

*Nuclear Armaments*

perhaps the time has come to stop the insanity. Perhaps the time has come to try to recapture what we lost in 1945.

I have to admit to some surprise. When I introduced a motion of this kind at the policy convention of our Party last November, I did not expect it to pass. It was going to be one of those controversial resolutions. However, over 75 per cent of our delegates voted for it. Many said afterwards that they were not sure exactly what a nuclear free zone meant in terms of specifics, but they did know that it perhaps was one further extension of what this country has tried to say over the years, that is, that perhaps we are in some peculiar and unique way one of those countries that can stand up and provide a difference to this thing.

I know I do not have much time and I wish I had another hour or two to explain this because it is a topic about which I feel strongly. Perhaps the most important nuclear weapons free zone that Canada should be arguing for right now is in the area of our Arctic, the northern territories. One of the really serious problems is that Canada can no longer treat nuclear weapons free zones as an academic exercise. It is not something that is happening in the South Pacific, in Antarctica or Latin America. We now face in our own northern territories the emergence of an arms race. We face the emergence of our own undersea submarines. In a sense I wish the resolution could be amended to say: "If there is one thing on which Canada should be united it is that we do not want an arms race on our territory underneath our own Arctic waters". We should be using every ounce of our diplomacy and persuasion to try to convince other countries who border on those Arctic waters to demilitarize and denuclearize, not to allow it to become an area of combat between Soviet and American submarines, not to allow the Forward Maritime Strategy to become the predominant philosophy.

This is an area where we can make not only a symbolic statement but a real statement because it affects us directly as Canadians. We should be negotiating with the Norwegians, the Russians, the Icelanders and the Americans rather than building up the arms race, rather than adding to the submarines, rather than putting missiles in those submarines. Let us declare our North nuclear free. Let us demilitarize. That is what I would like to see coming out of this kind of resolution, something not just symbolic in intent, as important as that may be, but something very real and tangible, and that is absolutely crucial.

**Mr. Bud Bradley (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be permitted the opportunity to comment on the motion of the New Democratic Party which would see Canada declaring itself a nuclear weapons free zone. I was disappointed, I must say, though, to hear the Liberal spokesman of his Party going again half-way and only wishing to declare half of Canada a nuclear free zone.

• (1740)

This type of motion has been debated on three previous occasions during Private Members' Business and once during an Opposition Day. The motion before us proposes a course of action for Canada which is unrealistic and hypocritical. The same could be said for the recently announced New Democratic Party's posture on defence.

No NATO members have declared themselves to be nuclear weapon free zones, and there are no NATO countries that prohibit visits by allied ships that may be carrying nuclear weapons.

**Mr. Young:** What about New Zealand?

**Mr. Bradley:** Some NATO countries have, either as a matter of government policy or by parliamentary resolution, decided that nuclear weapons should not, for the present, be stationed on their soil. Canada is among these countries which include Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Spain. However, these nations continue to share fully in the risks and responsibilities of Alliance collective security.

Alliance members, Canada included, have acknowledged publicly the critical requirement to maintain the continuance of nuclear and conventional deterrents as a pre-requisite to undiminished security at lower levels of armament.

Declaring Canada a nuclear weapons free zone would, first, be without precedent in NATO, as no other Alliance member has taken this course. Its consequences in terms of Alliance relationships cannot be predicted with certainty. Second, it would be incompatible with Canada's continued membership in NATO and NORAD, and, in particular, with participation in the NATO Nuclear Planning Group, which affords Canada the opportunity to consult on nuclear policy, including arms control affecting nuclear weapons.

This policy reflects the NDP's vision of a little Canada divorced from that larger community of states with which we share our traditions and basic political and social values.

**Mr. Young:** Deal with the issue!

**Mr. Bradley:** It suggests a ludicrous course of action which would be not only extremely costly for Canada to implement in terms of providing our own defence, but would result in a loss of credibility in the international community, reducing, not enhancing, Canada's ability on the world stage to encourage peace and stability.

**Mr. Young:** You should talk to your Prime Minister.

**Mr. Bradley:** For example, for Canada to take over the responsibility of the air defence alone would cost over \$5 billion. I would ask: Where are the savings that the NDP proposes?

As a useful and effective international player Canada would lose the following benefits of membership by withdrawing