

rational language when making his remarks this evening, although I firmly believe if he made any points they were somewhat vague. On the other hand, the Secretary of State of External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) delivered to this house this evening a sincere and blunt address. After having listened to his predecessor for many years, Mr. Speaker, it was rather refreshing to hear a clear expression of concern in respect of the issue being discussed.

On March 17, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) asked a question of the Prime Minister in the following terms:

I should like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether his government has studied the decision by the President of the United States to build an anti-missile defence system and if the government of Canada has considered the possible implications for Canada of the President's decision?

The Prime Minister replied that the matter was under consideration and he was not able to make any firm decision on this point. The Leader of the Opposition then asked a supplementary question:

—is the Prime Minister free to tell the house whether the government of the United States consulted the government of Canada on this matter and whether Canada made any representations to the United States in this regard?

The Leader of the Opposition was concerned whether actual deliberation or discussion in respect of this matter had in fact taken place. We were told this afternoon by a member of the cabinet that discussions had not taken place. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) stated earlier this evening that this matter had been under discussion for approximately 10 years. No one has suggested that the A.B.M. systems were weapons of aggression. They are merely weapons of defence. I hope that the Prime Minister will take a positive position on Monday and Tuesday of next week. I wish him well in his deliberations in Washington.

I listened with a great interest, Mr. Speaker, when members of the N.D.P. spoke earlier this evening. I feel there is a great misunderstanding in that party with regard to the issue under discussion. I am not sure they understood what their motion was about this afternoon. The real issue under discussion is whether we want defensive weapons, not offensive weapons. We are not suggesting that we are going to acquire offensive weapons of any nature. We are discussing whether we are going to allow the United States to use

Firing of A.B.M. Warheads over Canada
ground and air space for installation of A.B.M.'s for self-preservation.

I listened with interest to the young member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom). He described his generation as the generation born after the depression of 1935 and indeed after the last war. He described them as a bunch of gutless homo-sapiens, who could not or did not care to look after themselves. I do not believe that, Mr. Speaker, because I have four young sons who I am sure would defend this country.

Mr. Gilbert: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am certain that the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville did not use those words. I am sure the hon. member misunderstood and will be glad to withdraw them.

Mr. Skoreyko: I do not see any point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The inference was in his remarks. He could not agree with the decision of the government to take any steps to protect the nation. After all, who were the "reds" to be worried about? The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville seems to adopt the attitude seen in the Yorkville district of Toronto of simply disarming. If an enemy happens to strike, turn the other cheek. The hon. member says, withdraw. He says, "Let's get out of NATO and NORAD. Forget about our defences. If we are helpless militarily, nobody is going to bother us." What kind of reasoning is that? I understand the hon. member is in the teaching profession. If he recalls his history, he will know that militarily adequate countries are no longer in existence.

The leader of that party made the usual speech. He has jumped from policy to policy, riding to riding, and I hope some day he will jump from country to country. I agree with the principle of non-proliferation talks and with the initiative of disarmament talks. Who in this house would suggest that we disarm first and then try to negotiate world peace? It is like walking into a bear pit without a gun.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) stated this evening the A.B.M. installations might contribute to some degree to nuclear world balance. I agree with that principle. Shortly after the last election, the Prime Minister told the people of Canada on a national television broadcast that Canada's participation in NATO and NORAD would be reviewed. A committee of the house is now in Europe visiting the installations. I hope they will visit NORAD at the same time. It is reasonable to assume that upon its return this