

*Supply*

the two super powers which have the capability to engage in such a war.

The contradiction in the minds of many people is that while the avoidance of war and the desire for peace are being espoused, the arms build-up throughout the world continues to escalate in numbers and in potency. In its simplest form, people are saying: "If you really want to live in peace, why do you carry a gun?"

The answer, in theory as well as in reality, is that those of us who want peace and security live in a world in which we are surrounded by those who carry guns and have demonstrated their desire to use them. Thus, the establishment of a competent and capable military force by a nation with an underlying wish for peace cannot be considered a contradiction. In its true sense the military force of a nation is its vehicle for security at a national level.

It may be appropriate to draw an analogy to security on more personal and better understandable levels. Police and fire departments are established to protect the individual and the community as a whole from unwanted intrusion, aggression and destruction. Businesses and homes are equipped with safety devices for the same reason. We wish to live undisturbed in peace but we equip ourselves against others who do not share our desire.

● (1740)

To live in a world where peace is a universally attained goal is certainly the ideal. Unfortunately, ideals are seldom achieved. Because of this and of the very obvious territorial and ideological ambitions of aggressor nations and individuals in the world today, to pretend that a threat to our security does not exist is pure folly.

It has been well documented that, with variations, history repeats itself, and history has clearly shown that those who, however well meaning, blindly avoid either comprehending or responding to reality are quickly and decisively destroyed by those who have the power to take advantage of the weak, weak-willed and weakly equipped.

Obviously, the solution is to remain attuned to the reality of world events and to demonstrate both the will and the capability necessary to deter the opportunistic aggressor.

A solution which is less obvious, indeed seemingly elusive, is that which would halt this senseless state of mistrust between the major superpowers, which has resulted in the alarming situation in which we find ourselves today. In their effort to establish equality of capability, each remains deeply suspicious of the other's intentions, with the result that the parity desired with respect to weapons is in continual dispute.

In simple terms, if one side has two guns and the other has three guns, the side with one gun less wants the extra gun in order to feel equal. However, the side with the extra gun objects on the grounds that the two guns possessed by its opponent can shoot a bullet farther and with more destructive force, thereby making them equal.

This simple example, when expanded to encompass the vast array and complexity of weapons and inventory of weapons by both superpowers, gives some idea of the nature of the major difficulties surrounding disarmament. While disarmament remains under discussion, the cost of continuing the arms race has reached astounding levels. An estimated \$600 billion will be spent throughout the world for arms and equipment related to the armed forces. The state of the economies of the world nations today adds greatly to the pressures.

Nations which are fighting merely to survive have difficulty to justify moneys being spent on weapons and armies dedicated to a possible fight to survive as a nation.

We are well aware of the burden placed on the American economy due to its massive defence spending. What may be less obvious, however, is the problem such spending is creating for the Soviet Union, the other superpower.

During an appearance before the standing committee, Dr. Georgi Arbatov, a director from the embassy of the U.S.S.R. in Canada, and a very high profile member of the Soviet parliament, eloquently outlined the stress that the arms race is felt even in his own country. Although there was criticism when he was invited to appear before the committee as a witness, what he said was certainly interesting and quite stimulating. I had the privilege of questioning this eminent Russian, and it is interesting to note that some of his comments appear in the committee proceedings. It would be of interest to many members in the House and to many others to read the proceedings of that particular day.

Although I do not take every word he says as gospel and may question some of his statements, I recall pointing out to him what an important person he was in the U.S.S.R. Of course, he denied this and said that he was just an ordinary citizen of the U.S.S.R.

I inquired whether he would be present at the disarmament talks which are to take place in June and July in New York. He said that he would be there but that the Soviet ambassador to the United States and the foreign minister of the U.S.S.R. would be present to state their government's policy. However, I told Mr. Arbatov that I was quite sure he would be more influential than many others due to his vast knowledge of the subject. I said, "Even though you are not saying it, you will be at the right hand of those eminent citizens of the U.S.S.R. and will certainly be coaching them". I also mentioned to him that Canada was very fortunate in its long record of never having been invaded since 1814 when we won the Canada-United States war. Mr. Arbatov replied, "Yes, you are fortunate because you have two very good neighbors." I thought that statement rather ironic.

Another interesting comment made by Mr. Arbatov was that he agreed that the arms race was a tremendous drain on the Soviet economy. I pointed out to him the amount of money being spent by the United States—some \$200 billion—as well as the fact that these figures are known worldwide, especially by the U.S.S.R., but when we try to pin point the exact figure from Russia, we only get an evasive answer. I believe he