

is a bilateral arrangement with the United States and that it is not unusual for NATO allies to have independent policies on these issues.

...is [he] aware that various member countries of NATO take independent initiatives all the time?

They are not accused of being isolationist and neutralist. Some refuse to have foreign troops on their soil. Some refuse deployment of nuclear weapons on their soil....Some refuse to test cruise missiles....Why does he say that Canada, like Norway, Belgium or other West European powers, if in its best judgement such a decision should be made, cannot make such a decision?¹⁸

The debate then moved to a discussion of the proposed Liberal amendment. Members of the NDP party suggested that the amendment was out of order because it was a contradiction of the motion itself. Other members responded by stating that the motion itself was not clear in stating how and when the tests should be terminated; at the end of the first five-year period or immediately?

Mr. Clark spoke against the resolution. He stated:

This resolution suggests that to support unarmed cruise missile testing in Canada is to oppose SALT II. That is false. This motion suggests that Canada could strengthen the West's negotiating position by breaking the western solidarity which helped bring the Soviet Union to the table....It would have the opposite effect....

The point to underline, however, is that arms control negotiations have begun again in earnest.

It is important for us both to reflect upon how that happened, how it came to be and also to consider what it might mean....in the longer

perspective it is undeniably the case that a major factor leading to these arms control negotiations has been the consistent unity displayed by the allies of the United States....¹⁹

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 3905.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 3908-9.