

Supply

Cruise missile is designed to carry a nuclear warhead. If you look at the background papers, tabled with the umbrella agreement, which was tabled in this House, Section E, entitled, "The Cruise Missile—Deterrents and Arms Control", you will see in the last paragraph on Page 2:

Cruise missiles can be armed with either conventional or nuclear warheads. Any missiles which may be tested in Canada would, of course, be unarmed.

That is the source of our information when we say that the air-launched Cruise missile is designed to carry a nuclear warhead. Would the Hon. Member tell us what is his source of information which says the air-launched Cruise missile is not designed to carry a nuclear warhead?

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, my sources are the United States military authorities, the Pentagon, General Rogers, and a host of other people. I do not believe that I said that the air-launched Cruise missile was not capable of nuclear capability. I said that its role and purpose has a three or four-day duration, that it is designed to do a specific job. That job is conventional because there is no need to use a nuclear weapon to blow up a runway or a railway station. No military man whom I have met in three and a half or four years on the nuclear arms committee in Europe has ever suggested anything else. The Boeing people do not suggest that, nor does the Pentagon, where I have asked this question specifically—without getting into names. As a matter of fact, I asked General Rogers the question. General Rogers would deploy the air-launched Cruise missile specifically for the purpose I have indicated. He has said that publicly. He has said that it has no better role than to relieve the commanders of the responsibility of sending men, live people, souls, human beings, down the middle of a runway to destroy it only to know that when they issue that order three-quarters of the men will not come back. That is its role and its mission. Every nation in the world, unless we come to our senses, will deploy air-launched Cruise missiles in this particularly narrow way. There is absolutely no need to increase the cost of an air-launched Cruise missile to the level of the cost of a ground-launched missile or a sea-launched Cruise missile. There is no need to do that. You have the other weapon systems.

The Hon. Member is right in saying the system can carry anything. It can carry leaflets. It can carry mail, and God knows we need to speed up the mail around the country. However, it is not a dedicated nuclear system. I do not argue with the fact that it has the capacity to be converted to that, but it would take two to three years of new technology and new work to turn that vehicle into a nuclear-capable Cruise missile.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure who the Hon. Member was trying to "snow" in his answer to my friend, the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadowlake (Mr. Anguish). I would like to ask him about the arguments which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has thrown at us over the last number of months when we have opposed the testing of this missile in Canada. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Lamontagne) has also repeated this same point. We have said that this is not the missile which is going to be

used in NATO. They have said, however, that it does not really matter which of the three missiles we test, that what they are testing is the guidance system. Therefore, they are using this as a test bed for a guidance system which can subsequently be used in the ground-launched or sea-launched, or whatever launched missiles which are designed to carry nuclear weapons. That is the point we are trying to make. It is not whether this specific missile happens sometimes to carry nuclear and sometimes to carry conventional. Would the Hon. Member comment on that, please?

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of putting words in the mouth of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), or anyone else. He can do what he wants. The air-launched Cruise missile, just as the Tomahawk, as my friend knows very well because we viewed it together, I believe, has the capacity to carry a 1,000-pound conventional warhead. It can be converted. It is not my fault if the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence are not fully conversant with this subject. The secrecy which surrounds this debate, my dear friend, is nonsense. I believe Canadians should be aware of what is going on so that when we react out of natural human fear, we understand what we are reacting to, so that we are not reacting to something which we do not understand. It is my understanding that the system is designed to carry up to—and I should not say the numbers because I am not sure—a 1,000-pound conventional warhead missile, and that to convert it to a nuclear capacity would take at least two years. Even the guidance system is entirely different. The whole response is entirely different because its mission is entirely different from that of the air-launched Cruise missile. But it is immaterial. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that we have taken advantage of the testing of a guidance system in Canada to expand that into a nuclear debate, and we have labelled the air-launched Cruise missile as a horrendous nuclear dedicated weapon system, which it is not.

Mr. McRae: Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of difficulty with the statements of the Hon. Member. I do not in any way question his sources or what he is trying to put across. However, it seems to me that there is one very good reason why a conventional weapon would not be satisfactory, that is, that you need a much larger explosive force in order to be as accurate as you need to be, even though you can get 100 meters from your source. I have a list of all the Cruise weapons with built-in guidance systems, the TERCON guidance system. They are the ALCM AGM 86B, which is nuclear; the GLCM, the ground-launched BGM 109G, which is a tactical weapon, nuclear; and the SLCM BGM 109A, nuclear, and there are only a few of these coming along, and they will not come on until 1986. They actually will be conventional and are for that purpose.

I believe we are talking very seriously about a nuclear weapon which can get close enough to destroy a command post, but that cannot be done in any kind of hardened situation, and cannot be done if you are using a conventional