

Cruise Missile Testing

There are other questions. Some people say that the maintenance of a strong deterrence force can be guaranteed only by regular testing of existing and experimental nuclear weapons. That is the view that has been expressed by both the Government speakers. They are against 81 per cent of Canadian people, who are of the opinion that we should totally ban nuclear weapons testing.

The Government has claimed that by doing this we would weaken the western alliance and the Russians would come rolling in with their bombs, tanks, secret police and the rest. They are out of step with the majority of Canadians. Another question is whether such a policy would weaken the western alliance and cause serious problems with Canada's allies, especially the United States. Fifty-seven per cent think that on the other hand Canada should become a nuclear weapons free-zone. They are not worried about weakening the western alliance and causing serious problems.

Specifically on cruise, the question was: "Given that Ottawa has allowed testing of cruise missiles in Canada on the understanding that the United States would continue to pursue arms reductions with the Soviet Union, should the Canadian Government now refuse permission for further such tests or not?" Sixty-eight per cent said yes, Canada should refuse to allow further cruise testing.

Remember, we heard a lot about the two-track system, that we would go on with the cruise until the Russians agreed to INF arms reductions. The Russians agreed. Why go on with the cruise missile? I will come to that answer in a minute, but I want simply to add further, because one previous speaker seemed to get the figure a little wrong, that according to *The Toronto Star* on March 21, the Gallup Poll found that 54 per cent say Canada should not permit the tests and only 38 per cent said they should be allowed. That is quite a growth of public opinion against the testing.

The core of the Government's argument is that we need the cruise as part of the bargaining for Russian arms reductions. In fact, we are not using them that way. The public does not believe in it. The public does not believe in the nuclear deterrent any more because they are convinced that a nuclear war will simply end everything. The Government does not believe in it either. It does not use it that way.

Last year before the Standing Committee on National Defence, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) pointed out that to his knowledge there had been no public or private attempts to push for controls on the sea launched cruise missile.

The sea launched cruise missile is more dangerous to Canada than the air launched cruise missile. It is much more available if the Russians start lobbing them from their submarines than if they have to lob them over the North Pole. The submarines are less subject to central control than are air launched cruise missiles, yet the Government has not even attempted to negotiate a limitation or control of sea-launched cruise missiles. Therefore, our Government does not believe

the argument it uses, that this is a deterrent and should be used to bargain with the Russians. Rather, it looks as though the Government simply wants to get in on every bit of new technology so that it can get arms contracts and higher profits for Canadian military producers. The fact is that the new stealth or advanced cruise missile, is clearly becoming a first strike weapon, the most destabilizing thing we could have.

The American Air Defence Initiative has two prongs. One prong is a better system for knocking down Soviet missiles if they come over Canadian territory. Whether air launched or sea launched, as many as possible will be dumped on Canada. Thank you very much, Mr. Reagan. The other prong is to improve the American cruise missiles so that they will be faster, supersonic, be able to evade radar as much as possible and therefore be used to launch a first strike.

The American plan for the use of cruise missiles is very dangerously destabilizing. Why do we hear reports about the Russians increasing their air patrols over the Arctic waters with their Bear bombers and other airplanes? Obviously they are afraid of the destabilizing effort.

Therefore, since there is one minute left in the debate, I believe we should have a vote on this matter. It is a good resolution and I would urge that this House vote in favour of the resolution put forward by the Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam.

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Debate. The Hon. Member for Nepean—Carleton (Mr. Tupper).

Mr. Bill Tupper (Nepean—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak to the motion moved by the Member for New Westminster—Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett). I was intrigued by two things in the debate.

Mr. Prud'homme: On a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

Mr. Manly: There is one minute left.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Not by my watch. The Hon. Member for Saint Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) on a point of order.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, it is too late now, but the purpose of my point of order was to ask the Member if he would like to proceed with a vote. I would have liked to vote for this motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 42(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper.