

objectives have changed. We can hope for the best, but a prudent defence must plan for the worst case.

Third, modern weapons are so sophisticated that they take many years to plan and to produce. A mistake or miscalculation now could leave us vulnerable and unprotected at a time when our potential enemies are continuing to increase their military strength.

Fourth, we are in a position to welcome the changes taking place in the Soviet Union because we know that whatever happens our defence is sure.

For nearly 40 years that remarkable organization, NATO, has kept the peace. It has done so because everyone knew that an attack on one member would be an attack on all and we would respond accordingly and because we have had an effective mix of nuclear and conventional weapons and kept them up to date.

I pay particular tribute to Canada's contribution to NATO's strength and success by the way in which she welcomes our troops to train and exercise; by the resolute manner in which she agreed to test Cruise missiles over her territory, a demonstration of resolve which was crucial at that time; and by her intention to modernize her Navy by acquiring nuclear powered submarines we very much hope from Britain.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mrs. Thatcher:** They are quite the best, and Canada must have the best.

Mr. Speaker, wars are not caused by strength or by armaments. They happen when nations are weak in the face of others who are both ambitious and strong.

Our duty is to preserve NATO's strength by constantly updating our weapons, both nuclear and conventional; by maintaining as you do highly professional and trained armed forces; and by demonstrating our united resolve.

Peace with freedom and justice is the most precious thing we have, both for our generation and for our children. That is the trust they place in us and we must not fail them.

Mr. Speaker, we always remember what lies at the very root of the differences between the Soviet system and the free world. It is a fundamentally different view of the role of the individual and his rights in society.

History has not equipped the Russian people with the capacity to escape easily from the incubus of state socialism. They know nothing of personal liberty, have never experienced an independent judiciary, and are strangers to tolerance and the checks and balances which operate in a free society.

People used to believe that dictatorships had the advantage of being more efficient and better able to act decisively than the democracies. They were wrong. Now they understand that you cannot plan and regulate everything, and that if you try,

you lose the driving force of human nature and its inventiveness and creativity.

In modern societies success depends on openness, on free discussion, and on easy access to information. We in the West could never have experienced the great surge of technological advance without them. Once you try to suppress and restrain them, then not only are you unable to change, you are unable to respond to change.

Mr. Speaker, the example of what freedom has achieved in the open societies of the West is a powerful incentive to the closed societies of the Eastern bloc to extend it to their people and to accept restraints on the power of those who rule, but the case for freedom can never be merely a material one. It is a moral crusade.

The communist societies still see human rights as something given by the state, which can be taken away by the state. For us, they are something so fundamental that they cannot be given or taken away by any Government or human agency.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Thatcher:** Those who would have us believe that speaking out about human rights runs counter to the aim of better relations play into the hands of the enemies of freedom.

As President Reagan recently said in an inspired speech in London's Guildhall immediately after the Moscow Summit: "When free peoples cease telling the truth about and to their adversaries, they cease telling the truth to themselves. In matters of state, unless the truth be spoken, it ceases to exist".

Mr. Speaker, freedom is on the offensive as never before, a peaceful offensive pursued by example and by persuasion. Its triumph is our highest ambition.

• (1140)

In taking his leave of you in 1952, Winston Churchill did not say goodbye. Rather, he said:

[*Translation*]

"Goodby, my Canadian friends. Tomorrow a splendid future awaits you."

[*English*]

It is indeed a splendid future that awaits Canada, one filled with opportunity and pride. I know that Britain and Canada will walk that road together, unswerving in our purpose, strong in our joint defence, and firm in our abiding friendship.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Guy Charbonneau (Speaker of the Senate):** Prime Minister, the Parliament of Canada takes pride in having you as one of its illustrious guests. We are delighted with the decision to welcome you every five years, until the end of this century. You will go down in history with Robert Walpole and his twenty-two tenacious years, and especially William Pitt,