

*Supply—External Affairs*

face value, before she can expect us to respond and think that her proposals are well taken and well meaning, certainly she should be prepared to grant to the peoples of the countries under her domination the right to make their own choice and the right to elect their own governments, or in other words the right to self-determination. We in this particular group believe in the self-determination of peoples. We believe that these various nations should have the right to make their own choice and to elect the kind of governments that they would prefer to have. I should just like to refer to a speech that was made by the leader of our group in Winnipeg just a short time ago. This is what he had to say with regard to the self-determination of peoples:

It is because we place such great importance upon individual liberty that we take the position that the various peoples of the earth should be free to choose whether or not they shall enjoy independence. In our Social Credit charter we declare ourselves in undivided support of moral and political principles of national independence, the sovereignty and self-government of all nations and people, which does include the Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet union. We have always championed the principle of self-determination, and we do feel that until this principle is firmly established in our international understandings and practices there can be little hope for world peace and happiness. Moreover, we Social Crediters sincerely hope that Britain and Canada and the United States and the other free nations of the world will uphold the declaration of General Dwight D. Eisenhower when he said: "We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase gain for ourselves."

We sincerely trust that the day will not be too far distant when these people who at present languish under communist domination will be able to exercise their rights as human beings and choose according to their own desires.

With regard to the analysis of the changes in the Soviet position in these particular matters, I think it would be well for us to remember the statements of some of the statesmen of our world. General Gruenther, supreme allied commander in Europe, speaking in Edinburgh on May 16—and this is as reported in the NATO letter of June 1—with regard to reductions in Soviet forces, said this:

So, from the standpoint of their effectiveness against us, the changes they have made give us no reason to change our strategy or our requirements.

And then further down:

Why the Soviets have had this tremendous force we have never been able to understand, and I feel that what they have done now is simply to come to a delayed recognition of the same type of thinking that our side has engaged in for several years.

[Mr. Patterson.]

Then finally, the last part of the last sentence:

... but as to lessening our guard, as to lessening the requirements of the forces to implement the plans that have been very carefully considered, I think it would be a very great mistake if we should come to any such conclusion now.

President Eisenhower has also made statements in the same vein. I think the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs have added their voice and have expressed the same opinions with regard to this particular matter. As we listened to the Secretary of State for External Affairs give his address this morning, the thought came to us that all of these things that he was saying have been said before, or practically all of them. We were glad to hear a clear-cut statement once again. He painted the picture as he saw it. However, I do not think he outlined clearly and definitely what is the government's policy to cope with this situation. While commending the minister for his address, I think we could criticize him in this particular respect, namely that he has not come out clearly and stated what the government was preparing to do and what its policy was with regard to meeting the situation, facing it and doing something positive about the problems which confront us right at the present time.

I have a clipping from the *Globe and Mail* of June 29 under the heading "Views of Prime Ministers Vary on Soviet New Look". This article is by Harvey Hickey, and I should like to read two paragraphs of it:

Some of the western diplomatists—and these are not confined to the commonwealth—are getting weary of conferences poised on no other basis than on what to do about something that the communist bloc has already done.

Why, they ask, are we always put in a defensive position? Why can't we do something that will provide a meeting in the Kremlin to decide what they should do about us? The questions merely underline the fact of the world situation today, namely, that the communist powers have taken the initiative and others must follow.

I think perhaps the hon. member for Winnipeg North gave expression to the same thought in different words, that the west has lost the initiative if they ever had it. Now, instead of keeping one jump ahead or at least keeping up with the Soviet, it seems as though our policy is to wait until the Soviets do something or say something or more in some direction, then we try to get together to ascertain what to do in the face of the new challenge. It would seem to me that the time has come when our government should take a very definite and pronounced position, make some definite proposals and say we believe that this is what should be done; we believe this is how it should be done, and therefore we are