

## NATO

should look forward to a withdrawal of our forces within, at most, five years. The strike reconnaissance force and the heavy brigade should be phased out and replaced by strengthening our mobile force. Under no circumstances should we re-equip in such a way as to lock ourselves into a NATO role which would preclude our military withdrawal in the near future.

May I submit, as my last point, that both NORAD and NATO are instruments of discussion and, perhaps, consultation, although these intangible benefits can be marginal. Nevertheless, there are very useful benefits—

**An hon. Member:** I am disappointed in you, John.

**Mr. Roberts:** Well, I was disappointed in the speech the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) made. It was an entirely negative speech. I am told he made it yesterday; unfortunately I only had the opportunity of reading it in *Hansard* to-day. From my reading of it, it contained not one positive point. If that speech were a declaration of the foreign policy of the Conservative party it would be a declaration of bankruptcy.

Today, in the House of Commons, the Leader of the Opposition refused to give unanimous consent for the Secretary of State for External Affairs to continue his speech.

**An hon. Member:** That was a house order, my boy.

**Mr. Roberts:** That was an ungenerous act. Also, it was uncharacteristic. The Leader of the Opposition was more than ungenerous in his discussion of the government's foreign policy. He did a disservice in distorting the presentation of our position.

**An hon. Member:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Roberts:** All this talk about "isolation" and "fortress America" has done great disservice. If one takes the trouble to read what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), said recently at Calgary, one will see what is this government's attitude toward foreign policy. Our Prime Minister said that our foreign policy ought to serve our national interests. In his speech the other night he went on to say:

—when I say national interests I am not thinking in any egotistical sense of just what's happening to Canadians. It's in our national interest to reduce the tensions in the world, tensions which spring from the two thirds of the world's population who go to bed hungry every night, the two thirds of the world's population who are poor whereas

the other third is rich, and the tensions which spring from this great ideological struggle between the east and the west.

That is the aim of our foreign policy. It has nothing to do with isolationism or fortress America. Also, if one examines the speech the Prime Minister made in the House of Commons, one will see that among the five points he proposed there are points relating to peace keeping, to arms limitation and to increasing our contribution for purposes of external aid. Those points have nothing in common with isolationism or the concept of retreating into fortress America. That approach has nothing in common with the approach described—inaccurately—by the Leader of the Opposition.

**An hon. Member:** Come on, John. Be honest.

**Mr. Roberts:** We cannot withdraw ourselves into a fortress America. We cannot adopt a policy of isolationism or of North Americanism.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Roberts:** I knew if I spoke long enough I would find my hon. friends supporting me.

**Mr. Alexander:** That's because you are coming to the meat of it.

**Mr. Roberts:** Slogans are no substitute for a foreign policy—even the out of date slogans of the Leader of the Opposition. We cannot wash our hands of what is happening outside our continent. We cannot hope to see permanent peace in the world if we adopt an approach in our foreign policy of isolationism and continentalism. I submit that the foreign policy of the government is not tailored to fit isolationism. It would equally be folly to adopt a rear view mirror approach to our foreign policy and to decide that we must do in future what has been done in the past. If we do that we fail to take into account the real threats to security in the world today. It is no use trying to fight again the battles of yesteryear.

**An hon. Member:** Who wrote that line, John?

**Mr. Roberts:** I should like to refer the hon. member to a speech that Mr. Khrushchev gave in 1961. In it he said that the real threat to security came from wars of national liberation; we would call it aggressive subversion. That is the kind of thing about which we ought to be concerned. These are not simple