

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

stood up and accepted our responsibilities. I believe all of us here are united in one concern. We believe that any further escalation should be avoided; but the crux of this whole debate tonight is that we are not talking about escalation.

If the Russians were to introduce a new system of A.B.M.'s as a result of this system of A.B.M.'s, I think it would be a stabilizing instrument for peace. If we accept the premise that these are defensive weapons, this could lessen the possibility of war. I would like to find some better answer. I think and hope that the answer might be found in Geneva by the efforts of our ambassador, Mr. Ignatieff, who has been mentioned several times tonight. I do not believe that will be simple. I think as our concern is equal in respect of peace and harmony in the world, although the way we go about things may be different, this debate has served a useful purpose in focusing the concern Canada has in respect of this problem. As our Prime Minister goes to Washington I believe the hopes of all members of this house and all people of the country will go with him. He will discuss these problems with the President of the United States with a realism and knowledge which is sometimes not available to us in matters of defence and external affairs.

Our Prime Minister goes to Washington on our behalf, as he said today, in the legitimate interests of all mankind. He can go there with his head held high on our behalf because, when the chips have been down, we have shouldered our responsibilities. I hope we never lose our sense of responsibility in this regard.

**Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour):** Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak for about two minutes because I know the hour is very late. Some excellent speeches have been made in this debate. The members are concerned about the issues of peace and war. Most members know that in the real world of 1969 we are very much involved in the fate of the world and indeed the North American continent in the future. It is a deplorable and tragic measure of our failure to establish a climate of trust and confidence that such fantastic amounts are spent by all nations, whatever their ideology, on military weapons, offensive and defensive.

One of the truly great Canadians was the founder of the C.C.F. party, J. S. Woodsworth, the member at one time for Winnipeg North Centre. This evening, as I have been listening to the debate, I have been reading the great war debates which took place in 1939. One cannot help but be moved by what was said by the late J. S. Woodsworth on that occasion. His photograph occupies a place of honour in N.D.P. halls throughout this country and for good reason.

Even this great idealist, this good man, the philosopher of the New Democratic party, which party has sponsored the resolution we have been discussing tonight, recognized that Canada's position in North America imposes certain imperatives. I shall conclude merely by quoting what J. S. Woodsworth said in 1939. On the eve of the great tragedy of the second world war he said:

Canada is situated on the North American continent. Geographically and economically we are North America. To no small extent the attitude of our great neighbour must be a determining factor in our international relations—

Then, Woodsworth said:

We have boasted of the unguarded border between ourselves and the United States, but we cannot assume too lightly that this condition will continue forever. We assume that the United States is going to be forever with us. I hope that they will always be sympathetic with us—

He went on to say:

I believe that the greatest contribution that Canada can make—

Talking about the conditions at the time, he said:

—is to maintain the most friendly possible relations with the United States.

Woodsworth's words in 1939 I think have meaning in 1969 in the context of this debate.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Pursuant to section 13 of Standing Order 26 I am satisfied that the debate has been concluded. I, therefore, declare the motion carried. This house stands adjourned until today at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2, subsection (1).

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 12.10 a.m.