

warfare; and they did not yet have the airplane, but they thought of it. After reading that work, I think you will all agree that we have come a long way in our international gatherings in having so much of the information we require for the discussion of these problems. In those days they simply did not have the will or the material with which to work.

I have talked about trying to achieve these great objectives leading ultimately to disarmament, from the point of view of the standards that should be applied.

What is the standard to be applied when Russia confronts the United States, or when Russia confronts China, with ideologies so different that it seems almost impossible that there could be reconciliation between them? Inevitably you come to the question as to what should be done in a place like Viet Nam. Should the Americans back out of there? Are they to abandon those people, and indeed all of South East Asia, to Chinese Communism, which is another phrase for Chinese Imperialism? The Japanese are certainly concerned about this prospect, as are our sister dominions of Australia and New Zealand.

I was glad to hear Senator Aird quote the Secretary-General of NATO, Manlio Brosio, who spoke recently at the Washington Press Club and said, amongst other things, that he was not sanguine about the long-term goals that Russia had. He thought that the prospect of military aggression on the part of Russia had diminished, but he still believes that Russia is pursuing a diplomatic struggle to dominate both Europe and Asia.

Russia, as Senator Aird has indicated, is suspicious of a re-armed Germany. But then we have the British Foreign Secretary, George Brown, saying that the Germany of today is completely different from the Germany of the two world wars. First of all, Germany is a divided Germany. Mr. Brown is convinced that the German people today are devoted to democracy. Certainly they appeared to be when Mr. Adenauer was their Chancellor and they appeared to be when their Chancellor was Mr. Erhard, who so impressed us when he visited this country not so long ago. But, the recent elections in which the Christian Democratic Party was successful, with Mr. Keisinger becoming the Chancellor, and his forming a coalition with Mr. Brandt, whom we know, has raised questions in the minds of some people as to the direction in which Germany is heading.

For my part, I am prepared to rely upon the good faith of those people and upon their realism in the face of the balance of terror that is before us at all times. I am concerned—and I think we all should be—about the rise of the new nationalism in various parts of Europe. In this I do not exclude Germany, and I certainly do not exclude France because the French nationalism which has taken a stand against the philosophy of the common market and the philosophy of NATO, which Senator Aird has discussed so ably today, presents a challenge to a concept which I thought could only be fruitful of good. We must be concerned and Europeans must be concerned as to whether Europe will revert to a collection of relatively weak separate nationalistic states. We must be concerned with whether this is to be the permanent concept for pan-Europeanism or, on the other hand, whether in the interests of world peace there should be a strengthening of the international federation established by the Treaty of Rome, not only in the economic but in the political sphere as well.

Senator Aird raised also the question of the participation of Britain in Europe. If Britain joined the community would her participation arouse French antagonism with respect to leadership within the community? For my part I believe, and I believe it fervently, that not only would the heartland of western civilization and Europe itself be strengthened by the addition of Britain to the community but, as Senator Aird has so well said, that for all parties concerned a prosperous Britain will make for a more prosperous West. I believe that if Europe did have Britain as part of the community there would be an outward looking viewpoint from the community headquarters, particularly in economic affairs. There would be an anti-protectionist viewpoint because the British are freer traders.

Is Britain a part of Europe? Certainly the British are independent individualistic people, but we should never forget that Britain was the last rampart that was able to stand when Europe was overrun by the forces of oppression that began in 1939, and Britain belongs as much in Europe as any of the countries in Continental Europe. I think that the contribution she can make to the community, both politically and economically, is enormous.

We must all be grateful for the establishment of NATO, and this country played a large part in its establishment. I remember meeting Leon Blum, who was the head of the