

*Nuclear Armaments*

United States to negotiate some arms reduction. I regret that it has taken so long and hope that it does not always depend upon the balance of terror, as the establishment likes to call it.

I do not agree with the Hon. Member when he argues that Canada should reject this resolution because we need to participate in nuclear alliances in order to have access to their information so that we can be credible when negotiating arms control. That reminds me of a cartoon in the *Toronto Star* by the famous cartoonist, Ben Wicks. The king was sitting on his throne with his jester in front of him and he said, "Make me laugh, tell me the one about getting disarmament through making more bombs".

It seems to me that if Canada, which has very considerable civilian knowledge of nuclear matters, were to withdraw from nuclear alliances, we would not lose our credibility. Unless the Government wants to cancel everything which the National Research Council does, we need not lose our ability to understand the peaceful uses of nuclear weapons. I think we would be more credible to the smaller and middle-sized countries of the world if we divested ourselves of our ties with the nuclear powers.

I want to concentrate mainly on the Arctic. I admit that I have not been there much. I went to the Yukon once, but all Canadians, most of whom do not live in the Arctic, must give it more thought because the Arctic is becoming very important. It could be the focal point for the expanding ambitions of several countries and, therefore, a focal point for the risk of nuclear war which, it is agreed, we need to prevent.

The Arctic is a major theatre of interest for the American Star Wars program, the American air defence initiative, which some people call Son of Star Wars, and the American maritime strategy, which includes invading Soviet ports in order to destroy the Soviet submarine fleet. For that they may want to use the Arctic, perhaps even part of the Canadian Arctic.

All of these plans are inherently destabilizing and aggressive. Deployment, which makes it possible to make such moves as I have described, is threatening the Russians with the possibility of a U.S. first strike against their retaliatory or second strike capacities. Most arms experts and nuclear experts agree that that would be the shape of a plan which would be perceived in that way by the Soviet Union. Even if we say that the U.S. does not intend to use it, it is very foolish to give the appearance of intending to use it. If they do not intend to use it, they could say so which, of course, they refused to do.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) spoke about this on May 25, 1987, when he warned that if Star Wars are deployed with counterforce weapons, they do produce the option of a first strike. Some of the Government's actions are not consistent with that important understanding expressed by the Prime Minister. The policy of allowing Canadian corporations to engage in Star Wars research clouds that issue very gravely.

It is important for the Government to show leadership in this matter.

As the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) have said and demonstrated through their actions, we have the opportunity to get many other powers in the world to listen to us when we have a serious program. We could extend leadership toward the goal of helping to ensure that there is no nuclear war.

One way in which to do that is to negotiate for a nuclear free zone which would cover the Arctic. Not only the Canadian Arctic would be involved, and this is where the negotiating comes in. The Americans are present in Alaska and the Soviet Union is present throughout its side of the Arctic. Greenland, Iceland and the other Scandinavian countries all have a strong stake in the Arctic and the benefits of a nuclear free zone there. Canada could take a lead by inviting them to talk about that and trying to set up agreement in which all countries could participate on an equal basis to reduce the threat throughout the Arctic without any one country making itself dangerously vulnerable.

For Canada's part we would probably have to agree on several things. We would have to deny the use of Canadian soil and waters to the U.S. for their air defence initiative, their Star Wars, and their maritime strategy. The present Government of Canada has been investigating this possibility vigorously. We would have to investigate it more vigorously and perhaps more contentiously. We would have to continue the general work, especially as it relates to that area, of discouraging the build-up and deployment of nuclear weapons, at least within the Arctic.

We would also have to refuse to test the cruise missile, particularly the one using the stealth technology, which is the most obvious threat to the Soviet Union. We would have to ask that the Soviet Union also refrain from testing similar missiles on its northern territory. We would have to stop allowing the transit of nuclear weapons on Canadian soil.

We have some rather slippery agreements with the United States which seem to say that they will not store, deploy, or use these weapons on our soil except when there is a crisis, in other words, except when they want to. They do say that when they are going to, they will let us know and we will have a chance to agree. It sounds like a 30-second phone call to tell us that they are coming over with the bombs and asking whether we object. I do not know what Canada will have to say about it at that point. We must make it clear that our territory is out of bounds for an action that might bomb the Soviet Union.

We must take over our own northern defence and warning system to ensure that it will be used for strategies which promote peace and the cooling down of tensions rather than threatening war. We must cancel low-level flight training for B-52s and other nuclear capable planes from the NATO countries. Finally, we must talk with the Inuit and other northern people around the Circle to find out what they are doing by way of negotiating among themselves.