

*Government Orders*

quarter of a percent of saving one life in those 9,000 incidents be scrutinized again and again to its fullest.

I have spoken on the international scene and I suppose, in that sense, the likelihood of war, as we see it. I have spoken on the need for concern with NATO in Canada. I have spoken on the need to ensure that our search and rescue forces policies, dictums, methods and basings be done in such a way that under scrutiny it can be shown that there is no better way to do it, that we will have the best that money can buy.

I want to go back to the beginning of my statement with respect to the international scene and the relationship of the international scene to our defence policy right now. I look very simplistically at the defence policy as an insurance policy. If you go to a doctor and say: "Thank you doctor, I have just been told that I do not have cancer, but I still think I am going to die. I have this inscrutable pain. I do not know what is causing it. Now that you have diagnosed what it isn't, please tell me what it is", you do not on the same day run downtown or get on the telephone and tell your lawyer that you want to cancel your insurance policy because you are hedging, and that is essentially what a defence policy is.

If we have the right defence policy, we will never have to go to war. If we never have to go to war, we will not have to worry about Bill C-25 because we will not have the casualties to which great reference is made in this bill.

A defence policy is more than an insurance policy. A defence policy, no matter how it is written, no matter how long it is, how short it is, is essentially designed to do a number of things. It is designed to protect Canada, to protect Canadians here and abroad, and to protect our maritime interests, air interests and surface interests. If it is looked at in an implementation type of way, unless we have forces of any kind mobile enough to be able to be dispatched in the three dimensions of our country, be it on the land, on the sea, and in the air, our defence policy is not working.

We must bear that in mind so that we will prevent anything from happening in our country which will allow us to make a contribution to the international scene which, hopefully, will help us prevent war and the indescribable casualties that are involved. This is a terrible expression to use, Mr. Speaker, but I just made

reference 15 minutes or so ago to 100 million people in World War II.

A speaker at a conference which I attended roughly eight or nine years ago made a comment that I did not particularly like, but I found it very comparative. He said that if it were ever to happen again between the superpowers, or even not between the two superpowers, it would make World War II look like a picnic. That is a frightening statement. It is one that causes me to concern myself with how we perceive the future here in Canada.

I would hasten to add that the direction of change is not premeditated. There could be setbacks and there could be U-turns. I remind everyone about the night that we sat in this House and talked about Tiananmen Square. Mr. Gorbachev is not out of the woods. He may fall from power. There may be some reversals in the nationalistic trends that we have seen.

I am not suggesting for one minute that the Soviet Union will never again engage in military action in central Europe. But in the future it would be, perhaps, as a belligerent confronting another national army or perhaps as champion of a new European order. Who knows?

These changes happen to be centred in Europe right now, but let us not forget about the Third World and other parts of the world that do not even have to be named in this House. I think there is a minimum line that Canada could take and that it should be taking. I would certainly urge my colleague, the Minister of National Defence, as soon as he can—although I understand the difficulties he has in coming up with something at this particular point in time, but even if it is an interim policy—to give us a statement of where National Defence is going in Canada. I can assure him and his colleagues across the floor and my colleagues on this side that there are a lot of people who are confused, dismayed and whose morale is kept as high as it is only by the outstanding leadership shown by our senior military personnel and, indeed, our senior civilian personnel in the Department of National Defence, and that flows all the way through.

I think this is a fantastic bill. It talks about human dignity. It talks about human life. It talks about human rights. Who in this House is not for human rights? It is not a question of whether one is for it, but to what degree is one for it? When is one prepared to compromise something that may take a tinge away from human dignity, from human rights? When is responsibility more important than human rights? These are interesting