

We would be fools if we turned a blind eye to that reality.²⁰

The Liberal defence critic, Leonard Hopkins was also critical of the Government's support for the US modernization plan, and said that Mr. Nielsen should have asked for parliamentary approval prior to endorsing the binary weapons programme. Mr. Hopkins criticized the Government for its failure to bring forward a White Paper on defence policy and asked Mr. Andre to "commit himself and the Government to a debate in the House on such major international issues as this one so that Canadians may learn what is going on?" The Associate Minister said he would welcome such a debate and assured Mr. Hopkins that the Government would co-operate in arranging one.²¹ Denmark, Greece, Iceland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Norway are reported to have expressed serious doubts about the resumption of chemical weapons production by the United States. Mr. Hopkins said that Canadians were divided on this issue, and that the Government should not have taken an activist role in supporting the American position at the NATO meeting.²²

On 25 June 1986, NDP member Jim Fulton told the House that he had a catalogue of current Canadian Government chemical and biological warfare contracts.

These contracts amount to over \$5 million and have gone to major universities, private research laboratories and, yes, even the Ontario Ministry of Health....This is a nonsense. Biological and chemical weapons can not be used unless troops can be protected against their effects....I call upon the Government to halt work immediately in the field of chemical and biological warfare and to strike an initiative within NATO to halt development of these weapons while a global treaty is sought.²³

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid., p. 13564.

²² Communiqué, Len Hopkins, Official Opposition Critic for National Defence, 23 May, 1986.

²³ Commons Debates, 25 June 1986, p. 14807.