

Supply

On the other hand, the issue of missiles prompted acrimonious debate between the parties in that election held just recently. The tenor of the exchanges was harsher than in any post-war election. Some analysts have concluded that the strong emotions and fears raised may very well leave lasting scars on the population.

The divergent attitudes of political parties in West Germany toward the INF deployment provoked an unprecedented degree of outside involvement in that general election. The Soviet Union was notable for opposing deployment and intimidating those who favoured it. They used the carrot and stick approach as they frequently do. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko visited the FRG in January and figured prominently in the partisan domestic campaign. Painting a picture of the U.S.S.R. as benevolent and committed to a reasonable arms agreement in the Geneva INF talks, he characterized the Reagan administration as "gamblers and con men", insensitive to European problems and uncommitted to a successful outcome at Geneva.

We all know President Reagan's conclusion. He said this:

These actions reflect a bipartisan consensus on arms control, and new flexibility in the negotiations—steps to be viewed seriously by the Soviets and all others who have a stake in world peace. To the leaders of the Soviet Union, I urge that this new opportunity not be lost. To America's friends and allies around the world, I say that your steadfast support for the goals of both deterrence and arms control is essential in the future. To Congress and to the American people, I say let us continue to work together in a bipartisan spirit so that these days will be spoken of in the future as the time when America turned a corner. Let us put our differences behind us. Let us demonstrate measured flexibility in our approach, while remaining strong in our determination to reach our objectives of arms reductions, stability, and security. Let us be leaders in the cause of peace.

That is what we should be, Mr. Speaker. It is what Mr. Kohl in West Germany wants. It is what Prime Minister Thatcher wants, and she has just come through a very successful election. It is what the leaders in Holland want. Italy is going into an election, and that is what its leaders want. It is what the socialist movement in Italy wants; it is what members of the Communist Party in Italy want. They want a negotiated peace. It is what Canadians want. We differ on how we reach those goals, but at least let us support the leaders of the alliance who are our friends. Let us not go off on tangents and confuse an unsophisticated Canadian public on the nuclear debate. We must not do that either wittingly or unwittingly, and that is why I chose to take some time to speak about this. I am amazed that it was necessary to do so as I thought everyone understood the difference, the role and purpose of an air-launched Cruise missile compared to that of a ground-launched, Cruise missile or a sea-launched Cruise missile. Entirely different technologies are involved and each has a different purpose and a different role.

West Germany continues to support the principles of the December, 1979, decision. It was not easy for the leader. I tell this the way I understand it, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Kohl's victory did not necessarily come out of the debate, nor did the opposition to it. The growth of the Green Party in West Germany has been noted but it has lost most of its credibility.

In the United Kingdom, Prime Minister Thatcher did not waver at all. She has supported the 1979 agreement since its beginning. What happened to the coalition in that country? We all saw the manifesto printed down one side of the page

and another manifesto down the other. There were 21 points, 17 of them identical. If Hon. Members would do a little research, they would understand why honourable men and women of good will always defer to the right pursuit of peace. They do not necessarily reject other courses toward peace but they will always accept the right course.

How many Governments are there in Europe? We have 15 allies in NATO. Are we always right? Are we the only ones who know what is right? In Canada we have little choice but to support the knowledgeable decisions of the Government, and I hope this is a position that this Party would take. We have the same qualifications as the Government with respect to any escalation of the nuclear arms race. Those things are clear and are well set out. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Victoria, has done that, and others will follow.

Prime Minister Thatcher's Government repeatedly rejected the Soviet demand that the United Kingdom's independent nuclear forces be included in the Geneva INF negotiations. The Government has taken the position, shared by the NATO allies, that the Soviet posture is, in fact, an attempt to decouple the U.S. from Europe by excluding U.S. nuclear weapons systems from Europe. United Kingdom officials have argued that the British and French independent nuclear systems should not be included for several reasons; they are by definition and nature strategic and not theatre forces; they are minimal deterrent forces vis-à-vis the vast Soviet nuclear arsenal, and the INF negotiations are strictly bilateral. The March, 1982, U.K. white paper did indicate, however, that if circumstances were to change significantly, that is, if Soviet military capabilities and the threat they posed to the United Kingdom were to be reduced substantially, the U.K. would, of course, be prepared to review its position in relation to arms control. They have said these things. They are in place. They are part of the debate. It is incumbent upon us to be aware of it.

● (1620)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted for his speech has expired.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, the eloquence of the Hon. Member in describing his knowledge with respect to the Cruise missile, I believe has only portrayed his vast ignorance. I would like to quote to him from two sources. He has stated in questions today, and also in his speech just now, that the air-launched Cruise missile is not or cannot be equipped with a nuclear warhead. I would like to quote to him from a statement by William Epstein, who is the former director of Disarmament at the United Nations. He is referring to the air-launched Cruise missile to be tested in Canada. He said:

Each missile can carry a nuclear warhead up to about 300 kilotonnes in yield, about 20 times the power of the Hiroshima bomb.

If that does not satisfy the Hon. Member, I can go to another source to back up our assertion that the air-launched