

tion: a region at peace in a war-torn world. I believe that it is at least probable that nuclear deterrence is responsible for the prevention of war in those regions under the nuclear umbrella, including Canada. Canadians have a duty not only to defend themselves from the cataclysm of war; they must also bear witness to the moral basis of a free society.

Lord Chalfont has spoken tellingly of a young man who took part in a demonstration on a university campus in the United States. He carried a banner on which was inscribed, "Nothing is worth dying for." This young man was a student in a university where freedom of intellectual enquiry is guaranteed; he was enjoying freedom of assembly, and freedom to express his dissenting views. He could sleep at night without fear of a midnight knock at the door. Could he have really believed that none of these things was worth fighting and dying for? Canada is blessed by peace with freedom but this country could not be what it is if Canadians were not prepared to defend those values.

The defence of what Canadians strive for cannot begin or end on our Atlantic, Pacific and Arctic shores. Canadian values are threatened farther afield. They are threatened, for example, by international terrorism; they are imperilled if the democratic values of other nations, in Western Europe and elsewhere, are under threat.

While it is difficult to arrive at reliable figures for Soviet expenditures on defence, it is clear that the *burden* of Soviet defence, relative to its overall economy, is much larger than that of Western nations. It does not seem plausible to me, given the size of Soviet conventional and nuclear forces, and the nature of their deployment, that these can be for defence alone; therefore they pose a threat to the security of democratic governments.

Does it really matter to the well-being of Canadians if other democratic nations are threatened; is our future in North America really bound up in the fate of the 'old world' for example? Could Canada be as secure if Britain were to arrive at the level of freedom of Czechoslovakia, or if France became like Poland? Democratic values that we hold dear are shared goals of our partners in the West; they are under threat everywhere when they are imperilled anywhere.

The signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty affirmed that an armed attack against one or more of them, in Europe or in North America, shall be considered an attack against them all. In the same way that the national security of all states in NATO is

threatened when one is attacked, so too are the values of all threatened. Who else could be expected to join us in the defence of our freedoms except those nations that share the same values? The loss of democratic states to Soviet influence would fundamentally alter the balance of world power and make it much more difficult for Canada to remain the sort of country Canadians want it to be. Therefore, Canadian peace with freedom is bound up with the defence of peace with freedom in Europe and elsewhere.

Canada's geographic and political situation involves us in the East/West confrontation. It obliges us to face up to the threat and take the measures necessary to defend the kind of Canada we wish this country to be.

## COLLECTIVE SECURITY

No nation is made more secure by voluntarily renouncing its defence, or by allowing others to deprive it of its sovereignty or values. Accordingly, Canada has freely chosen to combine with like-minded nations to deter the outbreak or threat of war through collective security arrangements. The defence of each is made stronger through the collective effort. A military alliance with like-minded countries offers a more effective and less costly means of defending Canada and Canadian interests than anything we could do on our own. Indeed, by contributing to the overall defence capabilities each of the participants in an alliance acquires greater flexibility in the choice of roles for its national forces; a degree of specialization is possible on the part of individual alliance members provided that the alliance capability as a whole remains complete and balanced. Canada, then, relies on the collective strength and influence of alliance to guarantee its security, as do all its partners.

These benefits require certain responsibilities. As Hans Morgenthau has pointed out, "what collective security demands of the individual nations is to fore-sake national egotisms and the national policies serving them. Collective security expects the policies of the individual nations to be inspired by the ideal of mutual assistance and a spirit of self-sacrifice which will not shrink even from the supreme sacrifice of war should it be required by that ideal."<sup>3</sup> Canada freely accepts the risks and responsibilities, along with the benefits of its collective security arrangements. The risks, responsibilities and burdens of going it alone would be much greater, and the outcome much less certain.