

Mention has been made this evening of consultation. The Minister of National Defence questioned the stand taken by our party on the issue of consultation. If we were not a member of NORAD, he asked, how could we expect to engage in consultation with the United States. I submit we could quite properly consult with the United States and make representations as a friend and as a neighbour. We could quite properly be vociferous and firm in our representations if the interests of Canada were affected. It is not necessary to retain membership in NORAD, an obsolete arrangement, for us to take advantage of our friendship with our neighbour to consult on these issues. We need this consultation in order that Canada can make firm and full representations to the United States government in an effort to persuade that government to reconsider its decision to instal the threatened A.B.M. system.

It is not too late. Canada could have a voice which would be listened to with respect and understanding even if her opinions were not shared. The Minister of National Defence, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) could do not only Canada but the nations of the world a great favour. I believe they could even do Mr. Nixon a favour. It might well be that, privately, Mr. Nixon would welcome representations from friendly governments asking him to change his mind so that he could use these arguments against the arguments of the military and industrial complex which have mounted the most unholy pressure on the present and previous presidents of the United States to develop this system—anything to make a buck. And seven billion dollars spent on the A.B.M. system amount to a lot of bucks for a lot of generals and corporations who specialize in perfecting machines to kill. I submit that if Canada were a true friend and neighbour, in or out of NORAD, she ought to make this kind of representation to the President. I add my request that this course be followed, to those of the leader of my party, of other members of my party and, I dare say, of members of other parties in this house as well, because there is certainly no unanimity among the other parties on this issue. I was surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. McIntosh) tonight supporting this missile system since he was a member of a Conservative government which opposed nuclear weapons on Canadian soil. That policy has

Firing of A.B.M. Warheads over Canada
not yet been officially repudiated, though perhaps it has been repudiated unofficially.

I ask, as a Joe Citizen speaking on behalf of a lot of other Joe Citizens, that the Prime Minister and his colleagues proceed to Washington next week and urge upon the President of the United States in the firmest as well as in the friendliest fashion, that the construction of this system is unnecessary; that it would lead to escalation and lead to increased difficulty in negotiating arms reduction. I would ask, too, that they meet with members of United States Congress who have differing opinions on this subject. It would be well for them to hear the views of Senator Kennedy, former Vice-President Humphrey, Senator McGovern and Senator Mansfield. I may say, for the benefit of the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek and the hon. member who spoke after him, that these are men who cannot be accused of being "pinkos" or communists or sympathetic to the U.S.S.R. and so forth, the kind of nonsense we have heard so many times in this chamber and outside. We have a real opportunity to make a contribution towards understanding in the world, peace and the reduction of weapons. It is a delusion to think that an anti-ballistic missile system will contribute to the defence of North America. It is not designed to defend North America. It is designed to defend the United States offensive missile capacity, and nothing else.

● (11:30 p.m.)

Mr. Alastair Gillespie (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, the hour is late. We have heard many words this evening, some of them thoughtful, some of them quiet, some naive and others angry. Throughout, I think we could detect a yearning for peace, quiet and serenity in the world, reflecting man's frustration in dealing with cosmic forces over which he has no control.

In moving the adjournment motion the leader of the N.D.P. did this house a great service. After listening to his words I thought to myself that that was the only contribution he made. His were brave words—some of them were at any rate. He said we must not be subordinated. Listening to him, I wondered if he understood the idea of deterrence. When I heard the last speaker say that the A.B.M. system is designed to protect United States offensive capacity I wondered if he, too, understood the principle of deterrence. The leader of the N.D.P. reminded us of the nuclear holocaust, the arms race and of our