

and make clear what is ambiguous from the objects and functions section of the bill, which states:

The objects of the Agency are to promote the peaceful use and development of space, to advance the knowledge of space through science and to ensure that space science and technology provide social and economic benefits for Canadians.

They are very eloquent words, but ambiguous. When we look at Clause 5 (2), the object of my colleague's first amendment, we find that there is a Mack truck loophole, as I describe it. His proposed amendment comes in paragraph (b) and would change the wording to read the application of:

"space technology for non-military peaceful purposes".

That makes it very clear to the Canadian public, the Canadian taxpayers, just exactly what the purposes of the agency are, particularly in carrying out the objects. It states: "The agency shall". So it is very important that we have that wording added.

As we have learned before in this House legislation must be precise. The intent must be stated, not left to the interpretation of present or future ministers or the bureaucracy.

In particular, as we have learned, the Minister of State for Science and Technology, when questioned about this legislation and the purpose of the agency in committee, indicated that he was considering some military purposes for the agency. He described them as non-aggressive. If that is what the government was interested in doing vis-à-vis the agency, then clearly that should have been included in the objects and functions and included in the shall clause for what the agency shall be allowed to do. We simply cannot allow this kind of loose wording in either Clause 5 (2) (b) or (c) where my colleague has a similar amendment which would make it state: "To promote the transfer and diffusion of space technology for non-military peaceful purposes".

In assessing what any government is doing and where any government is going with legislation, it is very important that one look at what a government is doing, either intentionally or inadvertently. One can look at what is going on vis-à-vis Goose Bay, Labrador with the projected 65,000 low-level flights per year, if the NATO base were allowed to proceed.

### *Government Orders*

One looks in my own backyard at IR-910, the 4,000 kilometre route which is for Stealth first-strike training and route development for the U.S. military, incursions by up to 25 U.S. nuclear capable war planes at a time, a corridor cutting a swath right across British Columbia. It is a route, I might say, that is not allowed in the U.S. There is no similar route in the United States. The Americans want to do the training and Stealth route development in Canada.

Also, IR-920 in Alberta, the Northwest Territories and Saskatchewan will have similar Stealth training for low level war games.

Most recently the Chilcotin low level U.S. war games took place over B.C. airspace, between September 22 and 24 of this year. These are tree top war games with supersonic aircraft flying at tree top level in British Columbia, without there ever having even been an environmental impact statement, a notification to pilots, or a notification to the public that these were to take place.

We see the tritium sales even by the province of Ontario and Ontario Hydro in locking up commercialized tritium sales to the United States for use as a key component in nuclear bombs. The facilitation by the Canadian government of military sales and technology exchange to global dictatorships, human rights abusers, and such weapons bazaars as Armex right here in downtown Ottawa gives one some idea of the kind of expansion into the whole world of military development and deployment this present government is so interested in.

One need only read the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States to see the provisions that are included there for technology transfers and the redevelopment of some parts of Canada's economy for military purposes.

This House should be dealing immediately and urgently with the proposal by the United States Government to go ahead with a contract in the middle of this month to develop a Trident nuclear submarine base just 40 miles from Prince Rupert, placing it in an area to make it an international nuclear target. There have been no environmental impact studies done of the proposal. It threatens and endangers 35,000 Canadians and is to be put in an area where there are only a few thousand American citizens.