

NATO

European and United States components. I contend this is what the Prime Minister is bringing to pass with the policy he has now enunciated. We hear continued talk from some members of the government party and of the N.D.P. about the United States industrial-military complex. But I say that the industrial-military complex in the United States is ruled by a democratic government. Those same hon. members say nothing about the industrial-military complex in Russia where it is not ruled by a democratic process but rather where it is a law unto itself.

We need to remind ourselves that Khrushchev no longer rules in the Kremlin. The present rulers of the Kremlin are all older men trained under Stalin, men who have obviously reverted to a Stalinistic policy which, under Khrushchev, had perhaps begun to change. There is no evidence in modern history that the communists have ever been ready to talk in face of weakness. On the other hand, that there is plenty of evidence that they do talk in face of strength. What happened in Czechoslovakia is clear evidence that the Soviets will use brute force whenever they can get away with it. This is why the conventional role of military equipment has not yet seen its day in Europe. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. The NATO alliance is just as necessary today on the military side as it was in 1949.

We are asked now to accept the views of a man who has been entrusted with the great responsibility of the office of Prime Minister but who holds a pre-conceived idea of the world based on a doctrinaire ideology that the U.S.S.R. is mellowing, that there is no longer any danger of confrontation. Well, Mr. Speaker, the United Kingdom minister of defence told the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence that this was an ideological perch. He urged that the committee come down from that ideological perch and face the facts.

The Hon. Mr. Denis Healey said that the practical reality of life was that the basis of security and peace in Europe still depended upon a strong NATO. The day might come, he added, when de-escalation of the military aspect would be possible, and Britain would welcome it when it came, but under the present leadership and policies of the U.S.S.R. it was not yet a reality.

I would remind members of the New Democratic party, including the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), that the

labour-socialist government in the United Kingdom, which they claim to be a party similar to their own, made it very clear that the policy advocated by the N.D.P. in this country was wrong. Today Britain is increasing its commitment to NATO in response to the situation which exists at the present time.

The Prime Minister said yesterday that those who criticize his policy as being isolationist have a fixation on old wars and old problems. I say to the Prime Minister that he is altogether wrong in this assumption. It is he who lives in a dream world, refusing to face the facts of life in 1969. His philosophy is not new. He promulgated it when he was part of the Peace Research Institute a few years ago. Chamberlain did the same in 1938. The only people he pleases are the bitter isolationists in the United States and those who smirk behind the curtains. Certainly he is not pleasing the Canadian people.

• (5:20 p.m.)

On December 1, 1968, the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion revealed that 64 per cent of the Canadian people believed that Canadian troops should continue to stay in Europe as part of the NATO forces. No wonder the government is split on this issue. The consensus of government members on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence was that we should continue to play our part in NATO. This difference of opinion caused Senator Aird to resign. He refused to accept the kind of policies being advocated at present. No wonder the government is split in this regard.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the Prime Minister. For one who took the position during world war II that the war was being fought between the imperialists and had nothing to do with Canada, and who in the years following world war II took another, well known position it must now be extremely difficult to enunciate a realistic defence policy. I do not believe the leader of our nation has the right to formulate a minority policy which would mean a breaking away of Canadian foreign policy from that of our friends and allies. Neither has he the right to discuss and formulate defence policies which are out of context with what is going on today in the world.

The Prime Minister talked about Canada withdrawing to a continental role and of his hope that Canada will lead in the field of disarmament research. I ask, what has the 17-nation United Nations commission on