

In the difficult time since World War II, it has not been easy for the free nations to keep their freedoms intact. It has not been by chance, certainly, that this has been achieved. It has, indeed, been only because of the resolute determination of the free peoples working together toward a common end. As a partner in two great organizations looking to the maintenance of peace, the United Nations and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Canada has given abundant proof of her sincere desire to avoid war and of her active concern for the correction of conditions which might lead to war.

Despite its failure to measure up to the first high ideals it set itself, the United Nations has still helped to prevent and, at the least, to limit war. There is the historic example of Korea, where, incidentally, a small group of Canadians still serve on, the rear guard of that valiant force that fought, successfully, in the Korean war. Canadian officers also, under United Nations auspices, are today serving the cause in Indo-China, in Kashmir and in Israel.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is founded on the truth that in union there is strength. In Canada we subscribe to that truth. In stationing Canadian servicemen in France and Germany, in training aircrew from nine NATO countries here in Canada, and in welcoming United States troops to stand beside our own in defence of our common continental home, we give evidence of our conviction that, in the NATO family, a "stay at home" policy and a "visiting forces not wanted" policy have no place and, indeed, if given effect to, could endanger us all.

The great defensive system that we have built in NATO with so much labour must not be allowed to fall into disrepair. Honest assessment of the world situation tells us that we cannot safely rest on what we have done. We must go on working together for the common good with undiminished zeal and equal determination.

Despite our considerable defence expenditures, and despite our best defence endeavours, there can be, for Canadians, no such thing as absolute safety. That must be sought, not by standing alone in our defence preparations, but in the collective strength and evident capacity of the free nations to survive attack and to strike back with desperate, devastating force. For, paradoxically, it is in the awareness and abhorrence of nuclear war that we must probably look for our best defence against its breaking out . . .

Surely no one could look forward, with equanimity, to year after year of uneasy expectation of that dread day when the first H-bombs might fall. However futile our best attempts may have proved so far, we must keep on trying for disarmament. And we must come to grips with some of those central problems that have led to war: ignorance and hate, disease, privation and poverty.

For it is clearly evident—and it is on this note, and not a defence statistic, that I want to end my opening remarks to this committee—it is clearly evident that, for us and for the generations that will follow us into the wonders and hazards of this thermonuclear age, there must be some surer guarantee of peace, some less uncertain protection against disaster, than military might can hope to provide.