

an increasing experience and capacity for facing up to these problems in the meetings that take place at the Porte Dauphine. This is a good thing for the Canadian Parliament. I hope it is helpful for the Canadian public, because unless there is within the Canadian public an awareness of these problems, then the parliamentarians who are concerned about them and the governments which must do something about them will be operating in somewhat of a vacuum.

I am particularly pleased to hear what Senator Aird said about his visit with Senator Brooks and Senator Lefrançois to Soest, where the brigade is stationed. I am sure he could have said the same about the air force units they visited and about their very poignant experience at Verdun.

One fact we must be particularly proud of in this country is that the brigade, which is located near Soest in Germany, is not considered to be in any sense an army of occupation. They are friends of the German people, and are so regarded because they feel they are there as part of the shield. I am sure it is a source of gratification to all Canadians to know that just a year or so ago the brigade itself was given the freedom of the City of Soest. That is a tribute to the kind of work they do, and indeed to the kind of people with whom they are living.

NATO itself not only was but remains, in my personal view, a great concept. It was established in the spring of 1949. Originally it had some 12 members; now there are 15. It was established before the problem facing the world was nuclear proliferation, because at that time the United States alone had the bomb. It was established because Russia was deploying conventional forces in massive groups just east of the Iron Curtain. The answer, to the people in western Europe—indeed, the answer, to the people in the West—was NATO. It was the shield which provided, and was intended to provide, security in anxiety. It provided, and was intended to provide, confidence for the period of reconstruction that would be political, economic and social.

Almost immediately after its establishment, the great debate began. In the event of a conflict, with the Americans only having the bomb, the great moral and political question was: Should the bomb be used in the face of what were, in fact, overwhelming conventional forces on the other side of the Iron Curtain? The conventional forces of the West

did not measure up in striking capacity to the forces with which they were confronted.

That great debate did not continue for long, because in the fall of 1949 the Russians had their first atomic explosion. Since then France has tested; China has tested. In fact, what has been ushered in is not a balance of power quite so much as a balance of terror.

Some progress was made in 1963, when the treaty was culminated for the banning of tests in the atmosphere, but the problem of the banning of the bomb, the problem of international inspection and the wider problem of disarmament, still face the peoples of the world.

How is this to be accomplished? Can it be accomplished? These are problems that must be ever present in the minds of legislators in every part of the world. Are these objectives to be achieved by treaty? Are they to be achieved on the basis of a balance of terror or a balance of strength? Is it too much to expect that they might be achieved as a result of a growing sense of international morality? But if this is to develop, the question that we must ask ourselves is: What moral standard is to be set? Is it to be the standard of western Christendom? Is it to be some revolutionary standard? Is it to be some standard based upon power, upon some imperialistic approach? All these are not moral standards, but they are standards that are looked upon, and I wonder whether some of the ones we consider to be amoral, if not immoral, are the standards that might govern policy in these fields, say, as between Russia and China.

I have been reading a book called *The Proud Tower* by Barbara Tuchman, which in many respects, I have found completely fascinating. She has written a number of books. Among other significant but isolated items in the history of the nineteenth century, she describes an attempt made in approximately 1900, at the instance of the Czar of the Russias, for a conference on disarmament in Brussels. I would recommend this book for reading to all honourable senators, because to me it is one of the most fascinating I have seen—apart from Senator Power's book—in a long time.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): It is most amazing to me to read the account of the attempts that were being made at that time by the powers of Europe, and indeed of the world, based on ideas of disarmament and