

build a defensive system, we think it is better than it is, so we overbuild in order to penetrate it, and vice versa. Thus there is the real possibility that when everything is stabilized at some higher level and we are all relaxed because we have become used to it, the potential for destruction will have gone up instead of down.

This is what continuous escalation leads to. I guess there is truth in the old saying that there is nothing to fear but fear itself. It is this fear which contributes to the stockpiling of weapons throughout the world and the proliferation of arms. Worst of all, it polarizes the world community into two separate blocs as the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) mentioned.

What is the over-all effect of the A.B.M. system on national security and on world security? As I have said before, it will be to create difficulties rather than to solve them. We are proceeding on the basis of might being right, rather than in the direction in which the younger generation want to see us move. Why should there be any need for the A.B.M. system? Some would say it is required to preserve the balance of power for the protection of the United States. But whenever a balance is reached there is escalation on one side or the other. The weapons are built up, and some day someone will flip the switch and the powder keg will explode.

• (10:10 p.m.)

The United States has also introduced this A.B.M. system because it is afraid of communism and wishes to combat it this way. Third, and most important, certain industries that supply the military in the United States wish to keep the United States a military nation. May I first talk about my second point, the reason for the United States to introduce this A.B.M. system. As I said, part of the reason is fear of communism. I know hon. members opposite have interjected to the effect, "Does Russia consult us?" Of course, they do not. Russia will never consult us while the present atmosphere of distrust prevails. We ought to create some sort of understanding among the world community. We should try to avoid polarizing the world into east and west, communist and non-communist.

An hon. Member: But they have socialists in Russia.

Mr. Nystrom: That kind of remark coming from one of the hon. members for the Windsor area helps to polarize the world and keeps the world in a state of perpetual fear. That is

Firing of A.B.M. Warheads over Canada

why we are living today in a state of perpetual insecurity.

Commenting on this question, an article in the *Globe and Mail* of February 7, 1969, said the following:

—Insurance against a Chinese attack upon Canada is best provided not by its participation in any U.S. so-called 'Chinese-oriented' BMD system (deploying Spartans and Sprints in the point-defense of Greater Vancouver), not by any other military preparations. It is best provided by political measures—recognition of the People's Republic and the conclusion with its Government of a Canadian-Chinese non-aggression pact.

That is what I should like to see happen. We need to bring China into the international community, try to understand her and communicate with her. When you leave a quarter of the world's population outside the international community, you will only have trouble and insecurity in the world.

Instead of spending so much money on weapons we should be spending more money on trying to feed the hungry part of the world and upgrading their living standards. U Thant said that as long as we have hungry people and suffering in the world, we will not have peace and security. If we were hungry in this country, I am sure we, too, would be restless.

Some of our people keep saying that the Chinese are irrational and when they have sufficiently developed their new weapons they will lob them on New York or Washington. I say that we ought to understand the Chinese, bring them into the world community and consult them. Many leading congressmen and senators in the United States are now talking in this direction. They say United States defence policy ought to be revamped.

Writing in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of February 3, 1968, Air Vice Marshal Bob Cameron had the following to say:

The arguments Mr. McNamara used to oppose his military chiefs may make good theoretical sense. (I happen to agree with them.) But I very much fear that ABM defence is like many other gadgets in the shop window these days. They can be expensive, of doubtful value, and seldom required. But having been invented, they seem to sell.

That may be why the A.B.M. system is being installed in the United States. I sometimes think that maybe the end of the Viet Nam war is in sight and some industrial giants in the United States supplying military hardware may be worried about where they can earn money in future. Producing an A.B.M. system will bring them a great deal of revenue.