

## NATO

(Mr. Cadieux) can confirm this—is composed of 646 Polaris and Poseidon missiles on submarines and long-range bombers. These, combined with over 1,000 Minutemen I.C.B.M. and thousands of shorter range missiles in Europe and elsewhere, provide an arsenal of deterrents which gains nothing of significance from the proposed A.B.M. system.

Perhaps it is not necessary here to discuss the cost of the proposed system. The Americans may think they can afford billions of dollars for this purpose, though I doubt it, but that is their business. Opponents of the system have pointed out the inevitable tendency of such programs to expand. The thin system is a compromise and no more. It is almost certainly not the last word. They could go on to expand the system until, as reasonable opponents of the proposal have said, the cost could go up to \$70 billion. The system will have the effect of aggravating the arms race and making it difficult to bring the non-proliferation treaty into effect.

I suggest that what is desperately needed is an effort not only to prevent proliferation to other countries not now possessing nuclear weapons but also to cut down the existing stockpiles of destructive weapons, and here I mention the development of multiple re-entry vehicles and other new and horrendous methods of destruction which are being vastly expanded at the present time. We in Canada have approved, as has the United States, a non-proliferation treaty. This pledges us to take measures toward the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date. I say that this proposed A.B.M. system would be contrary to the intent and the spirit of that treaty.

The pretence is that the system has been designed to defend against a Chinese nuclear attack. That is still given as part of the rationale for its deployment, but even Senator Russell of the United States has said that there is nothing in this argument and that "the Chinese are not," as he says, "completely crazy." To base the system on defence against China, as being necessary against China, is not only unreal but is a contribution to that attitude of mind which perpetuates the isolation of the Chinese people to the great danger of the world as a whole.

It may be said that none of these arguments has any weight if the A.B.M. system can make a contribution to the national security of the United States or the continental security of North America. The answer is that the

system would probably make it less secure. Escalation of the arms race would result. There would be bound to be over-response on the part of the U.S.S.R. if past history is any guide, and at the end of colossal expenditures and vast and staggering costs there would be no real gain in security.

Why, then, does the American government plan to proceed with this expensive and probably useless system? I think that James Reston and other distinguished Americans have given us the clue. He has said that the anti-ballistic missile is really aimed not at all at the Chinese but at the military-industrial complex and its Congressional spokesmen. The decision made is a political compromise. Such a charge is difficult to prove, but it has been made by responsible Americans. Surely Canada can take an independent line on the basis of the merits of the matter. What is the use of talking about independence if we do not have independence of mind, if we are going to be dragged into systems of this sort for no good reason but simply as part of the on-going mad momentum of which Mr. McNamara has spoken?

I have not got time, Mr. Speaker, to go into the NORAD situation in full. But I call on the Minister of National Defence, if he is to take part in this debate, to give us an assurance that we will not proceed with vast new systems, such as AWACS, or the replenishment of systems of interceptors probably against non-existent threats of manned bombers, or get involved in any contributions to anti-ballistic systems without giving the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence a full opportunity to investigate whether there is any real threat and whether the proposed methods are necessary to the security of this country and of the United States.

I see it is almost six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I want to end my remarks by asking a number of questions and by saying that what is really at stake in this debate is whether we are going to have an independent Canadian foreign policy. It can only be independent if we take our decisions for ourselves.

The next thing I want to know is, are we going to contribute, directly or indirectly, to the escalating arms race? Are we going to devote our defence policies to useless hardware or to building a world community, without which we shall all perish?

We in this party call on the government to fill in the blanks. So far it has presented us with a policy almost entirely blank. Even