

Nuclear Armaments

present, they also put at risk succeeding generations. Like supreme arbiters, with our disputes of the moment we threaten to cut off the future and extinguish the lives of the innocent millions as yet unborn. There can be no greater arrogance. At the same time, the lives of all who lived before us may be rendered meaningless. For we have the power to dissolve in a conflict of hours or minutes the entire work of civilization, with all the brilliant culture heritage of humankind.

[*Translation*]

What Javier Perez de Cuellar was telling us, Mr. Speaker, was that we have not only the power to destroy, but also the power to make our future and our past completely meaningless because the destruction would be of such a magnitude that what came before and what will come in the future would have no real meaning as our way of life would be completely destroyed.

[*English*]

The only atomic bombs which have ever exploded have been in two cities of Japan, Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We commemorated the 40th anniversary of that event here on the steps of Parliament Hill sometime ago. I was there at that august ceremony to remember 40 years ago. There was a woman there who came to describe to us how she had lived through the incident. She was there the day the bomb exploded. She described the horror of those days. Today we have one million times the nuclear power that destroyed Hiroshima. I am told that the nuclear power the world has now is enough to destroy the planet 40 times over. One would think that once would be more than enough, but we have enough to do it 40 times. Obviously there is a message there. Apart from everything else, there is the tremendous waste of energy and human potential, the tremendous waste of resources. Surely there are better things we can do with our money than to buy enough armaments to blow ourselves up 40 times over.

One cannot help but wonder what the last 39 times is supposed to do after we have destroyed our world once? I do not know the answer to all of those questions.

[*Translation*]

It is quite possible that no one in this House can reply to all these questions, which makes it difficult to understand why Governments, individuals and countries would want to accumulate these nuclear devices.

I believe that it is important for us Canadians to do two things. First, we should take concrete action to encourage other countries, and preferably all of them, to get rid of their nuclear weapons. Second, I believe that it is important, and here I disagree with the previous speaker, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap), to preserve our alliances with our friends. However, Mr. Speaker, even though someone is our friend and our ally, this does not give him the right to destroy our planet.

While I am myself in favour of Canada remaining a member of NATO and NORAD, I believe that it is important for us to support such a motion to indicate to the United States, to the Soviet Union and to all other countries that what we want

most of all is a bilateral agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union to get rid of their nuclear weapons. By giving our support to this motion, and I hope that it will be adopted, we shall at least be telling those two countries that we are willing to do our share even though we are not a major power, and that we have the courage to do something which might lead the way to more concrete action by greater powers than Canada.

[*English*]

In conclusion, the Secretary General of the United Nations also stated that no one had given the United States and the Soviet Union the right to decide whether this world was to live or to die.

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to support the motion put forward by my friend, the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young), that the Government should consider the advisability of declaring Canada a nuclear arms free zone. I note that in his motion the Hon. Member included the transportation, testing, construction and deployment of nuclear weapons and associated equipment.

First, we must acknowledge that while Canada has begun to take steps which contribute to the ultimate goal of Canada becoming a nuclear arms free zone by ensuring that nuclear weapons, as my hon. colleague stated, are not stored or deployed on or from Canadian soil, we have not taken as a nation full measures which would show to the world our commitment to the full participation in the prevention of war. In fact, some countries might say that Canada's stance has been hypocritical. For example, Canada has voted in favour of treaties establishing nuclear weapons free zones on the seabed, in the Antarctic, Latin America, outer space and similar initiatives in Africa, the South Pacific and the Middle East. Despite the fact that 169 Canadian municipalities, and Ontario, Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and, I am proud to say, the area I represent, the Yukon, have declared their regions nuclear weapons free zones, Canada has declined to do what it supports others doing. Ostensibly, one of the reasons given is our NATO commitments.

• (1750)

NATO commitments aside, whether we agree or disagree with them, the North Atlantic Treaty makes no reference at all to nuclear weapons. In fact, the eight members of NATO have some sort of prohibition on the deployment of other NATO members' nuclear weapons in their territories. This excuse just does not wash.

Despite sentiments supporting Canada's role in the non-proliferation of nuclear arms, the Government still places no restraints on industrial involvement in the production of U.S. nuclear and nuclear capable delivery systems or their components. Canada still allows port visits by nuclear-armed naval vessels. Canada is a regular producer of components for an arsenal of nearly 30 different nuclear weapons and related weapons, aircraft or other weapons systems. Nuclear weapons