

that the Chair would allow argument as to its admissibility.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** As the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has suggested, the Chair will reserve its opinion on this amendment, and make a ruling tomorrow.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Madam Speaker, I would like to support the representations of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) by saying that, if need be, we will have an opportunity to voice our opinions on the acceptability of the motion.

**An hon. Member:** Agreed.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### NATIONAL DEFENCE—CANADIAN POSITION ON USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS—SUGGESTED RELUCTANCE OF UNITED STATES TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN DEFENCE OF EUROPE

**Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** Madam Speaker, I asked a question of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) some time ago and considered the answer unsatisfactory, so I have asked for this adjournment debate on the subject. As reported at page 2329 of *Hansard* for Tuesday, December 17, 1974, my question concerned the use of nuclear weapons by Americans in northwest Europe, and I quote:

During the recent meeting the Netherlands' minister suggested a reduction in tactical nuclear weapons, opposed by Canada. Let me quote from the *Gazette* under the headline "Canada supports NATO A-weapons" as follows:

Canada lined up with a majority against the suggestion . . .

Apparently Canada was against the suggestion that we reduce nuclear weapons in Europe. This is clearly a change in policy.

● (2200)

**Mr. Cadieux,** the former minister of national defence, said on December 8, 1969:

Speaking for Canada, I supported the adoption of those papers which further define and restrict the circumstances under which nuclear weapons might be used.

I asked, as recorded on page 2329 of *Hansard* for December 17, 1974:

Would the minister confirm and explain this change in policy?

The minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, Canada is not involved in the discussions with European allies about the use of nuclear weapons. We do not use nuclear weapons ourselves in Europe. The hon. member has quoted another country's policy, not Canada's policy.

### Adjournment Debate

That answer completely evaded the question. I then said:

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Secretary of Defence, Mr. Schlesinger stated at the same conference that NATO can no longer count on the United States umbrella to protect it. Did the minister consider this to be a reference to a growing United States reluctance to use nuclear weapons in a ground defence role in western Europe?

To which the minister replied:

No, Mr. Speaker, I think it was made very clear that if necessary or required the United States was prepared to use tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

Canada has a longstanding commitment to Europe and, at one time, our aircraft were used in the strike role and were carrying nuclear weapons on exercises. Recently a change has been made, and we are using aircraft designed for the strike role in a support role, which merely shows the futility of some of the policies embarked on by the present régime. Here we are, using a 1,500-mile-an-hour fighter in a 500-mile-an-hour role. It is hard to imagine a less efficient use of money, and a less efficient use of an aircraft designed for a much more demanding role.

It is crucial for us to know what is to be Canada's position concerning NATO. While the minister has made some statements, they have generally been equivocal. I should like the minister to explain what the situation is concerning our role in Europe, because our European allies are becoming uneasy about our position.

A senior diplomat in the German NATO delegation observed

Canada's cut in its NATO forces of ten thousand to five thousand was rather traumatic at the time and current talk of a defence review in Canada leads some of us to feel a cut of a thousand to zero is as possible as anything else.

I should like the minister to provide an answer, as cutting our forces further would involve questions about our reliability, particularly as Secretary Schlesinger said that NATO nuclear weapons may eventually become a Vienna bargaining counter.

This places us in this position: if we are no longer to have a nuclear deterrent in western Europe, it goes without saying that our European allies will look for stronger conventional forces to replace the nuclear umbrella, and apparently Canada is not willing to share that burden. Consider that at present Warsaw pact forces outnumber NATO forces. At least 70 Warsaw pact divisions face only 25 NATO divisions; 20,000 Warsaw pact tanks face 7,000 NATO tanks and 4,350 Warsaw pact aircraft face 2,040 NATO aircraft. Madam Speaker, we, on my side of the House, want to know what the level of Canadian forces is to be.

The minister said, as recorded at page 122 of *Hansard* for October 4, 1974:

We have found it necessary to reduce expenditures . . .

He was referring to personnel.

Thirteen days later in the defence committee he said the Canadian forces would be 79,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1974-75, which would mean an increase. The first statement suggests that the forces' strength is going down; the other suggests it is going up. Perhaps he does not know what will happen to the strength of the forces. He has once again changed the figure, because a few days ago,