

We have had progress in the talks that I have referred to in recent years. We have had the conclusion of certain treaties, such as the intermediate nuclear forces treaty.

However, there is still a substantial amount to be done. As a matter of fact, we can be lulled into a false sense of security by what has been done already. If we look at the INF treaty, it simply provided for the destruction of 1,100 intermediate nuclear weapons out of a total of 60,000 nuclear weapons. That is simply a drop in the bucket when we consider the destructive power of those weapons.

It is extremely important to make progress because all of this is related to the further proliferation of nuclear weapons to countries which now do not have those weapons. In other words, progress on such matters as a comprehensive test ban is extremely important, if we are going to continue with the non-proliferation treaty which was started in 1970.

Let me say a word about the non-proliferation treaty. The non-proliferation treaty provides that those countries which signed it renounce the right to develop nuclear weapons. There were 124 such nations. Canada is one of them. Three of the nuclear weapon states out of five nuclear weapon states also signed the treaty.

According to the treaty those who did not have nuclear weapons pledged that they would not develop them. It is significant that from the implementation of that treaty in 1970 not one of the countries that signed the treaty that did not have weapons has proceeded to the development of nuclear weapons.

On the other hand the *quid pro quo* in that treaty was that the nuclear weapon states that signed the treaty—the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain—would pledge to reduce their stockpiled nuclear weapons, according to Article 6 of the non-proliferation treaty.

But they did not do that. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union and the United States had 6,000 strategic nuclear weapons in 1970 and those increased to 20,000 last year. So while all the other countries that signed the nonproliferation treaty obeyed the provisions of the treaty, the nuclear weapon states did not do that. That is one reason given—although I do not accept it as being substantial enough—by countries like France and China that did not

sign the treaty. They said, “Why should we sign this treaty when the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain are being hypocritical and not obeying the provisions of Article 6.”

There are 15 states which are called threshold states, and they include India, Pakistan, Brazil, Argentina, Israel and South Africa, that did not sign the nonproliferation treaty and they did not sign it because they doubted the sincerity of the nuclear weapons states that signed the treaty. They had some reason for their doubt, as I pointed out. Those three states increased their stockpile of nuclear weapons from 1970 to the present time by four times.

Those 15 threshold states are developing the capability of producing nuclear weapons. The only way we are going to get them to reverse that trend and stop doing what they are doing is by proceeding and showing progress with respect to the control of nuclear weapons and the destruction of nuclear weapons by the nuclear weapon states.

It is important because the nonproliferation treaty comes to an end in 1995 and the last review conference with respect to the nonproliferation treaty will take place in August of this year in Geneva. These 15 threshold states and others will be watching to see whether they will become signatories of the nonproliferation treaty and whether that treaty will be renewed in 1990 for another period of time.

What about the Canadian government? Well the Canadian government of the day has a mixed record in this respect. It did an excellent job last week at the Open Skies Conference. It took a very strong position and progress was made. It is also a signatory to the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty. All of that is good.

However, on the negative side, we see that the government is still testing the cruise missile which is outdated and completely contrary to the other negotiations which are taking place. We see that the government is about to establish a NATO base in Labrador. While the superpowers are agreeing to withdraw their troops from Europe this government is establishing a new NATO base in Labrador which is objected to by the aboriginal people of the area. And we see that the government is still clinging to the rhetoric of its White

Private Members' Business