

*Government Orders*

years ago, each of the two blocs controlled half of the world, but today, in some places, there is no control from one bloc or the other.

That is why, as my colleague from Saint-Jean was saying about the old and the new way of thinking, we must look at these tests in the new global perspective. We must see this testing not as a yearly event that pushes us closer to a nuclear war but as a way to enhance security, since the missiles tested are not necessarily equipped with nuclear heads.

Also, civilian applications are eventually found for the sophisticated technologies often developed by the military. Will there be civilian applications in this case? We can hardly see any at the present time, but could the computerized systems, the maps charted and the aerial photos taken from satellites tracking these low-level missiles be used for other than military purposes?

• (1910)

This does not represent, like it did in the past, a stepping up of the confrontation with the communist bloc. It is not as far reaching since, as a result of disarmament initiatives and various treaties signed recently, the number of missiles is limited to 460. This is a thousand less than previously. They will be replaced as they become obsolete, but the number will never exceed 460. In that sense, the tests are done more to refine the missiles, to make them more effective, better targeted, and therefore better able to spare human lives.

[English]

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Madam Speaker, I want to start by congratulating you and your colleagues on your appointments. I assure you you can count on my full co-operation at all times.

I also want to give credit to the government for arranging this debate today and the debate on peacekeeping yesterday. This is a welcome departure in involving the whole House in policymaking before a policy decision is made or before an agreement is terminated as I hope the case will be in this instance.

I especially welcome the opportunity to speak on the question of cruise missile testing. As hon. members might know I have opposed the testing of cruise missiles from the very beginning in 1983 and on all previous occasions when this matter was before the House I voted against the testing.

Since the cold war is now fortunately no longer with us I am even more opposed than I have been in the past. Why is this so important and why am I so opposed?

First of all the cruise missile is an extremely dangerous weapon. It is small. It is easily concealed. It is mobile. It is accurate. It is capable of avoiding radar detection because it

flies close to the ground under the general radar beams and pickup. It also can carry a nuclear or a conventional war head.

Since these missiles can escape detection by radar they can be used for a successful first strike and as a result totally knock out the opponent's weaponry.

I originally opposed cruise missiles because in my view they contributed in a very serious way to the arms race. They contributed to international instability and they were also, in my view, contrary to the principles of the non-proliferation treaty which was signed and heavily supported by Canada.

Canada originally agreed to test these weapons for the United States by an agreement concluded in February 1983. It was said at that time that the United States wanted to test these missiles in the northwest of Canada because the northwest of Canada had a terrain similar to that of the northern Soviet Union.

In February 1988 the testing agreement was automatically renewed for another five years and in 1993 it was continued by the former Conservative government for a new 10-year agreement. Since 1983 there have been 23 tests, about two or three per year, with the most recent test in March 1993.

I want to make clear however that this agreement between the United States and Canada is not part of our NATO obligations and was never part of the NATO agreement.

I said I was originally opposed to cruise missile tests and I am now more than ever opposed.

In the last Parliament on January 24, 1989, our Liberal Party took a position against further cruise testing. I quote the first paragraph of the document which was issued by our party on January 24, 1989: "The Liberal Party of Canada today called for the Conservative government to finally shake off its cold war mentality and cancel further cruise testing in Canada as a tangible and positive gesture to improving the climate of east-west relations and ongoing disarmament negotiations". This is under the sponsorship of the leader of the opposition at that time.

• (1915)

This was a change of policy. Up until that time the Liberal Party had supported cruise missile testing. I had not personally supported it—I opposed it—but the party did support it. I felt I had some part in bringing about this change in party policy.

I also want to point out that our party at a major policy convention in 1986 passed two important resolutions. I will not read them because time is short but they are in our resolution book of 1986 opposing cruise missile testing.

The reasons for the change in our party policy given by our leader in 1989 were the following:

First, the cold war was over.