

Outlook for Disarmament Unencouraging

In the field of disarmament, the outlook is not very hopeful. One has only to go back to those years before the Second World War. Read for a moment the message of President Roosevelt at that time to the nations of the world in 1933. The hopes of that day have been dissipated in the light of subsequent experience. Today over mankind hangs this nuclear fear. What is our stand?

We have continued to press for disarmament, without which there cannot be survival, for, sooner or later, if the armament race continues, either by calculation or miscalculation war must almost inevitably follow. We have taken a stand for an end to nuclear weapons, an end of testing, an end to the production of fissionable material for weapons, and for the transfer of existent fissionable materials to peaceful purposes. We have taken a stand for internationalization of outer space, without which there cannot be hope for mankind a generation hence. We have, at the same time, demanded that there shall be full inspection, to the end that disarmament agreements will be carried out according to the pledged word.

NATO

Now what about NATO?

Until these measures for disarmament are achieved, Canadians must maintain their defences and all the nations of the free world must give full and first place to the requirements of security. I have noticed some people saying that Canada should withdraw from NATO. That I cannot accept.

I believe that NATO is, and will remain, an association where Canada belongs. It not only meets the criterion of self-interest from the point of view of military defence. It is a group of nations, strong of purpose, sound and good in motive, respectful of free institutions, and representing collectively those heritages that are part of our civilization. It has proven to be an impregnable bulwark for freedom. Its function today is as imperative as ever.

Changes Must be Made

We must not and dare not discard it. But that does not mean that changes do not have to be made. It is but reasonable that an organization designed to meet the fears and formulas of the 1950's may not be wholly appropriate for the threats and hopes of the 1960's.