

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

I ask, where do we go from here? How can we prevent this polarization of the world into two factions? What can we do to make sure that some money now spent on defence goes to feeding the hungry of the world? We ought to work towards the creation of a viable world community. I should like to see us withdrawing from all regional military pacts such as NATO and NORAD. If we do, Canada could become the leader of the middle powers. Our action may even prompt Warsaw pact and SEATO treaty nations to diminish their armed forces. We could be instrumental in building bridges toward understanding and communication in the world. Our action could lead to a better life for all the peoples of the world. That is the direction in which we must go if there is to be a future for us and our children.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister to consider some of these matters when talking to the President of the United States next Monday. I conclude my remarks appropriately by quoting a paragraph from a speech Senator Rabi gave. He said:

A country is more than its economic capacity or its material possessions. It has a personal, spiritual, psychological side—it is a culture.

Those of us who are teachers and close to young people know the degree to which they have been alienated by all this expenditure on military things. When they see the government putting out tremendous sums of money for military purposes, and then observe the government's reluctance to invest in the solution of domestic human problems, they see a reorientation of our national policy which they believe is turning us into a garrison state. If I have any trust in the American people, I can't believe they will stand for it much longer.

I plead with the government to re-examine our defence policy and foreign policy in general.

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) have replied to most questions that have been raised tonight by the opposition. I intend, in speaking briefly in this debate, to amplify a few points that seem to be relevant. I will speak about three matters which seem to bear upon the question raised by the leader of the New Democratic Party and that will, of course, be the subject of discussion between the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States next Monday and Tuesday.

I should like to make a few brief comments on the international strategic considerations

[Mr. Nystrom.]

flowing from the announcement of the United States and the effect on east-west relations. I shall also comment on some problems of particular concern to Canada arising from that announcement. It has been asked in this debate and outside this house whether the threat from the Soviet Union and China justifies this new defensive measure. Some speakers have apparently come to the conclusion already that it is not a justifiable measure. The Prime Minister has said very wisely that until he has had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the President of the United States he prefers to reserve judgment.

Many people are understandably concerned as to whether the decision to proceed with an A.B.M. deployment may not itself have an escalatory effect, and so lead to a disturbance of the balance of stability between the great powers without adding to world security. And this is the problem that is of concern to all of us. The Prime Minister indicated in this debate that this is the kind of question he will discuss with the president. Let me remind hon. members what the President said on this question. I think it is important that we should hear the president's explanation, even if we need to be convinced that his explanation is convincing.

● (10:20 p.m.)

The President said:

—the modified system has been designed so that its defensive intent is unmistakable... The U.S.S.R. has engaged in a build-up of its strategic forces larger than was envisaged in 1967 when the decision to deploy "Sentinel" was made.

He illustrated with the following points:

- (1) The Soviet have already deployed an A.B.M. system—
- (2) U.S.S.R. is continuing deployment of very large missiles with warheads capable of destroying (U.S.A.) hardened Minuteman forces.
- (3) U.S.S.R. has also been substantially increasing the size of its submarine launched ballistic missile force.
- (4) Soviets appear to be developing a semi-orbital nuclear weapon system.

In addition to these developments, the Chinese threat against our population, as well as danger of an accidental attack, cannot be ignored.

The President explained that the United States could have increased the number of its missiles and bombers. This, he said, would have been misinterpreted by the Soviets as an attempt to threaten their deterrent, and it would, therefore, stimulate an arms race. He chose instead the A.B.M. option.

What seems to me to be most important is what effect this proposed A.B.M. deployment