

one will doubt its authenticity and policy planners in the future will have reliable information to build on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Are there any questions on the remarks of the hon. gentleman?

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for my colleague, the Hon. Member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche). We have had the campers in front of the House of Commons for a little over a year now. They are camping on the grounds in protest of the Cruise vehicle testing in Alberta. I would say that slightly more than 50 per cent of Canadians are opposed to Cruise vehicle testing. On the other hand, the majority of Canadians support our commitments to NATO. Now that the campers have spent a year in front of the House of Commons, does the Hon. Member think that they should move and camp on the grounds of the Russian embassy? This is a two-way street. Both sides must disarm. We have received their message and are all for disarmament. Of course, the problem lies with the communists. I would like the Hon. Member to comment upon whether we should suggest that they move and camp on the grounds of the Russian embassy for a year to deliver the message to them. The campers have certainly given us the message.

We are talking about nuclear disarmament, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have conventional weapons included in the disarmament talks. Conventional weapons can do serious damage too. We know what happened to the cities in England and Europe during World War II.

Another issue which I think should be discussed with regard to disarmament is chemical warfare. There is enough evidence that the Russians are using chemical warfare in Afghanistan. We have also seen chemical warfare in the Iran-Iraq war. I would like my colleague to comment upon whether he would like those two additions to be made to the disarmament talks.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in 1963 a Conservative Government was defeated by the combined efforts of the NDP and the Liberals because the Conservative Government was opposed to nuclear weapons being on Canadian soil. In 1979 the Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon), who was then the Conservative Minister of Defence, gave a commitment to have all nuclear weapons removed from Canadian soil by 1982. That is, to remove the warheads from Comox and other places in Canada.

Finally, is the goal of disarmament to convince both sides to set up monitoring teams so that we can ensure that both sides will disarm at the same time?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order, please. The Chair doubts whether the question related to the peace camp is relevant to the Bill before us. Second, I would like to remind Hon. Members that questions or remarks addressed to an Hon. Member after his speech must be related to the contents of his speech.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for an interesting set of questions. I will try to respond briefly. The

International Peace and Security

people who espouse the position of balanced, mutual and verifiable disarmament measures are protesting today against the arms race wherever it is found. Of course, the deployment of the Soviet SS-20s in Europe which precipitated the NATO response of the Cruise and Pershing must be condemned. I believe that those who look very clearly and carefully, as I am sure the peace institute will, will recognize that it has been the Soviet build-up of forces which provoked the NATO response. We must protest that very clearly.

The campers can certainly move to the Soviet embassy. Whether that will do any good, I do not know. Perhaps it would be a useful effort on their part to go to the Soviet embassy and make the point which my hon. colleague has made. With regard to the front lawn, it seems to me there is a larger question at issue. That is the question of the rights of democracy for Canadians of any persuasion to come unobstructed to Parliament Hill to make their point. It is a source of concern to me that nothing be done to impede the rights of Canadians to protest whatever cause they stand for.

Conventional weapons must certainly be reduced. If Canada is to make a contribution to the reduction of nuclear capacity in the world, we must bring down this nuclear mountain. In order to do that I believe there will be an increase in conventional spending in order to strengthen our conventional forces. By so doing, we would then not have to rely on the nuclear deterrent. To the extent that NATO is deficient in its conventional strength, NATO will have to be upgraded. Canada will have to play its continuing role, as I believe we are doing with our increase of 3 per cent a year. I am not qualified to say whether that is sufficient. I only make the over-all point that Canada must make its significant contribution.

• (1420)

With respect to the question of 1963, if the Conservative Government was listened to at that time, of course we would not have been in such difficulties which have resulted in confusion about our position. On behalf of the Government the Prime Minister espoused a strategy of suffocation at the 1978 disarmament session at the United Nations. There is some confusion as to whether or not this strategy will be implemented in everything that we do.

While I am not so concerned about the past, I believe that because of the never-ending escalation of the arms race, conventional and nuclear, a significant Canadian contribution would be to enhance verifiability measures. This would include on site inspection, which is a policy that was adopted in the 1978 United Nations session and one which we should support. More particularly, it is the enhancement of satellite verification measures. I think that Canada is particularly well equipped to contribute in this area because of our technology. We can make a significant contribution and thereby enhance verifiability around the world.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): One further question for the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine.