

### *North-South Relations*

George Kennan talks about the stockpile of nuclear weapons, how it has proceeded steadily, relentlessly, without the faintest regard for all of the warning voices, with the result today that we have achieved in the creation of these devices—and by “we” he means the Russians and the Americans—and their means of delivery, “levels of redundancy of such grotesque dimensions as to defy rational understanding”. He continued:

I say redundancy, I know of no better way to describe it. But actually, the word is too mild. It implies that there could be levels of these weapons that would not be redundant. Personally, I doubt that there could. I question whether these devices are really weapons at all.

● (1650)

Later he states:

To my mind, the nuclear bomb is the most useless weapon ever invented. It can be employed to no rational purpose. It is not even an effective defence against itself. It is only something with which, in a moment of petulance or panic, you commit such fearful acts of destruction as no sane person would ever wish to have upon his conscience.

Then he goes on:

There are those who will agree, with a sigh, to much of what I have just said, but will point to the need for something called deterrence. This is, of course, a concept which attributes to others . . . the most fiendish and inhuman of tendencies. But all right: accepting for the sake of argument the profound iniquity of these adversaries, no one could deny, I think, that the present Soviet and American arsenals, presenting over a million times the destructive power of the Hiroshima bomb, are simply fantastically redundant to the purpose in question.

He goes on:

How have we got ourselves into this dangerous mess? Let us not confuse the question by blaming it all on our Soviet adversaries. They have, of course, their share of the blame . . . But we must remember that it has been we Americans who, at almost every step of the road, have taken the lead in the development of this sort of weaponry. It was we who first produced and tested such a device; we who were the first to raise its destructiveness to a new level with the hydrogen bomb; we who introduced the multiple warhead; we who have declined every proposal for the renunciation of the principle of “first use”; and we alone . . . who have used the weapon in anger against others, and against tens of thousands of helpless non-combatants at that.

That quotation from George Kennan I do believe is worthy of our serious consideration when we look to the possibility of Canada, and like-minded peoples and nations who want to see an end to the nuclear nightmare, operating much more independently of the great powers than we do now, powers that are so intimately involved in the nuclear nightmare. This might give us much greater leverage in promoting the really radical answer that Kennan is proposing. Kennan does not propose, by the way, just a continuation of SALT II and III. He sees them, indeed, as very limited. Indeed, SALT II is almost part of the problem. He says:

—I have . . . no illusion that negotiations of the SALT pattern . . . could ever be adequate to get us out of this hole. They are not a way of escape from the weapons race, they are an integral part of it.

He goes on to state:

I can see no way out of this dilemma other than by a bold and sweeping departure—a departure that would cut surgically through the exaggerated anxieties, the self-engendered nightmares, and the sophisticated mathematics of destruction, in which we have all been entangled over these recent years, and would permit us to move, with courage and decision, to the heart of the problem.

What he proposes is that:

—the President . . . with the Congress . . . propose to the Soviet government an immediate across-the-boards reduction by fifty per cent of the nuclear arsenals now being maintained by the two superpowers—a reduction affecting in equal measure all forms of the weapon, strategic, medium range and tactical, as well as all means of their delivery—all this to be implemented at once and without further wrangling among the experts—

He says:

Whether the balance of reduction would be precisely even—whether it could be construed to favour statistically one side or the other—would not be the question. Once we start thinking that way, we would be back on the same old fateful track that has brought us where we are today. Whatever the precise results of such a reduction, there would still be plenty of overkill left—so much so that if this first operation were successful, I would then like to see a second one put in hand to rid us of at least two thirds of what would be left.

I would like to see the Government of Canada proposing that kind of initiative, saying to the people of Canada that we are going to try more seriously, more rigorously and with fewer contradictions in our public statements, to pursue peace, security and justice, not only for ourselves, not only for other industrialized nations but, above all, since without peace there can be no life at all, for the developing world, for all other parts of the world which we want to share a larger place in the world.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[Translation]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn)—Finance—a) Price paid for treasury bills. b) Reasons for price paid; the hon. member for St. Catharines (Mr. Reid)—Employment—a) Adult academic upgrading at Niagara College. b) Reason for departmental decision; the hon. member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly)—Housing—Request for introduction of program with reasonable interest rates.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

NORTH-SOUTH RELATIONS  
REPORT OF PARLIAMENTARY TASK FORCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacGuigan: