

Firing of A.B.M. Warheads over Canada

need to participate in controlling it. These were useful reminders. He also spoke as if he were a member of a movement that practised the politics of non-involvement. His sort of argument really, was, "We will determine the ends you must seek but we will not tell you how you ought to arrive at those ends. We will criticize; we will warn you of the dangers, but do not look to us for any suggestions, because we have none." That, it seemed to me, was his position and the position of his party. It was a position of non-responsibility. They alone can indulge in the luxury of offering gratuitous advice.

This evening the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) spoke about the protection of Canadians and of all mankind. He spoke of the fate of humanity, emphasizing reason, not fear; reality and not the Alice in Wonderland world of international affairs that some hon. members preferred this evening. He referred to stability and perspective, to interdependence as opposed to dependence. He spoke of the need for stability of the deterrent system and that if any missile went off, the whole system would have failed. He spoke of the need, in his conversation with the United States President, to discuss the question of preventing escalation of nuclear capability and warned of accidents arising from miscalculation.

A real problem may arise through miscalculation. The A.B.M. system probably may be so automated that human decision will not enter into the question of whether a defensive missile is to be fired or not fired. I hope this point is discussed and clarified. It seems to me that it is possible for an anti-ballistic missile to be fired, without human decision, at a piece of space hardware returning to earth. If that happened it might stimulate concern or even panic in certain quarters, causing an inadvertent escalation of nuclear exchanges. That is what I think the Prime Minister meant when he talked of the dangers of miscalculation.

I do not propose to deal with all matters raised by the Conservative Party here. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) spoke about the question of consultation, regretting the lack of consultation although recognizing that the United States President had every right to make his decision without prior consultation.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) spoke of the notion of sovereignty of air space. We must ask ourselves, how far up does sovereignty extend?

[Mr. Gillespie.]

Does it extend up to 75 miles above the earth, or up to 35 miles? I hope the Prime Minister will discuss this with the President and perhaps take the initiative in suggesting new approaches to the control and use of outer space.

In this debate we have been reminded that the world order is not one we would choose if we had any choice in the matter. It is dominated by the super powers. We are part of that world order, and its fate will be our fate. We have been reminded of the frightening prospect arising from nuclear miscalculation. There are no instant solutions to the difficulties of our world order. We must remember to take a long perspective when looking at international settlements; that the settlement may take generations to come and that we must be prepared to pay a price for it. It is easy to say that our NORAD and NATO alliances have outgrown their usefulness and are no longer relevant in today's world. These alliances have maintained the peace of the world for the last 20 years, a peace that could only be maintained by a stability based on recognition of deterrence as we work towards detente.

In closing, I urge the house to recognize the dangers of miscalculation. I hope our Prime Minister will discuss this aspect with the President. I also hope he will discuss with him the whole question of whether A.B.M. systems are likely in any way to restrict the opportunity that may arise for a planned reduction in nuclear armaments. I hope also that he will raise the question of civilian control of these systems and civilian control of the Pentagon. In my view this is a legitimate question for our Prime Minister to raise with the President of the United States. After all, we are members of NATO and NORAD. If we were not, I do not think we would have the same right. Certainly, our voice would not carry the same emphasis. I hope he will discuss the question of stability with the President of the United States vis-à-vis China because there are shifts in the international power balance. Above all, Mr. Speaker, I hope that he says that Canada regards the United States as a friend and recognizes that the security of Canada depends on the security of the United States.

● (11:40 p.m.)

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate because I think I have some small contribution to make. I listened with patience to the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) calm and