

Firing of A.B.M. Warheads over Canada

disparities in living standards and increasing discrimination. We compromise constantly in the name of efficiency.

An hon. Member: All right. Let us have some answers.

Mr. Nystrom: We talk about communication, yet we refuse to communicate. We talk about co-operation but we refuse to co-operate. We talk about the equality of man, yet we live by the law of the survival of the fittest.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), for example, talked about Canada and the United States having consulted each other for years over these questions. On the other hand, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tells us we do not have enough information because we have not been consulted. This type of thing happens constantly. For instance, in the *Ottawa Journal* of March 18 I noticed a little article which said under the heading "Nixon seeks A.B.M. talks with Russia":

President Nixon informed the 17-country disarmament conference today the United States hopes to start talks with the Soviet Union in the near future on limiting anti-ballistic missile systems.

His remarks came in a message to the first session of the talks after a seven-month recess.

As I say, there is talk about co-operation but in practice we do not find co-operation. Because of these and other contradictions in our society young people say this amounts to a betrayal not only of their generation but of people in general.

This is the situation which prompted me to take part in the debate tonight. The action we are now discussing is regressive. The A.B.M. system would increase tension in the world, it would increase polarization, it would increase the animosities of the cold war, it would increase hatred and perpetuate fear instead of promoting a sense of security and understanding. It is a betrayal because it runs counter to some of the basic principles of life; the need to understand people, to co-operate with them and to communicate. It polarizes the world, it strengthens the force of regional pacts. It destroys the bridges which have been built toward understanding and toward trying to avoid a nuclear war. It causes the nuclear build-up to escalate and makes the whole country a powder keg. I hope the Prime Minister will confirm the statement he made a few days ago to the effect that the most important issue at stake here was the peace of the world as a total entity. I hope he does so because today, as a result of advances in

[Mr. Nystrom.]

technology, economics and communications, national boundaries have lost their old significance and nations are becoming increasingly interdependent.

For reasons such as these I believe we should ask a great many basic questions when we consider the A.B.M. system. We should ask what effect this system is likely to have on the military objectives of Canada and the world. We should ask what effect it is likely to have on the security of our country and the world, what effect it is likely to have upon the creation of a saner world, upon progress toward the eradication of poverty and the promotion of understanding and concern for each other. Canada is bound to be concerned about military objectives and the military aspects of the A.B.M. system. This must be so because we are members of NORAD. For this reason I believe we should take part in consultation with the United States. After all, we have a joint security plan and for this reason it is necessary for us to communicate with our neighbours. We should also be concerned by reason of our many political and economic ties with the United States. There is, too, the fact that Canada finds herself unfortunately between the two mightiest nations in the world in terms of military power, the Soviet Union and the United States. There should, therefore, be constant communication and consultation between our two nations as long as we have a joint military and production policy.

Another aspect is that we are close to the United States border, and when that country installs A.B.M. bases on its frontier the implications are alarming. What effect would this have on civilians in Canada? I think we have yet to learn all the answers; the Minister of National Defence, the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs all seem to give us different information on this point. In my view, each of us should be concerned about the kind of choice which might be available between the A.B.M. system and NORAD. We all want to know whether this system will be integrated. We also want to know why we have been ignored in many of the preliminary consultations. In general, a system of the type proposed leads only to escalation instead of to accord and harmony. I should like to quote a paragraph from an article by Jerome Wiesner, former science advisor to President Kennedy:

We always underestimate our own capabilities and overestimate those of the other fellow. I think this is true of both sides, and it generates what I call a parallax effect. That is, if the Russians