

National Security Measures

In the United States this week there was a motion by Senator Mansfield, which was defeated, which called for a cutback of U.S. troop commitment in Europe. We see a continuation of the war in Indochina and a continuation of the burden of poverty and starvation in many countries. People of my generation are challenging some of the fundamental and traditional beliefs that this society has practised for so many years. However, we do not seem to get many answers.

We seem to live in a world that is more interested in money and in trying to kill each other than in spending money for peaceful means of developing the world around us. We are now in a new age and need new solutions to old problems, but instead we rely on old solutions. We have a world community which is really a community of anarchy. We live by the balance of terror. If you have a big bomb on one side, you must have a bigger one on the other side as a deterrent. This is the goal and objective that all of us seem to pursue, instead of pursuing the goals of reducing tension and trying to disarm.

We live by the philosophy of the law of the jungle and survival of the fittest. This is the kind of thing we cannot risk in this world of sophisticated weapons. We live by the philosophy: My country, right or wrong. But if everybody lives by that philosophy the result is likely to be devastating.

We must have a new approach, not only in Canada but around the world. When I see a motion like the one before us, I am disappointed, when so many people around the world are trying to reach better understanding. Here we have a Conservative party which is saying, "We should escalate tensions and spend more money on defence, more on NATO and such organizations". I suggest that we should do exactly the opposite, Mr. Speaker. As a middle power nation, Canada should lead the way in trying to make this a better world.

What should be Canada's role? Have our interests changed? I think they have changed considerably in the last 20 years. I think the scene of activity has shifted away from Europe to the undeveloped countries of the third world. We have seen the growing gap between the have and have-not countries of this world, and we have not seen as much emphasis on international development as we should have. Canada should take the lead in many of these areas, as a respected middle power and a nation trusted by many peoples of different ideologies. I do not see things as black and white as do some Tories. I think there is a central ground, and Canada can lead the middle power nations in pursuing goals with countries such as Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania and Zambia.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I think Canada could make a real contribution if we joined some of these other countries in seeking a third way toward peace and international development. You see more and more of this happening among nations of the third world. I hope that Canada can take the lead in that area, instead of dragging behind. That is why I welcome what the Prime Minister has done in the Soviet

[Mr. Nystrom.]

Union. That is why I welcome our diplomatic recognition of China. We ought to be doing things like these, but at an even faster rate.

Secondly, I think that Canada should concentrate on strengthening the United Nations as an international body, instead of putting so much effort into NATO, NORAD and other regional military pacts. I know that my colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), spent several minutes talking about NORAD. I will not repeat what he said. I agree that NORAD is not only obsolete but that it detracts from world security and prevents or deters the possibility of peace. By contributing to NORAD we are building up tensions instead of de-escalating them. We could save all that money and spend it much more constructively, as others have suggested, on the world community if we did not spend it on defence pacts or in supporting regional organizations.

I am one of those—and the group is growing ever larger—who believe that Canada should withdraw from NATO immediately. For many years NATO has been strictly a military alliance which has been dominated by the United States in a way similar to that in which the Warsaw pact has been dominated by the Soviet Union. If Canada is to pursue an independent foreign policy, we must get out of NATO; otherwise we shall not be able to develop the position that we ought to enjoy in the world community.

On looking at some of the objectives of the NATO alliance, I think it is rather ironic to see that one of its basic objectives is the strengthening and safeguarding of democracy by embracing such authoritarian régimes. alliance there are countries like Greece and Portugal which are autocratic and authoritarian, which are not democratic and which do not have elected parliaments. If that is what NATO is all about, I do not want any part of it for Canada. You cannot save, preserve or develop democracy by embracing such authoritarian régimes. Those countries are in NATO, and that is another reason why we can make a more effective contribution to world peace and development by getting out of this regional organization.

Thirdly, I think that NATO today only increases world tensions. It only polarizes the world community. If Canada were to withdraw from that organization, we could contribute to a de-escalation of tensions both in NATO countries and in Warsaw pact countries. I think that Canada should take the lead here. I am happy that we have de-escalated our role in NATO. We should go all the way and get out altogether. That is one of the greatest contributions we could make to world peace and development.

Mr. Aiken: Surely the hon. member does not believe that.

Mr. Nystrom: I believe that, although I am not surprised that the hon. member of the Conservative party does not. His party is so out of touch with the realities of the world around us that it has put on the order paper a motion such as the one we are discussing.