

*Supply—National Defence*

I think that the efforts of the government should first be concentrated on making sure that the United Nations is strong.

No one in this chamber will deny that the United Nations is the best hope for continued world peace. All of us are aware, however, that in the charter and in the present operations of the United Nations, particularly of the Security Council, there are many cracks in the administrative machinery so that the organization does not function as well as we would like to see it function. Therefore, since the continued useful operation of that body is our most successful line of defence the government should bend its efforts to reforming, changing, modifying, and amending the United Nations Charter to make it more useful both for this country and for our friends and allies, indeed, for every country in the world.

I suppose this suggestion should be made to the Department of External Affairs since the matter probably lies within its orbit but it seems to me that questions of defence and external affairs are so bound together that I should mention it in this discussion, particularly since we are concerned with the further question of relations between states and the way in which they can be affected by the operations of our own defence policy. Every time we consider our defence policy we should consider what effect it is going to have on international affairs.

One question which has bothered me is the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. From time to time it has been debated in this chamber. For years and years it has been made a political football. When Canada accepted nuclear warheads for the Bomarc I submitted that to some extent we became a nuclear power. The Prime Minister and some members of his cabinet have denied this. I am quite aware of the arguments put forward that these are defensive weapons, that they could not by any stretch of the imagination be deemed to be offensive weapons, and therefore that in the ordinary meaning of the word we have not become a nuclear power.

Perhaps it does not have too much bearing on the case but in the proposal made the other day for a non-aggression treaty respecting the use of nuclear weapons the suggestion was made that at least there be an agreement that nuclear arms not be used against countries which possess no nuclear arms. However, I did not notice any suggestion that

such a treaty would include a provision that nuclear arms should not be used against those countries that possess no offensive nuclear weapons.

I have never been able to draw the simple distinction between offensive and defensive weapons that seems to satisfy some people when they consider these matters. Certainly I and many other people have never been satisfied that as we have a nuclear weapon that can be used in connection with the Bomarc it cannot reasonably be said that that same weapon cannot be used in a modified missile for an offensive purpose some place at some time in the future because of our limited technical knowledge.

If I have some misgivings about this matter, it can well be understood why other countries which are concerned about the proliferation of nuclear weapons should have the feeling that we are not being quite honest when we say that the Bomarcs are only defensive weapons and we have not widened the circle of countries having offensive nuclear arms. I think the only logical conclusion we can expect other countries to come to is that Canada does have nuclear weapons, that we have aided and abetted their proliferation, and that Canada's efforts at the external affairs level in assisting to stop the further spread of nuclear weapons are to say the least completely hypocritical. The question of hypocrisy with regard to nuclear weapons in Canada is, of course, not confined just to the Bomarc and to external affairs.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The hypocrisy has become more apparent every time the Bomarc has been discussed. I am quite sure that all of us will remember the discussions which took place in the house when the present government insisted there were commitments in this regard. I well recall the Prime Minister stating in answer to a question I asked on June 7, 1963, that the decision to take nuclear warheads for the Bomarc was a mistake. At that time he said that the decision which had been made even earlier was also a mistake. I am sure if it was a mistake earlier than June of 1963 it was more obviously a mistake in 1963. The Prime Minister admitted at that time that before we in this country could even get nuclear weapons it was necessary to agree to acquire Bomarcs. If anything could be more ridiculous as a facet of our defence policy than pursuing a policy admittedly a mistake