

jects in the region and increased sanctions on South Africa in an attempt to get that country to change its apartheid policy.

## Defence

### **Cruise Tests**

In a statement in the House of Commons on October 1, Liberal leader John Turner called on the government to halt US testing of cruise missiles in Canada, stating that "there is no need to renew the agreement if the two major powers ratify the treaty to limit intermediate missiles" (*Hansard*, October 1). His statements followed claims in the *Globe and Mail* that the government was shifting its policy towards granting approval of cruise testing in the Canadian north. Secretary of State for External Affairs Joe Clark, in the Commons, rejected Mr. Turner's call, saying that such a move violated Canadian obligations to international alliances and would serve to reduce pressure on the Soviet Union to move toward global disarmament (*Hansard*, October 1).

Later in the month, the *Globe and Mail* reported that, after numerous failures, the next series of cruise missile tests would commence on October 27. The air-launched missile would fly from the Beaufort Sea to the Primrose Lake weapons range near CFB Cold Lake, Alberta, attached to a B-52 jet bomber. This "captive-carry" test would be in addition to the maximum number of six free flights a year for cruise missiles (*Globe and Mail* and *Ottawa Citizen*, October 26).

Opposition to the test was voiced by several disarmament groups and an article in the *Globe and Mail*, written by S. Rosenblum of Project Ploughshares, reflected these groups' complaints by stating that the federal government should have demonstrated its support for the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Agreement by ending Canadian testing of cruise missiles, which was seen as a dangerous escalation, an undermining of arms control and an expansion of nuclear arsenals (*Globe and Mail*, October 27). David Kraft of the Toronto Disarmament Network said that "Canada's traditional image as a peacemaker has been completely discarded by the Mulroney government" (*Toronto Star*, October 28).

On October 28 the *Ottawa Citizen* reported that the test had been successful, but that the flight corridor had been changed to avoid populated areas.

### **Chemical Weapons**

A group of foreign diplomats and military experts, including three Canadians, was given a tour of a Soviet armory of chemical weapons, in the hopes of accelerating negotiations toward a weapons ban (*Toronto Star*, October 5). Meanwhile in Ottawa, chemical

weapons experts met to discuss concerns over the escalation in the production and use of chemical weapons. Recent exchanges between the US and the USSR indicated that a chemical weapons ban might be possible, according to a report in the *Ottawa Citizen* on October 7)

### **Nuclear Submarines**

At a cost of \$8-billion, Canada's proposed purchase of twelve nuclear submarines would be its biggest military purchase ever. The *Ottawa Citizen* reported on October 9 that the US was no longer reluctant to see Canada acquire nuclear submarines. The United States had decided not to invoke a 1958 treaty preventing Canada from buying the British Trafalgar-class submarine. It had been speculated that the US would block the sale, either to sell one of its own designs or because of the practical military considerations of having to share information with a Canadian submarine fleet. The *Ottawa Citizen* also reported that there was still no guarantee the technology for the power plant in the British submarines could be used by Canada since the US Congress would have to approve the sale by Britain of the nuclear reactors (*Ottawa Citizen*, November 4).

A comment by a US embassy naval attaché, Captain Bob Hofford, who said that there was a "perception in this country [the US] that the nuclear-powered fleet was conceived as a means to exercise Canadian sovereignty in the Arctic," was seen here in Canada as undiplomatic, but nonetheless representative of the negative US reaction to the proposed purchase, according to an *Ottawa Citizen* report on November 20.

In late October, the HMS Torbay, a Trafalgar-class British submarine, was in Halifax harbor to start its selling campaign. Defence Minister Perrin Beatty refused to say whether the \$450-million submarines were on the inside track over the cheaper Rubis-class French submarines. "Both are capable, both very quiet, both dependable," he said, although he noted that the British had more experience in the Arctic (*Ottawa Citizen*, October 23).

The latest estimates indicated in mid-November that the nuclear submarines would cost \$8-billion, which by some accounts was still an optimistic figure, since the purchase of nuclear fuel and the training of crews also had to be included. Other considerations mentioned in a study by the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament indicated the nuclear option might be too expensive and a detailed examination of cheaper options, as well as Canadian labor content and material should be made (*Globe and Mail*, November 16).

That newspaper also reported (November 24) that there was some opposition from Newfoundland to buying the French submarine because of the ongoing fishing dispute, and that there was also some opposition by External Affairs Minister Joe Clark because the submarines were nuclear, and on the part of Finance Minister Michael Wilson because of their cost.

Defe  
Th  
the M  
ing i  
poter  
polic  
ping  
flow  
geste  
Pape  
regar  
rin E  
that  
with  
there  
spen  
Citize  
  
Star  
Th  
Can  
Can  
the F  
ticipa  
Th  
contr  
four  
port  
clude  
Wars  
state  
13, h  
in ar  
  
Env  
  
Wast  
Fe  
hazar  
Karu  
ing ar  
which  
forme  
becau  
an in  
found  
an u  
theref  
ing p  
tical  
(Glob  
  
Diox  
A  
Ameri  
of a t  
in pu  
chlorin