

was interesting but not very useful. It was simply impossible to assimilate it all. What is needed, in my opinion, is a short precis or an appreciation of Canada's position on each of the subjects to come under discussion.

It is true that this is a conference of parliamentarians and not of countries and, therefore, the official line is not necessarily the individual line, but it seems to me very clear that the delegates must know the general Canadian position. For instance, where does Canada stand on the two-pillar approach? It would have been of benefit to me to have had an appreciation by an expert of what exactly this resounding phrase means to Canada. Then, if I felt so inclined, I could either agree or disagree in my capacity as a parliamentarian.

After all, there are only five standing committees—political, military, economic, scientific and educational—and it seems to me that as the agenda is more or less known prior to a conference, it would be a simple matter to prepare a situation appraisal for the benefit of those participating. Canada is looked to by other nations for leadership, for knowledge and for the necessary courage to speak up in affairs of this nature. If it is to properly discharge this role, its delegates must be properly armed. I understand that this year the briefings were more extensive and more intensive than ever before but, believe me, when you get on the ground and are required to carry the burden of representing not only yourself but your country, you cannot have had enough training and/or education.

I am not aware of the budget required to send this delegation, but it seems to me that two members per committee, plus three or four leaders would be sufficient for future meetings. I would rather see budget dollars spent in back-up staff who could assist the delegates on the ground. Canada goes to considerable expense to discharge its obligations to send a worthwhile delegation and I can see no reason why it should not adequately support its delegates with expert opinion and expert help both in Canada and at the conference.

In conclusion, you will note that I have generally tried to stay within my own field, namely, the economic side of the events that took place, but I would be remiss if I did not tell you of the great impression that I received of our troops overseas, both army and air force.

I spoke to as many of them as possible and believe me I conclude that the morale is high.

They are proud to be Canadians; they are proud to be in the front line; and they are good at what they are doing.

In many ways our NATO forces receive little attention and no publicity. Perhaps this is as it should be, but it should be recorded that we have every reason to be proud of them and to support them in every way we can. They are doing their part in preserving the peace of the world, and if one needs a reminder about the ravages of war, I wish to tell you of standing at the war memorial at Verdun in France where in a period of ten months, 600,000 soldiers of Germany and France were killed and where they are still discovering bodies. Or if one needs to be reminded about the desirability of peace, one should stand at the Berlin Wall and see the quarter mile of no man's land guarded by barbed wire, planted with mines, patrolled by Soviet troops with machine guns at the ready, and searchlights in position. In every sense of the word, Berlin is a beleaguered city, an island in a "red sea" surrounded by a wall of shame.

Finally, as I have said before, I believe that NATO is at a crossroads. Its strength in a very large measure has enabled the recovery of Europe and I think that it is too early to move away from its basic premise. I hope that it will remain strong and a force to be reckoned with in maintaining the peace of the world.

**Hon. John J. Connolly (Ottawa West):** Honourable senators, having had a number of years of experience with the work of NATO parliamentarians and because of the importance which I consider this Parliament should attach to the concept of NATO, I rise to participate in this debate. I do so not as a member of the Government but rather as a member of the Senate, and in the capacity of a member of the Canadian Parliament who has attended these very important meetings.

I am sure that you have all been impressed this afternoon, as I have been, with the report we have had from Senator Aird. What strikes me, perhaps more than anything else, is that as the years have passed and Canadian parliamentarians have attended meetings of the NATO Parliamentarians' Association, we have here heard reports in greater depth as to the real meaning of the problems that are faced, reports that involve more personal involvement in looking for solutions and, I think too,