

National Security Measures

leaders of those countries to give less attention to the development of destructive weapons and put their minds more to the means enabling all the people under their rule to live and reach their full development.

It is said that two thirds of the people suffer from hunger and lack the bare necessities of life. Instead of spending so much money, taxing people and putting them to work to manufacture nuclear armaments, we should increase grants for the development of natural resources to be put at the disposal of all those claiming a right to live.

In conclusion, I shall recall comments that were published in a bulletin that Catholics find a church every Sunday. In fact, the "Sunday Missal" in 1968 reported as follows:

"We do spend \$6 billion each year for development projects, and this reluctantly. We earmark \$150 billion per year for weapons and we find that normal", said Barbara Ward concerning the 1967 budget. Since then, such expenses have increased.

Such spiralling figures are astounding. Let us simplify them: They mean that we spend 25 times as much for armaments as for development. On this planet, we make in a single day \$411 million worth of weaponry.

And this happens every day.

While in Bombay in 1964 as well as in his Encyclical on the Development of Humanity, Paul VI denounced this "unbearable scandal" and requested the establishment of a world fund that would be supported by part of the military expenses. But the race continued.

Mr. Speaker, much more attention should be given to development. We should promote the rewarding aspects of life instead of the development of means of destruction. As long as men do not decide to amend their ways, to reduce armament designed to achieve destruction or prevent aggression, we must be on our guard.

• (2:30 p.m.)

[English]

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, this is the first occasion in over one year that defence matters have been discussed in the House of Commons itself. This debate is particularly appropriate in view of developments of the last few days and headlines which have appeared in today's newspapers.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Roberts) complained that the lead-off speaker for our party, the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) had not produced a white paper for the guidance of the government. I think it is expecting rather much of an hon. member to do that in half an hour when that task has taken the government upwards of two years. The government has not succeeded in bringing that white paper forward yet. I will not outline again, as I have done several times in past years, my own views with regard to what Canada's general policy might be in this field. In the few minutes at my disposal I intend, rather, to deal with two or three specific matters, which are about all that time will allow. First, I should like to say that the present trip of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to Russia, the statements he has made there and the pro-

[Mr. Laprise.]

ocol on consultations which was signed two days ago in Moscow are all of great significance in the discussion of Canadian defence policy. The preamble to that agreement, as it appears in the appendix to yesterday's *Hansard*, is in terms to which no one can take objection. Matters such as promoting the preservation of peace, endeavouring to improve relations in the fields of economy, trade, science, technology, culture and northern development and protecting the environment of the Arctic and the subArctic areas are matters to which no exception can be taken. I think everyone will agree with that. However, when you come to the actual terms of the protocol itself, important questions arise. One wonders what will be the effect of some of the conditions laid down. I refer in particular to condition No. 3 which reads:

The provisions set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 above do not affect obligations previously assumed by the parties in respect of third states and are not directed against any of them.

One wonders whether that paragraph refers to actions which may be directed against NATO. It may be that it refers to actions on the part of Russia directed against China. I do not know. It is difficult to tell what the meaning of that is. I think we need an explanation of that paragraph.

Generally, however, I would say this: This cosying up to Russia at the present time, when one considers the implications that that may have so far as defence arrangements and the national security of Canada are concerned, could have very far reaching effects indeed. High sounding declarations such as are contained in the preamble to the protocol on consultations are all very well and sound good, I suppose, to almost everybody. However, in my view the basic facts of the world situation must be the ones that we must primarily keep in our minds. The question immediately arises, what are those basic world considerations, particularly as far as our defence and security are concerned.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the first and most important of these considerations is that the only real threat to Canadian security or to the security of all countries of the western world at present comes from the Soviet Union. That is the only real threat to our independence, security and so forth. China may be a threat in future; she is not too much of a threat at present. Since the nuclear capability and very large armed forces of the Soviet Union constitute the only real threat to the security of the western world, the inescapable conclusion is that the NATO alliance of the western world, which has been the chief deterrent to aggressive actions on the part of the Soviet Union towards western countries, must be maintained in a state of strength. Any actions which are taken—and this may be one of them—which will weaken that alliance I think are directly contrary to the interests of this country and the interests of the western world as a whole.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Harkness: I see no indication whatever that the intentions of the Soviet Union have changed. Their