two Middle Eastern powers. I think we should be made thoroughly aware of all the ramifications of the

international step we are taking. It is much better that we should know now than to learn it some time later. We are prepared to enter into this arrangement, so let us do so with our eyes open and with a full evaluation and appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages, if any, which may be inherent therein.

In dealing with the question of Greece and Turkey I should like to echo some of the things that the minister very properly put on the record. I think it has always been a matter of great pride to the Canadian people to see the way in which Greece and Turkey stand up to those who would interfere with their freedom. We in Canada are a long way from the troubled spots, although perhaps closer in these days than we sometimes think; but nevertheless in relative geographic mileage we are quite a way from these troubled spots. It is sometimes a little easier for the man a long way from the scene to throw out his chest, be very courageous and say what he is going to do. It is not as easy for the man who is right beside the danger. When one considers that Turkey and Greece are right next to the danger zone, right at the front line if you like, I think one can say that they show us a sterling example of the bravery of their people and the determination of these nations to see to it that the bastions of freedom are not in any way interfered with unduly by any aggressor, whoever he may be.

We have every reason to welcome both Greece and Turkey into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I suppose that part of the importance of Greece, geographically, lies in its location at the Mediterranean end of the Vardar valley which runs right into the Danube basin and into the very heart of communist east Europe. This country was exhausted as few countries were in world war II; she was exhausted to the point where, had it not been for the determination, the grit and the courage of her people, she would have gone under; a lesser people would never have survived and Greece today would have been in the orbit in which are several smaller nations which are now enjoying that questionable constitutional phase of development which can best be known to the Soviets themselves.

In accepting both of these countries, I think it is important to say that they are not liabilities, no matter how you look at it. We are not agreeing to the accession of Greece and Turkey only for the purpose of protecting them. In return for the agreement that we are making we are getting a substantial contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty