

intercontinental warfare. We may be an inconsequential item in democracy's armoury this time, but at least we can do those things which are within our power to do in an effort to assist those who lead the cause in which we believe or are supposed to believe.

We can contribute and we can fight to that extent. There can be no doubt that the United States of America is the champion of those things which we, as a nation, wish to preserve, individual liberty, political freedom, the rule of law and democratic government. Much legitimate criticism can be levelled at our neighbour, but surely no Canadian in his right mind can equate the United States and the Communist colossus equally in terms of Canada's interests. We may have neither the men nor the missiles to give direct assistance in battle, but there are many things we can do to help ensure that our friends and allies have the best chance possible in a showdown. One of the most important of these I suggest is to help and not hinder the United States in those measures which that country sincerely believes are essential to her and our defence.

If it were up to me, I would be in Washington today pressing the United States government to instal more of these anti-ballistic missile sites much farther north, in our northern and Arctic territory. If there must be nuclear explosions of the type suggested by some people perhaps it would be better if these explosions took place over our Arctic or even farther away over Soviet Siberia. I think that would please us in western Canada much more.

There is an unpleasant, mean-spirited theory current today in this country that we can have our cake and eat it too; that is, that we can enjoy all the benefits of having a guardian without doing anything to help him. Some promoters of this theory go even further. They would even hold his arm when it is raised to ward off a blow. This criticism of the United States defence plans is part and parcel of a new and most unsavoury national stance that Canada has adopted ever since 1963 when the present government came to power. This stance has resulted in Canada's reputation abroad hitting rock bottom.

I suggest that the recent public questioning of our relations with NATO have spread dismay and disgust among Europeans and Americans alike. We have given the appearance of wanting all the benefits of a defensive alliance without being willing to pay part of the bill. We only offend by our preaching, our "holier than thou" attitude and criticism. In

*Firing of A.B.M. Warheads over Canada*

this instance, we have not even been asked to pay anything. It seems to me that Canada will have to make up its mind whether it is pro-Communist or pro-democratic. I think we should do that soon. India and several other countries have shown the futility of trying to form a third group. We have only one choice, which is to be for or against our own history. If we are for the free world, if we stand with the western democratic nations still, then in God's name let us say so clearly, loudly and in unmistakable terms.

Our present posture of questioning and doubt can do only a disservice to our friends and a greater disservice to Canada. If we do stand with the west, then let us make up our minds to shoulder the burden and the responsibility that that stance entails. We may not like the role circumstances force upon us. We may question methods and quibble about details; but if we stand for what we say we stand for we have no choice but to go along with those who call the shots for our side by virtue of their vastly greater financial, military and political abilities and sacrifices.

● (10:50 p.m.)

If we stand with the west, then we stand with the United States. If we stand with the United States we do our part, even if this part is small and negative, amounting to nothing more than desisting from destructive criticism and petty nagging. It might be well for those who today are carping at the United States for adopting this anti-missile defence system to remember that it was the Soviet Union which set the example in this regard. It was the Soviet Union which erected a similar system around its capital and broadly hinted that additions would soon make their territory invulnerable.

I would simply ask that the critics of the action of the United States consider one question. Where would Canada be and where would those hon. members be if the Soviet Union alone was invulnerable to attack by I.C.B.M.s, and thus able to dictate terms to the free world? It may be that there are some Canadians who wish this were so, and who look for the day of a Communist triumph. They might welcome worldwide domination by the Kremlin. That would at least give some logical basis to some of the arguments and criticism we have heard in respect of United States action.

Those Canadians who sincerely wish to see national freedom and individual liberty preserved have no other choice but to stand or