

specific test and evaluation project, if in its opinion, any unforeseen imperative circumstances should so warrant.

Surely the breach by the Americans of their obligations under SALT II would constitute such an eventuality if the Government so elected to stop testing the Cruise missile.⁶

Mr. Clark responded:

I also regret the action of the Liberal Party now in suggesting that we have no obligation to contribute to the collective defence of NATO, an obligation which we have accepted. Unhappily the nuclear deterrent remains a reality in the world. This country cannot opt out of our obligations.⁷

NDP member Pauline Jewett pursued the same line of questioning:

Does the Government yet recognize that there is a link between the breaching of the SALT II limits and air-launched Cruise missile?....why does it not do the honourable thing and dissociate us from the breach of the SALT II limits and cancel air-launched Cruise missile testing?⁸

Mr. Clark responded:

I know there is a great deal of concern in Canada about the inherent danger of living in a nuclear world. That is why Canada is doing everything we can to encourage arms control agreements which would move toward a reduction of that nuclear danger. One way to stop arms control agreements would be for a prominent member of the Western Alliance to turn its back on Europe, and to turn its back on the United States.⁹

⁶ Commons Debates, 1 Dec. 1986, p. 1643.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., p. 1644.