

of national defence, now Minister of Transport, knows better. As long ago as March of 1964 the minister referred in a white paper to the diminishing threat of the manned bomber.

In 1966, less than three years ago, as I indicated to the house last week, Mr. McNamara said that our anti-bomber defence was vulnerable to missile attack, that the threat of manned bombers had never developed as anticipated and, to use Mr. McNamara's own words, "without an unattainable A.B.M. system no air defence system could provide significant damage limiting capabilities". The damage limiting capability is the only purpose there could possibly be for any air defence system. I suggest that if it is impossible to provide such a system without the installation of an A.B.M. system, which Mr. McNamara says is unattainable, what he is saying in plain English is that the system is a waste of money and cannot perform the purpose for which it is designed. If this is so, who is irresponsible, the person who questions this useless waste of money or the government which is about to saddle the Canadian people with it without even a statement to parliament or an adequate debate on the subject? The minister of course, tries to cover up the matter by misrepresenting his critics. He suggests that those who oppose this anti-bomber system are thereby opposed to any contribution to the air defence of North America or any co-operation with the United States of America. Let me ask if there is any reasonable person who is opposing any form of air defence or co-operation with the United States of America? There is, of course, no one who does so. The critics of the anti-bomber defence system do not say that Canada should not contribute to the surveillance of the air space of North America. We do not say, if there is any reason to do so, that it should not be done in co-operation with the United States.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The minister suggests that to protect Canadian sovereignty it is necessary that Canada should participate in this United States anti-bomber defence. But if there is no real bomber threat—and it is to this that I direct the attention of the minister—what has an expensive system to repel it got to do with Canadian sovereignty? The precise reverse is true. If Canada is to be a genuinely sovereign nation then she must question for herself and use her own judgment as to the utility of proposed defensive systems and she must be

#### *Supply—External Affairs*

prepared to refuse to accept blindly the judgment of the Pentagon. This we must do if we are to have a true understanding of Canadian sovereignty and not merely accept systems of this sort at the request of others.

But the all-important issue in international affairs today is not NORAD; it is Viet Nam. I want to discuss Canada's responsibility in regard to Viet Nam. There is perhaps one aspect of this tragic situation from which we can draw some comfort. It is that television and modern means of communication have brought the horror and futility of war closer to the minds and hearts of people all over the world than ever before. All over the world today people are discussing with deep concern the war in Viet Nam. Out of this concern I believe there is growing, and it will grow especially among the younger generation, a new determination to abolish war as an institution, a new realization that in the nuclear world we must construct a world community or perish. Perhaps that is a Utopian aspiration. Let us concentrate instead on the immediate problems of the war in Viet Nam, because if we do not end that war there will not be much future for the human race to speculate about.

We have been absorbed in this house in the last few weeks in the discussion of economic and financial affairs. There are some who are bored when we insist on discussing Viet Nam. Yet today, quite apart from historical questions, quite apart from the individual agony of those who are dying, quite apart from the threat to world peace, the very financial crisis we have been discussing, which is faced by the whole western world, finds its roots in the enormous waste of resources in Viet Nam on the part of the world's wealthiest nation.

The Minister of Finance reminded us of this the other day. I say to this committee that the struggle in the jungles, swamps and mountains of that remote nation in southeast Asia is closely linked with the destiny of all of us. We in this party have therefore no apology to make for the fact that for many years we have through continuous questions and interventions in debate tried to keep to the fore what we think is Canada's responsibility in connection with the war.

This tragic, barbarous war goes on in the name of the defence of freedom of a nation from the threat of communism. The people of that nation are being destroyed by the tremendous weight of fire power. Their way of life is being corrupted and ruined. Although