

apparent, simple declaratory statement. The Bill, in effect, would require Canada's withdrawal from the security of 35 years' membership in NATO into questionable isolation and would abrogate a number of defensive bilateral agreements that Canada has with the United States.

On June 30, 1984, Canada removed the last remaining nuclear-tipped GENIE air-to-air missiles which were to be used in wartime in an air defence role by Canadian CF-101 Voodoo interceptors. The air defence role has now been taken over by CF-18 aircraft which can do the same job using conventional weapons system only. There are no nuclear weapons stationed on Canadian soil. Overflights of American aircraft with nuclear weapons, were they to occur, would take place only with the expressed permission of the Canadian Government. The same consultations and permission would be required for the deployment of any other nuclear weapons within Canadian territory.

Declaring Canada to be a nuclear weapons free zone would be a unilateral measure which is not supported by the Canadian Government. Unlike the originators of Bill C-218, the Canadian Government continues to believe in the concept of mutual security—a collective effort to deter aggression or to counter it if it occurs. That is why we are in the North Atlantic Alliance, which is also the framework for the NORAD agreement with the U.S.A. The Alliance relies on a deterrent strategy in which nuclear weapons play an important part. This is unfortunately unavoidable in the world as we know it.

The idea of a nuclear weapons free zone for Canada, with all its implications, would be realistic only if the Canadian Government were prepared to withdraw from the Alliance which has served us well and has helped to preserve peace for more than 35 years. The Canadian Government continues to believe that our defence partnership, co-operation and defence production sharing arrangements with our allies make a greater contribution to preserving peace and security than would our withdrawal into the uncertain isolation of a nuclear weapons free zone. As I have already mentioned, the Canadian Government does not support the idea of unilateral disarmament.

● (1720)

It is necessary for us to maintain our support for our NATO alliance until such time as disarmament is mutually agreed to by the great powers. In this context, we are particularly encouraged by the agreed objectives for the American-Soviet negotiations which are under way in Geneva, the prevention of an arms race in space and its termination on earth; the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms; and the strengthening of strategic stability, leading ultimately to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Canada is a member of the North Atlantic Alliance, and has now been a member for thirty-five years. We joined the Alliance because we believed in the concept of collective security, a united effort to deter aggression or to counter it should conflict occur. There were many advantages to such an

Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Act

alliance. However, the most telling advantages were then, and continue to be, the united strength which accrued to the Alliance enabling it to resist undue external political and military pressures and reduction of the cost of defence by dispersing the burden of armaments among the member states. Similarly, NATO has enabled the West to speak with a unified voice on critical issues of international security and to pursue the progressive development of East-West relations in a coherent fashion. It is an invaluable forum for nations such as Canada to express their views and to exert a constructive and moderating influence on the policy directions taken by the Western powers in their relations *vis-à-vis* the East bloc.

The Alliance has relied for its security on a deterrent strategy in which nuclear weapons play an important role. Clearly, an alternative approach which could provide an equal measure of stability and strength, but which would not rely on nuclear weapons for its effect, is a desirable objective. Unfortunately, we have been unable to fashion a post-war world in which such policies would be either realistic or desirable for the maintenance of peace.

The NATO Alliance remains an indispensable tool for Canada to maintain an effective and influential voice toward the improvement of East-West relations.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): What has NATO got to do with it?

Mr. Weiner: The idea of a nuclear weapons free zone for Canada would be realistic only if the Canadian Government were prepared to withdraw from the Alliance.

Mr. Althouse: You are on the wrong Bill.

Mr. Weiner: Would Canadian withdrawal from the Alliance enhance the prospects for peace and help to diminish the likelihood of nuclear catastrophe which continues to loom so threateningly in the distance? Were Canada to declare itself a nuclear weapons free zone, would this in any way reduce the devastating effects which a thermonuclear war would wreak on this country, and indeed the world?

Mr. Keeper: Yes.

Mr. Weiner: Would Canada's voice be listened to more seriously and would our words carry greater weight in the corridors of power around the world because we were no longer a member of the NATO Alliance?

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): What has NATO got to do with it?

Mr. Weiner: The answer to these questions remains unequivocally "No." Canada's possibilities for influencing these events would be greatly weakened and the stability of the East-West balance immeasurably shaken.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. This is Private Members' Hour. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Weiner) has the floor. I would like to hear him—