

*Government Orders*

capacity, enable Canadians to defend themselves better from the threat of the use of such weapons against them in the future?

From the reading I have been able to do there is a double reason for these tests. One is directed toward enabling the United States to perfect this weapon. The other equally important one about which we must ask ourselves or draw attention to today is to enable us to understand how these weapons work and to provide adequate defences to them.

All of us in the House watched the gulf war, saw the defence of Tel Aviv against the Scud missiles and watched the Patriot missiles work. If by watching this missile work and participating in these tests we would enable Canadian forces either in this country or elsewhere in the world to defend themselves against a similar attack by a similar missile, would not the test of such a missile have been worth while? That is the question that I ask myself. That is the question I would direct to the Minister of National Defence.

• (1640)

I urge the government, the minister of defence and cabinet to consider this matter. The minister of defence has clearly said that they are considering the matter. If they can assure the House and assure themselves on the best technological and military advice they have that as a result of these tests we will be obtaining information that will enable us to defend ourselves in this country or our troops to defend themselves elsewhere in the world, we should allow this testing to go forward.

It seems to me that would be in the spirit of what I would call the new agenda of defence that is necessary in a world where new threats are evolving with which we are not yet familiar from sectors with which we are not familiar and from technologies that are being developed and falling into the hands of many disparate groups about which we have no idea in today's context.

That is the new agenda of the debate. It is no longer a debate in respect of the cold war and the testing of a missile device which, in the sort of star wars concept, is to deliver a knockout blow to the Soviet Union. It is the testing of a sophisticated weapon in order to determine our own ability to defend ourselves against it.

It is my personal belief that testing will enable us to do that. I believe it would be in our interest as Canadians both in our own country and in respect of our troops serving in the United Nations or other capacities abroad.

Finally I would like to leave members of the House with one last thought. As other members have pointed out this is a global issue. It is a matter of geopolitics and our relationships with our American neighbour to the south. I will cite the member for Western Arctic, the hon. Secretary of State for Training and Youth. In 1989 she said: "What Canada needs is a defence policy, not in terms of cruise missile tests or nuclear submarines but in service of an overall security strategy emphasizing

economic, environmental and non-military elements of security"?

It seems we have an opportunity, if we expect to allow the Americans to continue these tests, of recognizing that we will get benefits from them. Let us press them as part of that package to participate in the Arctic council proposed by the government, by this party. Let us propose to the Americans, who are the ones presently blocking it, the development of an Arctic council that will recognize the participation of the peoples in the north who must live with northern developments. They should participate in their future and have a say and thereby enable this as a peacemaking, as a defensive measure to go forward and enabling Canada to participate more fully in a area of the world where we are fortunate enough to have an important border and important neighbours.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for his remarks with which I generally agree. I think he is right in saying that there are two debates: the old one and the new one in the context in which we now find ourselves.

I must admit that, in the old debate, I was personally and completely opposed to cruise missile testing because, at the time, they were only adding to a nuclear arsenal already horrible and terrifying for the whole planet.

In those days, in that old debate, as soon as something new happened in the area of armament, there was always someone in the intelligentsia, in Quebec as well as in the rest of Canada, who rose in disgust claiming that we should stop pouring huge amounts of money into armament. That was part of the old debate and at that time, you would have found me on the barricades or marching to protest against cruise missile testing.

In this new debate, with the end of the cold war, there still remain areas of the world which pose a threat for democratic nations like ours. There are countries that rule through terrorism, choking off democracy. We saw an example of this during the gulf war and we saw that with the kind of interventions called for by the UN, we can avoid massive killing of civilian populations. This kind of equipment and its sophisticated guiding mechanism makes it possible to hit a target dead on, with a minimum of civilian casualties.

• (1645)

I now think, in this new debate, that to protect democracy as such, in our country and everywhere else, it is important to be equipped with the proper tools, no longer aimed at massive destruction, but at delicate surgery to excise those threats to democracy.

My question is this: After what I have said, do you agree that some countries should increase their activities against terrorism on the international level by using this type of surgical tool to strike down those anti-democratic offenders? Do you think that