

## Motions

of that space station. There is still no confirmation that that has been agreed to. There is still no confirmation, far from it, that the Government has reached agreement with the Americans that there will be no military use.

● (1130)

The recommendation of the committee was that Canada proceed with its participation in the space station project "provided that agreement be reached with the United States on military use of the space station". That is an equivocal statement, but the next sentence clarifies the intention of the committee when it states, "A minimum acceptable agreement would be the exclusion of weapons or weapons prototype testing from the space station". I interpret that to mean that there not be a military use. When the committee states that agreement be reached with the United States on military use of the space station, I think it was generally agreed that there not be military use. There still is no evidence that that is the case.

First, what is the definition of military use? That has changed. In the beginning we talked about international peaceful purposes. I am reading from an article in *Aerospace Canada International* in May, 1987 which states:

Recent reaffirmation by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) that the manned space station will be used for "peaceful purposes consistent with international law" has, for the time being mollified Canadian taxpayers who will contribute more than a billion dollars for the space station's Mobile Servicing Centre (MSC).

Recently the statements that are coming out of Cape Canaveral are as follows:

The proposed text of a Canada-U.S. agreement spelling out Canada's role in an American space station project says the station will be civilian, not military, and will be used for peaceful purposes in accordance with U.S. law . . .

Well, is it international law? Is it U.S. law? What do we mean by military use, military purposes? Who decides what the definition is? Is it in accordance with international law? Is it in accordance with U.S. law? We do not have a clear definition of what is military use.

All along the position of this Party has been that it must not be used for star wars purposes or for any link with SDI. The Government has stated that it does not want to get involved on a government-to-government basis with the SDI project. But in any number of cases, including allowing Crown corporations to bid on projects associated with that effort, and now in negotiating with the Americans for the possible use for military purposes, it seems to me that the Government is allowing itself to get in by the back door.

The Government must be clear for the Canadian people. Is the Government for SDI? Is the Government for star wars, or is it not? Is the space station project going to be used for military purposes, or is it not? The Government has to come clean with the Canadian people. As I stated, the position of this Party is very clear. We are against the SDI project, we are against star wars, and there must be absolutely no involvement of the Canadian Government in that particular project.

There is an article in the paper today which states that if any military use is made of the space station, the Government will possibly get its money back. I do not think that is good enough for the Canadian people. It is another indication of waffling, equivocation, and the smoke and mirrors that has gone on with this whole issue of military purposes or not military purposes. I do not think it is good enough to say that if at some point it is used for military purposes we will get our money back. The Canadian people do not want to approach it on that basis. They do not want to invest in any activity that will be used for military purposes.

The fact that now there is an agreement to get our money back if it is used for military purposes again suggests that the possibility is there that it will be used for military purposes. If it was not going to be used for military purposes, why would the two Governments have to agree to give Canada its money back should that happen? There is evidence again that there is a grey area here that has not been clarified, and that has to be done.

Mr. Weinberger told us that they were going to plough ahead, and that they were willing to go it alone if the other countries did not agree. Therefore, the position of the United States has been clear all along. It has been a top priority with the President and his Cabinet as enunciated by Mr. Weinberger. The intention of the Americans has been clear. The Canadian Government has not, in our opinion, taken the type of tough stand that it should. It has not sought and obtained the necessary clarification with regard to the use of the space agency. That is one area.

The other area is the allocation of funds in the whole space program. The space station will be costly. For a long time we debated in committee whether that amount of money was justified. We came to the conclusion that essentially it was. Basically, Canada really did not have an option; that this space station was where the action is in terms of the future, in terms of research and development, and that Canada had to get involved. I do not have to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the type of spin-offs that we have had already from the space program in ordinary consumer products. We have to make that leap ahead. But I make the point again that it is only for peaceful purposes, it is only on the condition that there will be no military use of that space station.

Let me return to the allocation of funds. It is a lot of money that we are committing on behalf of the Canadian people. We felt that not enough money was being allocated to basic research conducted in space. The committee recommended that 15 per cent of the budget be allocated to basic research in space. The Government declined to go along with that, and has maintained an allocation of 9 per cent of funds devoted to space research. We do not think that that is good enough. As I said before, if this is the cutting edge, if this is where the action will be, then the real pay-off in the long term to Canada and to the world will come from the type of research that is carried on in space. We are going to put up a servicing mechanism, and that is all to the good, but as one scientist