

*External Affairs*

Two ideologies, however, were growing up in Europe, both as far apart as the north pole from the south pole. One was national socialism, which we called nazism, and the other, the dictatorship of the proletariat, or in common language communism. These two ideologies were born and grew up after the first world war, and had nothing in common. At least, they did have this in common: they hated democracy. They had a thirst for world conquest, and both believed in totalitarianism, or rule by dictatorship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened? Those two ideologies, those two forces, could not exist or live side by side without a conflict springing up sooner or later. In particular, that thirst for world domination by nazism threw the world into the second world war. Hitler and Mussolini rang the death knell of the league of nations, and thus the first effort by humanity to outlaw war and to settle differences between nations by means of negotiation, some form of collective bargaining, ended.

What happened in the second world war? Democracy destroyed nazism but thereby saved communism. It saved that totalitarian ideology which since the end of the second world war has been a direct threat to our very existence.

In 1945, as everyone knows, the second world war ended. The heads of state met in San Francisco and the United Nations came into being. The United Nations set out certain principles for the maintenance of international peace, to develop friendly relations between nations and to achieve international co-operation. What lofty ideals. The western democracies thought that peace was within their grasp at last. But lo and behold, communism, like a prairie fire, spread over eastern and central Europe, and on to western Europe to over 100 miles west of Berlin. Peoples who had gained their freedom after the first world war lost their independence. Democracy was burned at the stake. Christian culture and civilization was destroyed by this flood which threatened to inundate the whole of western Europe.

Less than four years after the end of the last war, NATO was born. Red propaganda accuses us of organizing NATO for aggressive purposes. We all know that NATO was a defensive alliance of 15 nations which had banded together to stop this onslaught, to stop this ungodly advance of dictatorship. What have we seen since? NATO has checked that advance. NATO has proved a sufficient deterrent to further aggression against western democracy.

Our defence budgets went up. We had to re-arm, although we had demobilized our

[Mr. Mandziuk.]

forces after the second world war. The result is that we have experienced what is termed the cold war; just as dangerous, just as expensive and just as frustrating.

After NATO was organized—and Canada contributed her full share in support of that organization—we found there was a gap in the north where danger lurked because of man's conquest of space. We found we were defenseless in that particular region. We felt that danger, and so did the United States, and the two countries decided that they must do something about it and do it in a hurry. Therefore defences were planned and the D.E.W. line was built. Mistakes were made, but both of us decided to share in this defence project together. We cannot state the matter more frankly than did the Prime Minister when he spoke in the commencement exercises at Michigan State University on June 10. Here are his exact words:

Canada by herself cannot provide adequate defence in a modern war. Each is needed to the other. Indeed the U.S.A. strong and powerful and carrying a mandate to all parts of the world, the hope of freedom to mankind, cannot on the North American continent defend itself effectively without Canadian co-operation and without defence facilities on Canadian territories.

The Prime Minister went on to say further:

Close relationship, geographically, socially and ideologically makes it natural that we join together, for each of us has a common heritage of freedom and common aspirations for peace.

There is no need to fool ourselves. Even a child of school age knows that the United States can afford to equip her forces with a great variety of weapons to meet a diversified attack, while Canada cannot hope to be able to afford the fantastic cost of modern weapons. Air defence weapons, particularly, are very expensive. On the other hand, the United States can afford to carry out expensive tests and experiments. We cannot afford that luxury.

After 15 years of the cold war Canada, like the rest of the world, has grown tired of fighting this war, tired of the uncertainty, tired of the threats of war. That is not the state of the world which the fathers of the United Nations charter had envisaged when they met in San Francisco in 1945. So when Mr. Khrushchev made his peace proposal in the latter part of 1959 it was met with great interest by the whole world. Reactions were varied. Responses were varied. But that word "peace" sounded sweet to our ears even though it came from a man who, like his predecessor, had held the world in a state of jitters for years, a man whose name caused shivers in the spines of every free man. A few people found it hard to believe, and a few are still doubtful about the sincerity of those offers of peace. More surprising is