

Abandonment of Defence Projects

analysis of our position, and far more from the need to satisfy Canadian political exigencies, to satisfy the misguided impressions of a section of the Canadian public that these weapons are useful to the defence of Canada or the United States. In fact, they are not useful at all.

In so far as the introduction of nuclear warheads into any part of Canada is concerned, in our view that is clearly based on an obsolete, impractical military doctrine because it is meaningless in terms of effective defence. We feel we are bound to support the amendment, based on its application to all of Canada as well as the province of Quebec.

Something has been said, Mr. Speaker, about the wording of the amendment and particularly the reference to the "state of Quebec." This certainly is not language which we would be familiar with or would use in this party. I do not think that language has any particular significance; but a very distinguished, leading Liberal, the premier of Quebec, Mr. Jean Lesage, habitually refers to the state of Quebec. If the expression is good enough for him, I do not see why it should not be good enough for the hon. member for Villeneuve and, indeed, for the members of this house. I do not think it has any more significance in relation to the status of Quebec within confederation than a reference to the state of Pennsylvania would have in the United States. I think any attempt that may be made later to concentrate on this particular form of expression would be a red herring tending to obscure the real meaning of the amendment, which is in opposition to the useless nuclear installations in the province of Quebec and, I assume, by the extension thereof, in any other part of Canada.

In this party, we have consistently opposed nuclear installations in Canada, not for sentimental or emotional reasons, or simply moral reasons. We have opposed them for sound common sense reasons that have commended themselves to General Simonds, General Foulkes, Mr. Gellner and other witnesses to whom I have referred. We believe our views have been confirmed by common sense and the evidence that has been heard in the committee. Our opposition to nuclear weapons has been established and we shall cast our vote on this motion in the light of that well known opposition.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gerald Laniel (Beauharnois-Salaberry): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to take part in this discussion and to indicate that I associate myself with this government's defence policy; this should prove to the hon. member for

Lapointe (Mr. Gregoire) that I am not afraid to express my views and opinions in this house, even before tonight's vote.

When I was appointed to the committee on defence, several of my voters rejoiced at my being a member of such an important committee. And tonight, I am given the opportunity of making my views in defence matters known to the people who elected me as their representative as well as to all hon. members of the house.

The hon. member of Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) did not surprise me at all when he criticized this government's actions in defence matters, and still less when he introduced his non-confidence motion. The hon. gentleman, who is a member of the defence committee and a former minister of national defence, was often disappointed with the way that committee went about its business, because he would have liked us to rehash all those disputes which arose during the months preceding the defeat of the Conservative government, so that our committee would have become a political arena with regard to defence matters. The committee members preferred to limit themselves to their terms of reference, by making a complete analysis of the present situation, so as to familiarize themselves with the subject matter and be able to make the appropriate recommendations with regard to the whole defence problem in this country while helping establish a Canadian policy in this field.

I consider that at this stage, the committee was far from being ready to come to a conclusion on the general purpose frigate program, no more than we are ready, as regards the unification of the three arms or their integration into a very mobile force, because the members had not yet started a discussion on the various testimonies given in the last few months.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that even the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), who just spoke before me, could himself express an opinion on behalf of the defence committee because he only quoted the evidence that he saw fit to quote.

I think that the members of the defence committee still have much work to do. They have to exchange ideas and concepts. As far as I am concerned, I know that some of my original ideas might have changed or evolved and I even know that if, on some other matters, I think I have a very clear idea at the present, I am still ready to discuss them and I hope that the other members of the committee will keep up the same spirit. This will make room for a thorough discussion and at the same time will enable us to