

peoples of the world. Einstein was right. When the lives of every individual on the face of the earth are in danger, the eyes of the world are on humanity and on peace. They are not on armaments to the extent of looking to the future in that direction. They are on reduction of armaments which must come about verifiably and realistically.

The fact that two major world powers will come together in the New Year is most significant. Hopefully it will be successful and productive. We should do everything we can as a nation respected around the world. We should talk to the other middle powers. We have an obligation to talk to the Third World and to bring pressure to bear upon the two major powers to come to an agreement and give people in this world the right to live and to raise future generations.

Human beings as a whole have not taken arms seriously until now. Until recently they did not know that the capacity to destroy the world existed. The capacity to destroy the world not only exists but without disarmament, without verifiable controls and without political will and goodwill, it could happen.

Verification is always emphasized. It is outlined in SALT I. It had limited verification through satellite and electronic devices. SALT II also had verification in part. There are limitations to verification through satellite and electronic devices to gain a reading, but electronic and satellite devices cannot survey the factory floor. They cannot penetrate the research laboratory. Verification cannot be done by science up there alone. There must be on-ground agreements as well. Verification becomes a difficult problem when it comes to a state of perfection, but it must be the major part of any disarmament agreement. Otherwise an agreement will not be worth the paper it is written on. We have seen such agreements in past history.

We have looked back today at the founding of NATO. It is now comprised of 16 countries. We should think of the great statesmen of that day, such as Mr. Acheson, Canada's own Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent and others. Contrary to some negative comments which we have heard even as early as this morning about NATO, I do not buy them, largely because of the NATO alliance, its success and diplomatic relations along the way. Because of these facts we are now in our fortieth year of world peace. All one has to do is study the last 40 years of history. I agree with what was said before, that 40 years is but a small piece of history. Nevertheless, it is an important piece of history for those who lived during those 40 years and for those who will follow hereafter. Thanks to NATO this has been possible.

I want to emphasize that NATO is indeed a peace organization. There is no one in the world who wants war. We want agreement and goodwill. We want good faith at the bargaining table. We want controls on the scientific armaments which are in place and can destroy the world many times over. That is our objective as mankind and womankind.

Many military people are condemned by some because they are military. Mr. Speaker, you and I have heard them.

Supply

Because they are military, people think they are warlike and are there to create war. Some of our military personnel are the greatest diplomats. To a degree they are politicians because they deal with people of other nations and are defenders of peace. The Pershing II missiles were to be deployed in Europe starting in 1983. Many people called that year the year of the missile. I totally disagree because in 1977 the Soviet Union placed SS-20s on and behind the demarcation line in Europe. That is what brought about an upgrading of NATO alliance missiles and the establishment of Pershing II missiles. That is still ongoing. It is not complete. As I said before, the Soviet Union has had its SS-20s in place for a long time. If we were in that position, we would be going for a 100 per cent freeze as well.

Let us look at this matter in realistic terms. Let us look at what has happened in the western world to put us in the position we are in today. The fact is that the free world has not kept pace with conventional arms. Because we have not kept pace, as a group of allies we are virtually outnumbered three to one in heavy armoured tanks on the Warsaw Pact-Nato line in Europe. That is one of the problems. We must upgrade our conventional arms in order to lower the threshold of nuclear threat. No nation on the face of the earth has the moral, political or egotistical right to hold the rest of the world up for ransom. An outright freeze without disarmament and good faith in verification is simply the signing of another piece of paper with nothing to back it up. No nation is supreme on the face of the earth, whether it be by armaments, intelligence or whatever.

I should like to say something now which has been seldom been said on the floor of the House. As we are in the middle of this debate, I think it should be said. Einstein said that the day would come when man would have to think about mankind, not about arms. We talk about supreme nations. There is only one supreme person in the world: God is supreme. We are debating this issue today and it has been debated at the United Nations. As the two major leaders—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member. He has some time left for this afternoon. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.