

*Supply*

It boils down to this, as I often say when referring to that party, is it the no-decision party. They do not know where they are going, and they will never know it, Mr. Speaker. They cannot know it and what better proof do you need. It is an aberration! Surely I would be the first to want to go and say tomorrow, listen, constituents from Lac-Saint-Jean, there will be no more wars. There are some people from Lac-Saint-Jean in the galleries this evening, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to greet them. There will be no more wars, no more nuclear weapons. That is all over. We are now all brothers. We will all love each other. We must not delude ourselves. We have responsibilities as a member country of NATO, one of many countries which have ensured their own defence for years and have never done otherwise, especially Canada. Everywhere Canada went as a member of NATO or the United Nations, it brought peace. I must say this because, as you know, this occurred under Liberal governments.

Of course, we had a Conservative government for nine months, but things were not going too well and it was not defeated too soon. The Canadian embassy was being moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The Arab countries were all hopping mad at us. When the Russians invaded Afghanistan, we were declaring war against them even before the Americans. We were showing the way to everyone, swords held high. There we go! Canada is coming. Here we are! That was the policy of Joe Clark, the policy of the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Fortunately, that lasted only nine months, but it was quite incoherent.

On the one hand, we have the fellow who tells us: There are no atom bombs left on earth, let us disarm Canada completely, let everyone disarm around the world because, even if the Russians rearm themselves, it cannot be a serious matter. On the other hand, we have the other group telling us: Let's go everybody, with fixed bayonets; let's go fight the Russians. Thank goodness there is a happy medium, and that medium is the Liberal Party of Canada. It happens to be there. If we did not have it, there would be problems, not only in Canada but elsewhere in the world. Things would be difficult. This matter is put to us and we are asked to vote on it. Let me tell you right now that I will vote against it for two main reasons. First, because under the cover of good intentions and with a view to tripping up the government, I would never give any authority to that party which cannot make up its mind about anything at all. And also because behind all these good intentions, the threat of a nuclear war remains. The day when we vote on and implement this proposal, the Russians will pounce on us. We would look smart. Listen, there are two very good reasons for that, and I ask my hon. colleagues of any party to be just as reasonable as we are. We are past the stage of pious wishes, we are reasonable people. We must consider not words but deeds. Canada is the country which reduced its Armed Forces from 120,000 to 80,000 troops over the past ten years. Canada is the country which had over 250 fighter planes and which will have fewer than 150 within two years. Canada is the country which

is carrying out its disarmament in a sensible fashion, to be able to defend itself and assume its responsibilities within NATO, while keeping abreast of the very advanced new developments in new and defensive weaponry. And this is how things should be, Mr. Speaker.

● (2140)

About this hope of peace on earth, I said at one point when Mr. Arbatov, from the supreme Soviet, came to testify before the committee about disarmament, that the SALT II comprehensive discussions, the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament, all strike me as sheer hypocrisy. I will give you an example: suppose you placed two individuals one in front of the other and told them: You two guys are going to kill each other, but we are going to decide what sort of weapons you will use. Maybe you will use nuclear weapons, and maybe not. Maybe you will use shotguns, and maybe not. But you have to be enemies and fire at each other. I feel that this motion proposes something like that: no more nuclear arms or tests. But people will continue to get killed, because since World War II, some 25 million men, women and children have been killed in wars, Mr. Speaker. Although Lebanon, my father's native country, has been occupied by Syria for the past six years, I have not seen a single one of those holier-than-thou doves rise and say that foreigners should get out of Lebanon. No. Thousands of Lebanese have died these last ten years, but it matters not. We see them die and we do not even bother. Go ahead and die! In the meantime we, the sanctimonious, want no nuclear bombs. We are afraid they will explode over our heads.

Mr. Speaker, one conclusion is to be drawn from a motion such as this: those people want no more nuclear arms because they are more concerned with their own safety than with global peace. Truly, global peace is certainly much more than that. As I was saying, the day someone wants to introduce a motion here dealing seriously with peace, he will have to come here and ask whether there is in this world a table at which we could have one representative from the United States stating that we are capitalists and want peace, sitting with a representative from the Soviet bloc stating that he is communist and wants to discuss peace, a table at which representatives from our countries would sit to deal with peace. Mr. Speaker, I have an anecdote to tell.

I stated in here some months ago, in a very emotional speech, that a Liberal could even be a communist. I know honorable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, members from the Progressive Conservative Party, from the constipated party, made use of this statement as far away as in their constituencies, in mailers, in partisan publicity to collect moneys. I know some of them who went as low as that. Do you know what that means? Narrow-mindedness. That is the kind of people who are responsible for wars, who say that the other fellow over