

*NATO Foreign Ministers' Meeting*

east-west problems. Surely, the world has institutions aplenty, but what seems to me to be lacking is the will to make these institutions work with any degree of effectiveness.

Brooding over NATO must be the paradox of partnership with the cruel and repressive government of Greece and the colonial posture of Portugal, which spends its fortune not on improving domestic conditions but on continuing its colonial African empire of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea. These are issues which will not die, despite how much easier it might be if we did not have to face them. Future historians of this age may well wonder if lack of communication procedures was not, in fact, the most obvious gap in the efforts that governments make to lessen the danger of conflict and war. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if NATO ministers do nothing else during 1970 than find a technique for east and west to talk, they will have accomplished something of very great value.

The contacts the minister made in eastern Europe can only be useful. It is to be hoped that Canada will soon be able to announce the dispatch of a Canadian ambassador to Roumania. We are in the embarrassing position of having a Roumanian ambassador here, and I think it is important that we clear up this anomaly. The flood which has caused so much death and anguish in that country evoked an obvious and speedy response from Canada, both in cash and in food. We hope that the generosity of this country, and of other nations, will find its way quickly to those in need and will not be diverted, as we have some reason to believe might be happening, into state agencies for use for their own purposes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but be struck by the whimsical understatement in the one sentence in the minister's statement about his visit to Dublin: "On the way home, I paid a brief official visit to Dublin." I imagine the minister will agree that the Prime Minister of Eire has a little more on his plate just now, gracious as he would want to be to the minister, than visits from Canadian officials at this difficult time in that country.

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to welcome the minister back to Canada from his European trip. I am particularly glad that he was able to pay visits to Yugoslavia and Roumania, and perhaps I should not forget to mention Ireland. These first two countries, while they are on the other side of the so-called Iron Curtain,

can, like Canada, play a positive role in the complicated task of avoiding the disasters that would arise out of conflict in Europe or in the Middle East.

With regard to Roumania, I can only hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs was not too embarrassed that there was no Canadian ambassador in Bucharest. I remind him and the House that Roumania is an important country. It has often shown an example to the world in its courageous stance of independence in relation to the super powers. If this absence of a Canadian ambassador in Roumania is due to what has been called "Trudeau austerity," as the minister seems to have hinted, it is a senseless manifestation of it.

To me the minister's statement on NATO smacked, as usual, of perhaps too much ministerial caution. While favouring a European security conference, the ministerial statement indicated that the conference should not take place until an east-west consensus had emerged on just about everything, or until the conference had a reasonable chance of success. I suggest that such hedging about of the proposal with preconditions may well mean that it will never come about. Would it not be better to risk failure than not to try at all? We think that the western allies should show their readiness to talk about anything that might lead to an end to the dangerous, highly armed confrontation in Europe. In our view, our attitude should be positively positive.

I am pleased that the proposals for a balanced forces reduction seem to have taken a step forward. They should be pressed with vigour and dispatch.

I deeply regret the absence in the minister's statement of any reference to the NATO situation vis-à-vis Greece. The NATO charter refers to the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. These are supposed to be the keystones of the alliance. The foreign ministers of Norway and Denmark both raised the incongruity of these principles with the conduct of one of the NATO countries, namely, Greece. For two years, an iron dictatorship has held down the people of that country by torture and the denial of human rights.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Why was the minister so silent, as apparently he was, when this issue was raised? Are we to accept the suggestion that NATO is merely a military alliance? Are the words of