

Naturally, the Soviet Union matched the U.S. by developing its own Cruise missile system. So now Canada has to spend up to \$800 million to build a North Warning System to defend itself against a weapon that it helped to develop. That is the Government's idea of job creation? I think it is slightly mad!

Now I have mentioned it, let us examine MAD—Mutual-Assured Destruction. That is the nuclear deterrence which has kept peace for 40 years. But it cannot last forever. Now there is a chance that the Soviet Union may offer to cut its offensive weapons in return for U.S. cuts in star wars. But the U.S. insists on developing yet another new weapons system. No one knows where SDI will lead or how it will affect arms control, but we do know some of the potential dangers. SDI may split the Western Alliance if the U.S. turns down cuts in Soviet weapons because it wants to develop star wars. The U.S. may violate the ABM treaty if it goes ahead with the Talon Gold Test in 1987, and the Soviets may counter SDI by MIRVing their ICBMs and adding more Cruise missiles.

In Question Period this afternoon, the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) if the clause which was taken out of the NORAD Agreement by the Liberals in 1981 would be returned this weekend in Quebec City. I would like to quote the Secretary of State for External Affairs word for word. He said, "This agreement will not involve in any way a Canadian commitment to participate in an active ballistic missile defence". That clause was taken out. I would ask the Minister of National Defence, will he insist this weekend that that clause be returned to any new NORAD Agreement? It is fundamental to the future development of star wars. Without that clause—and the Minister once again spoke about our sovereignty in our airspace—it is absolutely hollow. That clause must be put back into the NORAD Agreement. That is all there is to it. It is very simple.

It will affect Canada in many ways. The submarines and bombers armed with those Cruise missiles will threaten from the Arctic. Still, the Government insists on the following: One, that SDI is only research. Can anyone in their right mind sitting on the other side tell me that the United States will spend up to \$25 billion on blackboard and chalk, and that it will not develop the system and then deploy it? It is utter nonsense. How naive can the Government be? Two, the Government insists that the Dew Line update is only a warning system. Three, there is no connection between SDI and the North Warning System, and, four, there may be inadvertent consequences, but we can get out of them. This, too, is absolute nonsense.

Yesterday in the House I described how NORAD and the U.S. Air Force were already merging space and surface warning systems into a NORAD/Space Command. It is a combined command. The system will pick up a threat detected by either satellites or ground-based radars. It will then co-ordinate the defensive response. In other words, the two systems are already combined. In other words, the upgrading of the North Warning System is, in fact, already a part of star wars. A star wars

Air Defence Modernization

system could counter ICBMs, and fighter planes can counter bombers and Cruise missiles.

In that context we should ask, is it a coincidence that the North Warning System will upgrade northern bases for CF-18 fighters? Is it a coincidence that the Government is considering buying an additional 20 CF-18s? Is it a coincidence that the U.S. is developing a "look-down, shoot-down" radar so that fighters can knock down Cruise missiles? No. The Americans know that SDI will have to counter the air-breathing threat that can slip under space-based weapons. That is the inadvertent consequence of adopting a defence strategy.

The U.S. is adopting that strategy with the Strategic Defence Initiative. NORAD will have to be a part of that strategy. The North Warning System will be a necessary component of the defensive strategy. The Government should make it its business to know about these "inadvertent consequences". The Minister of National Defence and the Secretary of State for External Affairs should investigate them and report to the House or to the appropriate standing committee of this House.

● (1530)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Government has the right and the obligation to consult with the United States about future activities of our defence alliance. That obligation is set out explicitly in the current NORAD Agreement. The Government must take that obligation seriously if it intends to govern responsibly.

The scientific world is leading the military world which, in turn, is leading the political world down a dark path about which most of us know very little, and we should have the courage to admit it at this stage. We should make sure in this country that there are built-in safeguards so that we do not get sucked into the Strategic Defence Initiative, which I feel is more appropriately called star wars, because that is exactly what it is. It is space-based, space-launched warfare.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, when American scientists are now talking in terms of not a few hours of response, not a few minutes, but in terms of a few seconds, where are we going? I hope the Minister will make it abundantly clear to President Reagan this weekend that we want that clause put back in NORAD and that we want control over the North. Yes, we are prepared to share early warning information with our allies, but we are not prepared to go along with the star wars holus-bolus without knowing where it is going to take us, because it is the most destabilizing defence offensive system which has ever been devised by man to date.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Nielsen) on what is a very serious day in the life of this country. We are now taking a very radical departure and making a change in the whole foreign policy defence standing which Canada has adopted in the past 30 or 40 years. We regret deeply, as my colleague has already stated, that this major departure in our