

NATO

military problems. They are most complex, involving questions of military, political, social and economic relations. Those are the kinds of problems we are faced with when we deal with problems of subversive aggression.

It is all too easy to misunderstand these problems. They are difficult, complicated, and not easy of solution. If we are to meet such problems we must be concerned about peace keeping and be ready to play our part in international aid efforts.

The first of two major objectives in our foreign policy is peace keeping. There have been over 50 wars since 1945 and there is a need for improved institutional arrangements in the world to control and contain these disputes. There is nothing isolationistic in that approach. The other objective of our foreign policy ought to be the encouragement of external aid and development work. The need for expanding Canada's efforts in external aid and development work, seem to me so obvious as not to need lengthy elaboration. We are a rich country and have access to technical skills and investment capital which underdeveloped countries badly need. We are a trading nation containing two major cultures, each speaking a world language. We spend about half of one per cent of our gross national product on external aid. That is not enough. We must do more.

There are many basic tasks for us to perform, valuable to others and useful for our own interests. We do not want for work, nor do we want for capacity to undertake it. Our task is to construct pragmatic policies to deal with a work-a-day world and not to yearn for a grander, more dramatic and more self-congratulatory role as saviour of Europe.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I hope that by speaking in this debate I shall contribute, if ever so slightly perhaps, to the dimension of the discussion that has been taking place in this chamber. It ought to be obvious by now that the debate that began yesterday afternoon is basic to the question of national security. We want to know how we are to preserve it. We want to preserve, in this nation, many of the values and benefits our people have enjoyed over the past century of development. It strikes me, however, that we ought to be concerned about three basic areas that touch our national security, and they will become obvious if we consider the problem in a methodical way. In the first place, we must be concerned about preserving some semblance of national unity

[Mr. Roberts.]

and some simple law and order within this country. We must also be concerned about the possibility of revolution at home. Our first concern in maintenance of national security is that of peace at home.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Secondly, it is the preoccupation of every nation to take all reasonable steps to prevent aggression from abroad. We are a rather fortunate nation in the history of this world, even though we have been in existence for a century. We have only suffered direct aggression on our soil once. Perhaps it is one of the ironies of history that that particular aggression was by a country that has always been regarded as our best neighbour, the United States.

The third basic way in which we preserve our national security is in dealing with possible hostilities or confrontations in some other part of the globe that could eventually boil over and involve us in our own country. It is this third matter of national security which concerns us. We are concerned here specifically with the viability and vitality of our NATO commitment. It is, perhaps, not strange to think that our country has been preoccupied for the better part of this century with peace in Europe. It is not strange because we have given the best treasure that this nation possesses in two very ghastly world wars on that continent.

We have been concerned in a pre-eminent way, therefore, in maintaining the peace of Europe. The main contention of those who continue to argue the validity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is that it has in the past 24 year period, a considerable passage of time, preserved peace on that continent. If the argument is accepted at face value, as so often it is, surely it is not a strong one because there are many countries in this world who have been involved in these two world conflicts in this century. Countries such as Australia, South Africa, Sweden and others could, in fact, say they have also known peace for this period but have not been involved in a similar alliance. They might be moved to say, because they were not involved in that alliance, their peace was preserved.

It is rather interesting to realize the nature of the NATO alliance. It is the enemies of yesterday who have, in fact, for this period of a quarter of a century been the allies of today. It may be when we speak freely of the prevention of war in Europe, that we are