

*Motions*

of space science here in Canada. That, too, raises some very serious problems.

This one prestige project—the opportunity or the hope that the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Oberle), or the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), can go and wave as the satellite goes aloft, or cut a ribbon at Cape Canaveral, or something like that—is quite profoundly distorting Canada's space program.

The committee itself found a great deal more benefit in many ways from Radarsat. The committee stated that Radarsat fulfils all the relevant objectives of the Canadian space program; that it would build and expand on Canada's expertise in remote sensing; that it would maintain Canada's position in international co-operation on the peaceful uses of space, particularly because it would be a Canadian-led project; that it would provide substantial economic and social benefits for Canadians, and not only through the sale of hardware or of expertise.

It was pointed out that much of the hardware for Radarsat would probably be located or built in Ontario and Quebec, but that the resource management data would benefit every region of the country, particularly the remote regions where resources are most often to be found. Second, Canada and Canadians as a whole would benefit from Radarsat because of its ability to reinforce Canada's claims to sovereignty in the Arctic, particularly in those areas of the Arctic which are frozen ice and not land.

It is quite clear that it is a lot cheaper and probably more effective for Canada to exercise its sovereignty by satellite in the Arctic wastes of the northern part of this country than it is to put eight or ten nuclear submarines up there at a cost of somewhere over \$8 billion, the cost of a space station project in its entirety.

I recognize that in its response the Government has committed its approval to the Radarsat program, subject to the conclusion of agreements with our partners in the United Kingdom and in the United States, and that is welcome. But I note the prioritization which the committee itself indicated to the Government—it is a Government-dominated committee so I suppose it could not reject totally Canada's participation in the space station. Clearly it indicated where it thought the priority should lie.

I also note the committee's concern over the possible military spin-offs from the space station program. I for one am disturbed at the inadequate response given by the Government on this particular question.

The committee stated in its recommendations that there should be agreement with the United States on the military use of the space station. When one looks at the committee's report in more detail, it specifically states, "Overt military use of the space station is unacceptable to the committee". What has the Minister got? He has an agreement in the Memorandum of Understanding which he will shortly submit to Cabinet

that, if the Americans try to do something that is too overtly military in the space station, then we can ask them to buy us out. Is that not ridiculous?

In other words, we have not got the specific commitment that Canada should have sought and insisted upon, that before we participated in the space station the Americans clearly and unequivocally promise they will not use the space station as a part of the star wars program.

Scientists have told me that the star wars program is probably impossible in scientific terms. I suspect that that is probably true. Computers cannot be built for it, and it cannot be done. Nonetheless, that assurance should have come from the Americans rather than this rather awkward situation where we might get our money back if we find that we are not particularly happy with the way the Americans are using the space station. That seems to be what the Government is pursuing at the present time.

In addition, the committee indicates that experimentation dedicated to the development of weapons systems including the Strategic Defense Initiative should not be performed on the space station. What does the Government state in its response? It states that it would be inappropriate to discuss these conditions about military use in detail. However, the Government has made its position very clear with respect to the possible military use of the space station.

The Government wishes to ensure that any military use of the space station is consistent with international law, and with the treaty obligations of all participants in the space station. The Minister of State for Science and Technology is nodding, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know what are the treaty obligations.

Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan met in a summit last week, which was welcomed by people from around the world, but on the question of the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty which effectively governs experimentation in space that might be used for the SDI, for star wars, they went away agreeing to disagree. They simply stated that both countries would respect the treaty obligations.

It is interesting that Canada should parrot that particularly word which we know is used by the right-wing hawks in the Pentagon as a code word for saying, "We will do what we please and damn the ABM Treaty", and the Government seems to be going along with that particular interpretation.

In addition, with respect to cost overruns, the matter that I have already raised, the Government states and I quote, "The issue of dealing with cost overruns is related to the over-all issue of maintaining a balance within the Canadian space program". The Minister is certainly correct on that front. It goes on to state that, "It is not feasible for any Government to give assurances in advance that cost overruns in one project will not affect other programs". In other words, since the largest amount of money in the space program has been committed to the space station, therefore, cost overruns in that