

NATO

we favour peace in the world everybody else does. This is certainly not the case. The difference of opinion which exists in this country seems to arise as to the way in which Canada can best achieve its objective, namely, world peace. In this regard, Canada can follow policies of a long range, short range or medium term nature. Those who offer opinions on foreign policy sometimes tend to make no distinction between the short and the long run; I believe it is essential to make such a distinction. Our policies, long or short run, have always been carried out in concert with others. It is often said that Canada has four cornerstones of foreign policy—our relations with the United Nations, our relations with the Commonwealth, our special relationship with the United States, and our membership in NATO. Of course, we also co-operate in maintaining world stability through other bodies such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

● (5:30 p.m.)

I agree, of course with the proposition of an old friend and former colleague, Mr. Escott Reid. About one year ago he enunciated a well known proposition, namely, that the two major problems facing us for the remainder of the century will probably be the development of the underdeveloped part of the world and the prevention of starvation and poverty in that underdeveloped part of the world, and the normalization of relations between the People's Republic of China and the so-called western world. I agree with Mr. Reid and with many others who hold this viewpoint. These policies are essentially long-run policies, as it were. They are essential, and there is little argument about that. But no one will say that long-term policies like these are necessarily in conflict with what may be very essential short-term policies. The two are not mutually exclusive; they are complementary.

Without doubt the immediate short-term policy we must follow is that of preventing immediate conflicts in the world. There have always been conflicts and threats of conflicts in the world around us. We have a very upset sort of world where force has become more and more important in the settling of disputes. We find this attitude reflected in our own country where people accept violence as a means of solving problems. I am sorry to say that in some cases people belonging to a generation younger than my own have promoted violence, although sometimes the idea of violence is promoted by people belonging

to the older generation who have no good in mind.

To return to the subject of whether conflicts are likely to take place, we must remember that we face the possibility of conflict today in the Middle East. Many such potential conflicts could escalate into world war III. In the last few years Canada has done much more than her share in trying to contain those conflicts, some of which might be called bush-fire wars. Of course, many of them are larger than that. Probably we would have continued to carry out this duty in the Near East if our troops had not been dismissed a few years ago by Colonel Nasser. I also refer to the Congo, and to our present role in Cyprus. We have done a great deal to contain these smaller wars, some of which might have escalated into world war III if they had not been contained.

I agree with hon. members on the other side of the house who say that we should continue with this sort of work. I think it is very valuable. However, the one and only major threat to Canada at present is the threat of conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. I am referring, of course, to a conflict that escalates into nuclear war. The reasons for my statement are too obvious, and I need not elaborate on them. We are the "ham in the sandwich". We are between the two major powers and if nuclear war were to break out there is no doubt that Canada as we know it would be destroyed. There is little argument about that. The immediate objective of our foreign policy should be to do everything we can to prevent this kind of war from taking place. This is not a long-run objective. This is an immediate, short-run, essential matter we must attend to now. We should do everything we can to prevent such a war. I do not say that we must not allow for some kind of defence of our "sovereignty" but, frankly, I do not know against whom we are to defend ourselves. The Prime Minister did not mention that. But if nuclear war were to break out between the major powers any number of troops we would muster would be of very little use indeed.

We must try to use our influence to prevent such a war from taking place. Can this be done by diplomacy alone, Mr. Speaker? I do not think so. We are not big enough nor powerful enough by ourselves to force a détente between the two giants. Only by acting with others can we exert any influence we may have.

Some say that perhaps we should let the United States defend us and then we could