

*Adjournment Debate*

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I will proceed on this point and try not to intervene in your difference of opinion with the member from Kingston.

On March 9, 1992 I asked a question of the Prime Minister, which was eventually answered by the Associate Minister of National Defence, on the issue of a new version of Star Wars, this one going under the unlikely and implausible name of GPALS which stands for Global Protection Against Limited Strikes, once again an acronym designed to lull the public into thinking that what we are talking about here is something benign.

What we really have here is the American space military complex coming up with another version of the Strategic Defence Initiative, an idea touted by President Reagan, an idea which was at the time bizarre and expensive, and which is now being recognized as a bizarre, expensive and gross waste of human and financial resources.

The SDI proposal, the Star Wars proposal, depended on having an enemy, and the enemy was the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has now collapsed so the same industry has to come up with another idea in order to keep itself going, in order to suck public funds primarily out of the American taxpayer, but as well out of the world economy, and they are coming to Canada to try to sell this project to the Canadian government.

The project finds a new enemy; this time, fortunately, they have Saddam Hussein and they have the example of the Scud missiles. So they come forward touting this idea that maybe we should invest billions of dollars in trying to set up a space based defence against ballistic missiles, not coming from the Soviet Union across the pole or elsewhere to North America, but they conjure up the idea of ballistic missiles coming from places like Libya or Iraq to cities in North America. They build on the fear that was generated during the gulf war of scud missiles, a fear generated by Saddam Hussein and now being exploited by the purveyors of this bizarre idea.

I call on the government to ensure that while it seeks information about this, it is made clear right at the outset that Canada is not going to spend one dollar of Canadian taxpayers' money on this bizarre scheme; second, that we recognize it will not provide an ounce of protection against scud missiles or ballistic missiles; third, that it is a breach of the anti-ballistic missile treaty in which Cana-

da and the international community has a critical stake; fourth, that because it involves putting weapons in space it goes directly counter to Canadian policy promoted at the United Nations.

Whatever information we seek about this bizarre proposal, we make it clear at the outset that we will have nothing to do with it and we urge the American government to have nothing to do with it, and we make that plea on behalf of the Canadian people.

In 1985 the external affairs and defence committee came out against Star Wars. It should not be necessary for us to do that again, and I call on the government to make clear its opposition to this ludicrous proposal.

**Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, we all know that while attention to the cold war is quickly fading, the recent gulf war demonstrated the real threat of proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile delivery systems.

In response to this concern, the Prime Minister outlined Canadian initiatives in a speech in Washington this morning. This speech in turn followed upon an exhaustive program outlined by the Prime Minister and the SSEA in other speeches in February 1991.

It is in this broad context that the ballistic missile defence must be considered. While recognizing the need to respond to threats Canada also wishes to ensure that any proposal in the area of ballistic missile defence is stabilizing in nature.

We therefore welcome the fact that the U.S.A. 1991 missile defence act prudently stipulates that the initial U.S.A. BMD system should not contravene the United States anti-ballistic missile treaty with the former U.S.S.R. or authorize the deployment of weapons in space.

Moreover we have welcomed the broad co-operative approach the United States government has taken, particularly the ongoing U.S.A.-Russia dialogue and the program of consultation taking place with other interested countries.

This is all taking place against the historic co-operation between the United States and Russia in reducing their nuclear arsenals. We hope all these activities will permit new co-operative approaches to common security.