

Nuclear Armaments

cost in the world today, would be a profound concern to the world community.

Evidently, we must bring to the attention of the Hon. Member for Leeds—Grenville that while the cost of arms 20 years ago was in the range of \$30 billion, it is now well over \$300 billion, and it is estimated at even \$500 billion. Would the Hon. Member like to compare the cost of the referendum about which she expressed concern with the yearly cost of arms?

Would the Hon. Member still believe that because of the cost of that type of mobilization of public opinion, which is what a referendum basically is, it should not be attempted in order to generate the pressure which is needed to be put upon the politicians who make those important decisions to be convinced and alerted to the fact that public opinion in Canada and elsewhere does wish to move in the direction of a global nuclear free zone? That is basically the sense of a referendum.

Of course, it would be well beyond the scope of holding it in only one nation. As it has been advanced by Project Ploughshares on a number of occasions over the past few years, it would not only take place in municipalities and provinces across the nation, but it would take place in every nation where a concept of declaring the world nuclear arms free is extremely desirable.

I would like to take the Hon. Member for Leeds—Grenville through the text of a book written 20 years go by former Prime Minister Lester Pearson, and in particular to the chapter entitled "The balance of fear", and his image of a meeting of an austere ostrich. It states:

'An austere ostrich of awesome authority was lecturing younger ostriches one day on the superiority of their species to all other species'.

These are the first words of one of James Thurber's *Fables for our Time*, about a conference of ostriches called to find out why they could not fly. One impatient young ostrich, Oliver by name, was complaining bitterly that while man, an animal, could fly sitting down, ostriches, birds, couldn't fly at all.

An old ostrich looked severely at Oliver, first with one eye and then with the other. 'Man is flying too fast for a world that is round,' he said. 'Soon he will catch up with himself in a great rear-end collision, and man will never know that what hit man from behind was man.'

In his book entitled *Peace in the Family of Man*, Lester Pearson concluded:

So far, we've avoided this rear-end collision, but we shouldn't be too complacent about our escape.

In particular, the ending of the speech of the Hon. Member for Leeds—Grenville was complacent in stating that we should not entertain such thoughts of a referendum because it is too expensive.

In addressing the motion and its merit, for which we should be grateful to the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young), one has to reflect that there is a lot of fear in the world community and in Canada about the potential of a nuclear war. The knowledge is that without changes in the international society, this fear will be with us for some time. This is what motivates

the public to express the notion that we should have and want to have areas or zones in the world that ought to be declared nuclear free. It is a legitimate understanding, and this is why politicians eventually put this type of motion on the Order Paper.

The question that one should ask is, how far would such a measure proposed by the Hon. Member for Beaches influence other nations in doing the same, particularly the most powerful ones that are engaged in this deadly race for weapons paralleled by attempts to control the arsenal of nuclear powers, and hopefully to reduce them?

There are a number of considerations that must be made in this respect. As Lester Pearson stated in *Peace in the Family of Man*, we must aim at the major objective of limiting armaments by progressive stages, beginning with a freeze on existing levels and categories of weapons, with a prohibition of the testing of new weapons, enforced by international control and inspection, and then a ban on the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems.

Much could be said on those items in any debate, but let us not forget that in the end what will bring about any of those three steps that I outlined would be the re-establishment of a dialogue between East and West and putting on track again the good old word that has disappeared from the diplomatic dictionary in recent years, namely, the word "détente". In the end that is what will bring some type of mutual confidence that must be at the base of nuclear disarmament in the world. As Mr. Pearson observed 20 years ago:

There are people in the Kremlin, and no doubt in the Pentagon, who believe in military power as an agent of the wrong kind of persuasion: not as something from which you negotiate for accommodation, but as something to be used as a threat to bring about the achievement of a political objective.

This influence shows itself in another way, which General Eisenhower went out of his way to refer to in his last broadcast as President of the United States: 'We have been compelled,' he said, 'to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions . . . This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience . . . In the councils of government we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes.'

President Eisenhower was in a good position to know that a military-industrial complex of this kind can influence, and may increasingly seek to influence, national policy.

Mr. Pearson concluded:

Even if we believe that the Russian fear of a threat from outside its borders is basically a paranoiac fear, we ought to understand that from their point of view it is not baseless.

Somehow we have got to persuade the Russians and their friends that with common fears we also have common interests; that the greatest of all common interests is the avoidance of war, whether it is brought about by calculation or, as is more likely, by accident; war which could destroy us all. If that seems a policy for Utopia, I'd like to know a better one.

As we are debating here we know that we are part of a world community that is engaged in military expenses in the hundreds of billions of dollars. While that continues, the Hon.