

*Supply*

attempts by the Soviet Union to achieve military superiority in any particular area, such as the INF. Moreover, such decisions are taken only after the most careful consideration. They are not autonomous or planned. Arms control aims to control this competition, to stabilize the balance and, if possible, to reduce the level of forces on both sides.

● (1640)

Among the Hon. Members opposite who put forward the resolution before us, there is a number who have philosophical leanings. I would suggest that even the best philosophers would benefit from minimal knowledge of history. It would not have taken much research to show that the West simply cannot be charged with escalating the nuclear arms race. One does not even require this degree of historical expertise to observe that the only conceivable cause for war between East and West would be a Soviet military attack.

Cruise missiles are not a new weapon, nor will they give a new twist to the arms race. The Soviet Union is deploying its new SS-20s now, and has been doing so since 1977. One new SS-20 missile has been deployed on an average each week, to a total of 350, each with three warheads.

From their silence over the past six years, one can only conclude that those who tabled the resolution today were not troubled by such developments. The NATO Cruise missiles, on the other hand, which are the object of the resolution, are not due to start arriving in Europe until the end of this year at the earliest, and only then if a satisfactory arms control agreement is not reached.

In taking its modernization decision, NATO agreed that before the first missile arrived, a major effort should be made to prevent an arms spiral. As evidence of this, the Americans have already withdrawn 1,000 nuclear warheads from Europe, and they will remove one more for every new warhead deployed.

It is worth recalling that at the start the Russians refused to even talk. It was only when faced with NATO's determination to proceed with the modernization decision that the Russians concluded that they could not get what they wanted on a one-sided basis and agreed to negotiate.

The resolution must be opposed. It is flawed in its essence. It has no redeeming features. It does not even call for a lessening of reliance on nuclear weapons through improvements to our conventional defences. Rather, it betrays a state of mind prepared to acquiesce in Soviet strategic superiority and to dismantle or disavow any weapons systems on our soil that the Soviet Union might regard as being provocative. The resolution bears eloquent if unwitting witness to the political dividends that the development of nuclear superiority brings in its wake.

In conclusion, let me say that living with nuclear weapons is one of the inevitable results of mankind's unrelenting search for knowledge, just as are the many benefits that we enjoy in medicine, communications and agriculture. Nuclear weapons cannot be disinvented. We must learn to live with them. We need to create an environment where there is stability between

nuclear equipped forces so that there be no incentive to attempt aggression.

Nuclear deterrence is a dreadful form of security, but it is effective, it has proven itself, and it does prevent the horrors of any type of war. However, to be effective, it must be such that there is no doubt but that initiating a nuclear engagement would entail absolutely unacceptable costs and punishment to the initiator. I will therefore vote against the resolution.

**Mr. McKinnon:** I would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary a question concerning a Government policy which seems to me to be overly dedicated to secrecy. I do not know if he listened as I read a list of things that I thought we could have without endangering national security in this matter. I wonder if he could tell us if the Government will relax its attitude. It is not always in the interests of security to keep everything secret about everything. Would the Parliamentary Secretary have a look at the list in the Cruise Missile Project Arrangement to see if there is any reason we cannot have a much fuller briefing, a written briefing, that we could use as reference material in future debates of this nature?

**Mr. Hudecki:** Yes, I heard the worthy recommendations of the Hon. Member this morning. They do make sense. It seems to me, however, that it is a bilateral agreement. We would probably need agreement from NATO and from the United States officials as well. I have already taken the liberty of passing on the Hon. Member's thoughts and concerns not only to the Ministers but to the officials in the Department as well. I hope that we will receive a favourable answer in that respect.

**Mr. McKinnon:** I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary would take note that in a Congressional committee in the United States, there would not be the slightest question. Agreement would be given before it was ratified. It would be the same with SALT II. It would not be held in secret by the administration in the United States until such time as the Senate or the Government there decided whether it would pass it. We are doing things backwards. We are making the decisions and then, afterwards, we receive a little dribble of information and a kind of staged debate as to whether we should or should not have gone along with the decision.

**Mr. Hudecki:** I was just wondering whether one of the obstacles is the need of previous knowledge of technology that is associated, whether this subject lends itself to scrutiny by a committee, or one which does not have the background in the technical knowledge of the various weapons and weapons systems.

**Mr. Anguish:** Mr. Speaker, I have two questions to ask. Instead of asking a supplementary question, I will pose both questions at the same time and ask the Parliamentary Secretary to respond to them. If in fact the Canadian people accepted the build-up of nuclear arms, nuclear weaponry, as a deterrence, where does it stop? At what point do we stop building up nuclear arms, stop hiding our heads in the sand as an ostrich would, in terms of our Canadian Government, and proposed some kind of meaningful intervention by the Canadian Government, by the Canadian people, to reduce and