

*Government Orders*

To allow this test to proceed in my opinion is simply to confirm the political reality which existed in 1983 but has vanished in the intervening years.

From a military perspective what can be the logical explanation for this testing? There is the argument that other countries can and are developing cruise capability which then, by implication, requires the United States to continue to be technically superior. If we, and I say this as a Canadian and as a member of this House, want to allow this testing to proceed then I suggest we should also ask what is the perceived or real benefit to Canada. Is it to counter the former Soviet Union and maintain the security of North America? Alternatively, is it to facilitate the very specialized American-based industries which are dependent upon military programs for their very existence?

● (1930)

The global political reality of 1983 has substantially changed. Canadians must therefore acknowledge this in determining whether these tests should proceed.

These musings of mine reflect the politics of another era, a time when there was an arms race, a time when there was a perceived threat to our national security and a time when NORAD had some continental importance. These factors today have simply either vanished or diminished to the point where they are meaningless.

The other factor I would suggest requires consideration is quite simply this: As Canadians, is it beneficial in any way from a security or economic perspective to allow these tests? This is not a matter of abrogating a bilateral agreement, as has been suggested here today. The agreement dictates the technical and financial terms but states specifically that each test must be approved by the Government of Canada. I ask: "What is the perceived benefit to Canadians?" or more directly and simply, "What is in it for us?"

Yesterday in the House several speakers discussed the humanitarian aspect of peacekeeping, that is in certain circumstances Canadian military peacekeeping represents a positive influence in areas of the world. Many of the opinions put forward yesterday reflected a desire to improve the plight of many people in countries undergoing conflict. Those are very laudable and humanitarian objectives which we, as members of the United Nations, have collectively stated in a global perspective are in the best interests of all nations.

These peacekeeping roles mesh or coincide with the common values shared with other member states of that body. Yet as a Canadian I ask: Where does the testing of a cruise missile fit into the objectives of the Canadian government? Is there a national interest which is being served if these tests proceed?

American governments over a period of several administrations have quite overtly inserted a quid pro quo into their

relationships with other national governments. Foreign aid, whether it be monetary or technical, is often tied to events occurring in the other state. For example, the extension of American aid to China was jeopardized by China after the Tiananmen Square incident. The interventions by American forces in Grenada and Panama in the late eighties are also examples of a more direct nature. These actions were simply as a result, in my opinion, of serving the national objectives of the United States.

I therefore ask members present today to reflect on the broader issue of our relationship with the United States and with the Americans. I have heard from many of my constituents on this issue and though I cannot say that I am a member of the third party, I can quite safely say that my opinion is here reflecting the greater consensus that I am hearing in my constituency that in our dealings with our American neighbours in the broadest and most general sense of the word and of the idea, that we must become more self-centred, even more specifically that we must ask "Is it in the Canadian interests"; in the most basic sense "What's in it for us?"

My riding is a narrow wedge of real estate on the Ontario-Michigan border. I would venture to say that 75 per cent of the people in my riding live about a three-minute car ride from the United States. I would also point out that in my riding anyone can purchase a *Detroit News*, a *Detroit Free Press* at any corner variety store just as easily as I could buy the *Globe and Mail*. My riding is the third busiest crossing along the Canada-U.S. border, in fact 15 per cent of all trade between Canada and the United States crosses the border in Sarnia or Point Edward in my riding. Yet despite this overwhelming presence, which we call the American influence, it is abundantly clear to me that we are not Americans. My constituents tell me that. We are not anti-American, we are simply not Americans.

Through a process of national evolution we have stated that our priorities are not always identical to their priorities. We have stated that our national values are not the same as their national values.

As a result, I am aware of Americans attempting to enter some of the health clinics offered by the local health unit in my riding in an attempt to take advantage of the health services and treatment programs offered anonymously to walk-in clients.

Obviously our priorities are not their priorities. I am aware of the significant collection of hand weapons seized daily by our customs officials from American vehicles entering Canada in my riding. Obviously our values are not their values. As a result I must ask once again: Where does the allowance of cruise missile testing over Canadian territory as an objective of American military policy coincide with Canadian priorities and values?