

Mr. Allmand went on to explain the importance of the motion he was proposing:

This is extremely important not only for the environmental consequences of testing but also to stop the development of new nuclear weapons. It is concluded by experts throughout the world that, if you could stop the testing of nuclear weapons, you could stop the development of nuclear weapons. This becomes an extremely important step in bringing about the end of nuclear weapons.¹³

On the same day, NDP Member Dan Heap also commented on the effort to convert the PTBT into a CTBT. He stated:

This move has the support of 116 countries, which is a good majority of the United Nations. Unfortunately, some of the heavyweights have not supported it. The point of such a conference as is being proposed is to bring the public opinion of the whole world, or of two-thirds of the world or more that are represented in these countries, to bear on the heavyweights that are resisting the idea of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

It has been the dream of hundreds of millions of people around the world that we would arrive at a reasonable decision to stop the use of nuclear weapons, to decide that we will never use them and, therefore, to decide that we will never produce them, to decide that we will never research their production, and to decide as a key decision, that we will never test the production of any new nuclear weapons.¹⁴

In reference to the question of completely stopping the testing of nuclear weapons, Progressive Conservative Member Bill Casey stated that the adoption of a CTBT had always been a fundamental objective for the Government. He noted that in 1985 the Prime Minister had stated that this was one of the six key objectives in the area of arms control and disarmament. Mr. Casey continued:

In addition, it must be borne in mind that no amendment to the partial test ban treaty can come into effect without the approval of the original depository states, and here there is clear opposition. Canada has long recognized the futility of holding a special conference or a negotiation on a CTBT in the absence of support of the parties most directly concerned.

Meaningful arms control, including the progress on the comprehensive test ban treaty, requires that issues be approached in a forthright manner. In this case, however, proponents of the comprehensive test ban treaty are taking advantage of a legal

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Commons Debates*, 16 February 1990, p. 8478.