

*Alleged Lack of Government Leadership*

We, of the New Democratic party, do not for one moment hide our anxiety, our concern, our deep-seated worry about the question of nuclear weapons in the world. We believe that is the most important issue facing Canada today.

**Mr. Gregoire:** After unemployment.

**Mr. Lewis:** Not after unemployment, I say to the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Gregoire), because there will be no chance for employment or unemployment if some people in this world get the opportunity to let loose some nuclear missiles. The question for mankind, whether or not questions on international affairs are such as to get votes, is the problem of nuclear weapons. I would have preferred and my colleagues would have preferred if this house had before it a clear-cut amendment which said, "In our view, we reject the idea of nuclear weapons".

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, one need not be an expert in military affairs to know that nuclear war is not the kind of war about which histories have been written in the past. Nuclear war is annihilation. We are talking about total destruction when we talk about nuclear war. I suggest—and you may call it an emotional issue if you like—this fact about nuclear war meaning total destruction, total annihilation, must be seared into our minds and into our hearts when we discuss international questions today.

I suggest to you also that one need not be an expert in military affairs to know that there is no defence in nuclear war; that there is no defence against nuclear missiles; that there is only the possibility of massive retaliation. There is only the possibility of saying to the other side, to put it in simple, every-day language, "If I go, I will take you with me." This is all the defence there is in the threat of nuclear war.

President Kennedy has said this. Premier Khrushchev has stated it. Our Prime Minister has repeated it. The Leader of the Opposition has said it. I urge this parliament, it is time we based our policies on that fact, that there is no defence against nuclear war. The fearful nightmare of a nuclear deterrent gives us some time—I do not know how long, no one knows—to find a policy that will lead an anxious world to peace. What can Canada's contribution be in that respect? It should be, in our view, a non-nuclear role in the western alliance, staying in NATO and giving our best to those with whom we are allied in this world. It will not do for any member in this house, as the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) did the other night, to shout across, "You do not believe in NATO", and think that thereby he has switched the

issue from nuclear weapons to NATO. His statement was not true. The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas), my leader, made that clear the other day in answer to a question from, I think, the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn). He said, and I repeat for our party, that we want Canada to remain a part of NATO, to remain a part of the western alliance and to make its best contribution in that alliance, a contribution with conventional forces.

Our reasons for that, Mr. Speaker, were stated by the Prime Minister the other day when he said, as reported on page 3129 of *Hansard*:

More and more the nuclear deterrent is becoming of such a nature that more nuclear arms will add nothing material to our defences.

The Prime Minister quoted the Leader of the Opposition as having said precisely the same thing on many occasions. I quote from the bottom of page 3133 of *Hansard* and the top of 3134 where the Prime Minister is referring to the Leader of the Opposition as having been reported in the *Ottawa Journal* of January 10, 1961 as follows:

Any extension of the possession of nuclear weapons under individual national control will greatly increase the danger of accidental outbreak of nuclear war and also the difficulty of achieving disarmament.

The Leader of the Opposition was reported as having said this and the report continued:

Membership in the nuclear club, therefore, should not be extended beyond the four countries which now possess such weapons... Canada cannot deny nuclear weapons to other nations and at the same time arm her own forces with them.

Then the report went on to say, according to the Prime Minister as reported on page 3134 of *Hansard*:

A new Liberal government, therefore, should not acquire, manufacture or use such weapons under separate Canadian control or under joint United States-Canadian control.

I am not quoting that for the same purpose as the Prime Minister; I am not throwing it back at the Leader of the Opposition to show he changed his mind. He had as much right to change his mind as the hon. member for Red Deer had to change his. I am quoting that to ask, Mr. Speaker, what has happened since January, 1961? The only thing that I know has happened since January, 1961, is that every military expert in the United States, including the secretary of state, the secretary of defence and the assistant secretaries of those departments have come to the conclusion that nuclear tactical weapons in NATO, in Europe, are now much more useless and dangerous. Those are the words used by Henry Kissinger. They can serve no useful purpose.