

I cannot help but think that when a motion such as was given to us this afternoon is made, there is a certain amount of anti-Americanism expressed. I do not blame my friends to the left, although I do not agree with their policies, when they say that the Americans control our industries. I am not critical of that. Nor do I blame them when they say that the Americans control our oil interests. Personally, I could not care less so long as they employ Canadian workmen, pay Canadian taxes and obey Canadian laws. But when they suggest that the Americans are wrong in trying to defend themselves; that they are wrong in employing defensive not offensive weapons, then I say, with all due respect to my friends to the left, that this is anti-Americanism which is not popular in Canada. I hope it is not popular anywhere in the whole world.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I take part in this debate with some trepidation because I cannot for one moment pretend to be an expert in the military technology of missile and nuclear warfare. I take part only as Joe Citizen who represents many other Mr. and Mrs. Joe Citizens in my constituency, who are voiceless and defenceless in matters such as the location of an A.B.M. system and who are, I submit, under-represented. They do not have enough access to information to intelligently decide what decisions they feel should be made. I suggest that this applies to many Mr. and Mrs. Joe Citizens in Canada as well as in my own riding. So, I hope that however inadequate my remarks may be I can to some degree express the feelings of ordinary Joe Citizens.

I do not know who it was who said that wars were too important to be left in the hands of generals. Personally, I have often felt appalled at the kind of statements made by generals on both sides of the Iron Curtain. They have contributed more to the continuation of hatred and mistrust among nations on both sides of the Iron Curtain than any other group of citizens in those respective societies.

I listened to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) express pleasure at the fact that this debate was allowed by you, Mr. Speaker, today. I was, therefore, a little disappointed at the comments made by a member of his party and by a member of the official opposition that this debate was a waste of time, or words to that effect. We all listened with attention to the remarks of the Prime Minister and, if I understood him correctly, he let

Firing of A.B.M. Warheads over Canada

us know that he and his government, as I inferred from his words, have not yet made up their minds on this matter. He does not wish to take a stand at this time until he is able to get more facts and more information. He will then have a free hand.

If this is the position of the Prime Minister, then I find it passing strange that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) should spend a great deal of time quoting the President of the United States and quoting statistics defending the A.B.M. system. I have a strange feeling that either a "snow" job is being done on the members of this house by the government or that there are some deep divisions within the government on the pros and cons of an A.B.M. system. I feel there are those, including the Prime Minister, who have some sincere and deep reservations about it, and there are others, including the Minister of National Defence and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), who do not have reservations about it but who support and applaud the installation of an A.B.M. system.

The Prime Minister said that we are all interested in protecting our people and our cities. I hope he was not trying to give an impression that an A.B.M. system is designed to protect our cities or, for that matter, any of the cities in the United States. I do not think he was, and if he was I hope that sometime soon he will clarify these remarks. As I understand it, the decision made by President Nixon places the A.B.M. system away from U.S. cities. The system is designed to protect their own I.C.B.M. sites and to protect their first and second strike capability. It is not designed to protect Canadian cities, and now it appears the decision has been made that it will not protect American cities. The A.B.M. system is designed to protect the U.S. offensive capability. I submit that it logically follows the A.B.M. system which is proposed is an offensive system. If so, this throws into a cocked hat the entire proposal made by President Nixon that the A.B.M. system will be for defensive purposes only.

A number of speakers tonight have said that they doubted whether the installation of this system would cause an escalation of the arms race. It seems to me there is overwhelming evidence that it will inevitably escalate the arms race no matter how small, minor or thin the system may be, it seems to me that we might assume that the Russian