

NATO

NATO countries. I suggest that the Prime Minister has weakened the prospect and perhaps postponed the détente by embarrassing NATO and by placing it in a position where it would have a somewhat weaker negotiating hand if it entered now into discussions with the Warsaw Pact countries.

I am not merely talking of the troops we are withdrawing, which are perhaps marginal in the over-all picture. I am also talking of the psychological damage done to the alliance. Six years ago the right hon. Mr. Pearson put it in this way:

Today, defence policy is based more on the inter-dependence, than the independence, of nations. No country can defend itself alone. The only security, especially for a country like Canada, lies in collective action through a defensive alliance such as NATO, which rests, or should rest, in so far as its military side is concerned, on a pooling of strength.

Canada . . . must do nothing to weaken continental or NATO collective policy and action, while insisting that this requires full and continuous consultation between partners. Otherwise the defence coalition will not survive and the defence policies of its members will go their separate ways, along with their foreign policies.

To the extent that the alliance to which we belong is broadly based, there is somewhat less risk of a unilateral confrontation between the two major powers.

• (4:00 p.m.)

It is surely in the interest of Canada to strengthen the NATO alliance rather than increase emphasis on some concept of preserving Canadian sovereignty in a system of North American defence. Analogies are dangerous, of course, but I suggest we should be delighted, if we were not so dependent on the United States economy to have involved with us in an act of alliance a number of countries so that we would not be in bed alone with that big elephant the Prime Minister does not enjoy sleeping with. These and other advantages of NATO justify the continued expenditure of Canadian funds to maintain this Canadian commitment.

I suggest that no alternative the Prime Minister has put forward is credible. No alternative which he put forward in connection with the five goals he has established is credible. We know a committee of the House of Commons found that the role of Canada in NATO ought to be maintained. Certainly there is always room for discussion and improvement. NATO is not perfect; I do not know of any perfect institution in the world, Mr. Speaker, not even the Liberal party.

We could be neutral of course, and unaligned. The Prime Minister has properly

rejected neutrality as a policy for Canada. But if we choose, as the Prime Minister says we have chosen, to reject neutralism and belong to alliances, why does the right hon. gentleman wish to downgrade the broader alliance and bring us into more intimate association with a continental partnership, and to do so probably at a greater financial cost and at the cost of some influence in a broader sphere? At this point we come face to face with the truth about the Prime Minister's philosophy in this regard. His concept is that of a "fortress America". It contains two ideas which most Canadians long ago rejected—isolationism and continentalism.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: During the election campaign the Prime Minister spoke grandly of abolishing concepts of foreign policy which were 20 years old. He returned to the same theme today. Who would have thought he would try to replace those 20-year old concepts with concepts which are 40 years old or more?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: To younger people especially, who expected imagination and creative new leadership from the Prime Minister, the disappointment is nowhere greater than in the area of foreign policy. The right hon. gentleman uttered a monotonous series of legalisms to avoid any effective role in assisting in connection with Biafra. At the Commonwealth Conference, Canada played the most insignificant role it ever has in the history of that organization. Now, in the words of Professor Peyton Lyon, the Prime Minister and I quote:

—has repudiated the best in our diplomatic tradition and revived the most shortsighted and shabby. His invocation to worship at the shrine of national sovereignty is nothing less than a call to return to the self-centred and ultimately disastrous isolationism of the inter-war period.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I remember that period, Mr. Speaker, and so does the Prime Minister. This is a philosophy which is illiberal and reactionary and therefore, seconded by my friend, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting the words "the Government's policy of," and by deleting everything after the word "and", and adding the following:

"strongly condemns the retreat from internationalism to isolationism contained in the Prime Minister's statement of April 3 and his speech of April 12."