

These big questions, which I have mentioned and which are vital for peace and security in Europe, were not decided at Rome. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom said not long ago that the Rome meeting was in a sense an intermediate meeting between the Ottawa meeting and the next meeting in Portugal. But it has become increasingly clear that we cannot postpone decisions on these matters indefinitely and we are expecting decisions to be taken at the next meeting.

I read not long ago in the New York Times an article by one of its European correspondents, Mr. Sulzberger, which very well summarizes I think the Rome meeting and the problems that faced us in the North Atlantic Organization subsequent to that meeting. Mr. Sulzberger wrote at that time:

NATO undoubtedly became aware at this Rome meeting that its development is at a very critical stage. However, the ministers proved that they could debate one another's views in what is becoming a small and select parliament—

I may say, in parenthesis, it was not so small at Rome. One of our difficulties in the North Atlantic Council is the number of people who now attend the meetings. We had between 300 and 400 at one of the meetings in Rome, and it is very difficult to conduct intimate informal discussions with that number of people in the room. Mr. Sulzberger goes on:

—and still remain friends and allies. They also recognized that there is value in the habit of getting together.

And that value is emphasized more and more the oftener we meet together. He went on:

The organization must surely have recognized that it is now in the period where it will suffer its greatest growing pains. Looking back, it can recognize the considerable achievement of the past year, in which an army with its allied headquarters has been consolidated in Europe. But looking forward, it is becoming increasingly aware of long, difficult and expensive years looming ahead for an indefinite time.

The price of liberty is rather high and every one of the twelve nations (plus Greek and Turkish observers) was surely even more aware of that truism when the Rome meeting was over. This awareness is a necessity as the past developments toward that condition of strength which, it is hoped, will finally permit the negotiation of a more real peace than exists today.

As one further step toward the goal of the negotiation of a real peace, we are today discussing a protocol which provides for membership in our North Atlantic Treaty Organization of Greece and Turkey. I said something about this matter in the House on October 22, and I do not wish to repeat what I said then. Hon. members will recall that at our North Atlantic Council meeting in Ottawa in September it was decided unanimously to take steps which would be necessary to invite Greece and Turkey to full membership in the Organization. And the protocol which we have before us, is the result of that decision taken in Ottawa.

What faces us now, before that protocol can be made effective, and before an invitation can be given to the countries in question, is its ratification. That, following a well-established constitutional practice, should receive parliamentary approval before the Government acts. It is parliamentary approval we are requesting today in the resolution before the House.

This question of the membership of Greece and Turkey in our North Atlantic Treaty Organization is the result of long and careful consideration. There were various ways by which these two countries could be associated with the defence of Western Europe, and with the defence of the Mediterranean and North Atlantic states. We examined these various ways before we decided on the solution of full membership. If we took some time in examining the alternative methods, it was not because we did not appreciate the importance of associating Turkey and Greece with our efforts in the North Atlantic Organization.