

we may have owing to the obsolescence of our equipment is largely compensated by the ability and professionalism of the men and women in our Armed Forces.

[English]

I would like to congratulate the members of the committee. Despite some divergent views, they displayed a good example of democracy in the hearing of witnesses and worked as hard as possible.

I decided to speak on this motion because I feel directly implicated in it, not because of the content or the repercussion that such a resolution could well have on the future of this country, and I would say the future of this planet, if it were adopted, but because I care for the survival of my children and of future generations.

I will try to put forward my view in a most objective way and with the greatest possible understanding for those who do not share my views. I am one of the lucky ones who managed to live through the last war. As you know, I was a bomber pilot. I served in England for nearly two years. Then I was shot down and spent two years in concentration camps in Germany, Russia and Poland. I know from bitter experience all the reasons for hating war and I know all the horrors of war.

When I heard the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) talking about the horrors of a nuclear war, I assure you I was not scared. At the same time, I know the other side of the coin. I hope, however, that we will never again have to experience the horrors of any kind of war.

I do not say that for my personal benefit for there are many thousands of Canadians who have done the same and even more than I have done. I am thinking of the ones who have given their lives because of the naivete of some well-meaning politicians like Mr. Daladier, certainly a good socialist, as well as Mr. Chamberlain in 1938.

They succumbed to the temptation of wishing to evade the aggressor, by giving up or making concessions. It is what I would call submission. In recent history, it was called the spirit of Munich. Daladier and Chamberlain were not betraying their people. They were only doing that which any good democrat would do, that is abide by what they thought was the wish of their people.

Today these demonstrators who parade in the streets singing the same slogan are the successors, or *les héritiers*, of those who were frenetically applauding Chamberlain's return from Munich.

It was a pity at the time to see these gullible people thinking that that kind of disarmament was reassuring, not knowing that it was condemning them. These poor leaders who, to preserve still several short months of confidence from their people, were in fact hiding the reality and their concerns. It was accepted with ease that some friendly country had to be sacrificed to appease the appetite of that dictator at the time.

Then they were reassured by the declarations of specialists or by telegrams from ambassadors affirming in chorus that Mr. Hitler would be thrown out of power because of the bankruptcy of the German economy. They were showing to the dictator their unarmed hands to reassure their aggressor and take away, they were hoping, all of its reflexes of fear and

Supply

aggression. What a farce when we know what followed! I feel, however, that there are some who are following this same process these days using the same words and with the same intentions to make the same error.

[Translation]

In 1938 in Munich, Chamberlain and Daladier wanted peace at any cost. By advocating disarmament, they condemned the nations of the world to a war that was postponed only one year. They were hiding the facts. We must not fall in the same trap. That is why NATO has a bipolar policy, which aims at strengthening our defence and making every effort to negotiate bilateral disarmament. It is reassuring to speak about world disarmament, but it must occur on both sides. Unilateral disarmament without reasonable parity would be equivalent to nothing but surrender and capitulation. While our sociocapitalistic system is not perfect, I still prefer it to the sociocommunist regime because we have much greater freedoms and rights than any other country. The temptation of wanting to escape the aggressor by yielding to him denotes a spirit of submission that I do not accept.

[English]

Following those remarks, I should thank the leader of the New Democratic Party for presenting this motion to the House for debate today. It underlines to the Canadian people the distinct lack of realism possessed by that party on all these matters, their lack of realism in spite of all the facts.

• (2010)

This debate provides us, on the government side, with an opportunity to present to the Canadian people the realistic facts upon which our current defence posture and that of our allies in the western alliance rests.

The NDP members appear to be united in their support of this motion, this motion that reflects a minority of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. If this is indeed the case, then I am puzzled; I hope that we will hear clearly, one day soon, their full policy with respect to NATO, North American defence, and even the defence of their own country.

It is important to point out that we are debating today a motion based on the minority report of the SCEAND Committee which examined Canada's security and disarmament policy. Fully 80 per cent of the members of that committee agreed with the final report, a report that was prepared after a month and a half of extensive hearings—hearings at which numerous, well-known witnesses, representing a wide spectrum of views, were heard. This motion suggests that the NDP is not pleased with the report of their peers. Since this is the case, it is important to recall for them some of the evidence presented therein.

Last week, every member of the House of Commons, as well as every member of the other place, received a copy of the letter that I sent to the hundreds of Canadians who had