

Supply

I thought the minister was moving a little on the second recommendation of the minority report, that there not be any Cruise testing in Canada. He has already moved to some extent because I assume that originally the plan was to have the agreement signed by this time. When it became public, then, of course, he moved toward not having it signed, at least until we have had the second special session on disarmament at the United Nations.

I think he may be moving a little further and coming closer to our second recommendation, because this afternoon he said, as I understood it, that Canada is not involved in development of nuclear weapons systems. I take this to be a promise that we will no longer be involved in development of nuclear weapons systems. Of course, we are now involved, as we all well know. Not only are we possibly going to draw up an agreement for the testing of the Cruise missile but we have also been involved for some time in giving support to industries that are helping to provide the guidance system for the Cruise missile and other nuclear weaponry, particularly Litton Systems Canada Limited. Vickers Canada and Litton Industries are providing the hulls for the Trident submarine. When the minister says we are not involved in the development of nuclear weapons systems, of course that is not true. We are involved through testing, if we do test, and by encouraging the manufacturers of the Trident and Cruise missiles through grants and loans. The reason I have some hope is that I take it he is moving toward a position that, just as we are not going to have nuclear weapons on our soil once they are pulled out of Comox, so also we are not going to be involved in the future in the development of nuclear weapons systems. For this reason I believe it is possible that the minister and many members will follow, in a sense, the lead which the Canadian public is already giving; that is, no Cruise testing and no further manufacture, although the latter is not in the minority report.

● (2040)

The minister made no comment at all on the third recommendation in the minority report that all nations should pledge never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. I take it that is because he would be in fundamental agreement with the no-first-use pledge. I expect he has read the article in the spring issue of *Foreign Affairs* written by Robert McNamara, the former U.S. Defence Secretary; George Kennan, former Ambassador to Moscow; McGeorge Bundy, a former adviser on national security; and Gerard Smith, the chief arms control negotiator in recent Democratic and Republican administrations. Nothing in that article confirms what the Minister of National Defence just said, that the authors had made the no-first-use pledge conditional upon an increase of conventional armaments. Certainly Robert McNamara and the others have pointed out the great importance of conventional armaments which they would like to see accompany the adoption of the non-first-use pledge. However, to the best of my knowledge, that is the most they have said. For lack of time I cannot give hon. members the details of this article. However, I urge the

minister and all members of the House to read it. I would just like to emphasize the last few words of the article:

There has been no first use of nuclear weapons since 1945, and no one in any country regrets that fact. The right way to maintain this record is to recognize that in the age of massive thermonuclear over kill it no longer makes sense—if it ever did—to hold these weapons for any other purpose than the prevention of their use.

As I say, because the minister did not comment on the no-first-use pledge—although I am confident he has read most of the material surrounding this proposal—I assume he would support it.

Finally, in the fourth general category of recommendations in the minority report on security and disarmament is what one could broadly call Canadian efforts at disarmament education, efforts that we might make to encourage greater public knowledge and understanding of the whole question of security and disarmament. This would include the desirability of a global referendum on disarmament which, as we point out, is being taken up by more and more municipalities in this country. Again, it may be that the minister did not refer to that recommendation because he was in agreement with it. He is a *universitaire* and no doubt puts a good deal of hope in public illumination and education. However, it also may be that he feels there has been a tremendous awakening of public interest in and knowledge about these important life and death issues. It certainly has not been referred to as much today as I think it ought to have been, this enormous upsurge in public interest and concern. We of course had evidence of that only last Saturday in Vancouver when a march to end the nuclear arms race, followed by a rally, was attended by 30,000 to 35,000 people, according to a police estimate. I expect it was one of the largest marches and rallies ever held in Canadian history, representing a cross-section of people in British Columbia and therefore in Canada.

I am sure all of us here are aware of the tremendous popular movements in most European countries.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to her has expired. Nevertheless, she may continue with unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Miss Jewett: I thank my colleagues. Some people have said that surely these movements are communist-inspired. Most, if not all, of the witnesses before the subcommittee on security and disarmament said that was not true. They said the only one which might have been communist-inspired was the one in Paris; otherwise, they are popular movements. When the minister spoke earlier about some of the bigger powers in NATO and NORAD wanting the two-track decision, I wish he had also mentioned how many of the smaller powers do not want the Cruise missile. Belgium has not even discussed the matter yet, that is how badly they want it; the Netherlands has come as close as they can to refusing the stationing of the Cruise missile on their soil. We must not confuse the wishes of the larger powers with those of the smaller powers on these matters. It is irrelevant whether they are socialists, Christian Democrats or whatever. We should not make a big deal of