

Nuclear Armaments

important disarmament initiative. The process of establishing such zones should be encouraged with the ultimate objective of achieving a world free of nuclear weapons".

In the past, Canadian Governments have traditionally supported the thrust of this policy. At two special sessions of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament, one in 1978 and the other in 1982, Canada supported the final declarations which encouraged the establishment of nuclear weapons free zones. It would appear from all that activity that Canada should have taken the lead and shown by example what it is indeed encouraging other nations to do. Instead, we have managed to confuse our position by acts of both the present and previous Governments.

This is the third time this particular motion has been debated, once on May 29, 1984, and once on October 10, 1985. As well, two similar Private Members' Bills were debated, one put forward by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) on March 18, 1985, and the other put forward by the previous Member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, Mr. Doug Anguish, on March 30, 1985.

In reviewing those debates, the central argument used by opponents of this proposal is that if Canada were to adopt it, her obligations to her allies would be seen to be diminished. In particular, it would isolate Canada from her allies in NATO and NORAD. As I understand the policy of the present Government, it is that it does not support the declaration of a nuclear weapons free status for Canada because Canada does not possess nuclear weapons. Since such weapons are not stationed in Canada we are essentially a nuclear weapons free zone. However, since we are members of NATO, which is a defence alliance which deploys a nuclear deterrent, we would be inconsistent with our membership in NATO if we were to adopt this motion.

I fully expect to hear that same kind of argument being advanced numerous times in the course of this debate. However, my Party believes, as do I, that on the evidence the argument does not stand up. Nuclear arms are not even mentioned in the North Atlantic Treaty. Therefore, Canada is not obliged to support what has developed as a NATO policy. As well, the treaty makes it clear that it is up to member states to decide the size and nature of their commitment within NATO. Presumably that is the reason given by Canada for its recent decision to withdraw its contingent of troops from Norway. It is also why Canada took the position at the 1957 Paris heads of government meeting that whether or not Canada would commit itself to having nuclear weapons was a decision only Canada could and should make. As we all know, the record will show that we decided not to do that.

I would like to think that we made that decision because to do otherwise would have meant that we would be lending our support to the build-up of nuclear arms and contributing to the increase in world tensions and the threat of nuclear war. In my view, the position Canada took was both visionary and in keeping with the respect we have internationally as a peace-

loving nation. I think we continue to enjoy that respect, but I also believe the principles we adopted then are not as clear today. In point of fact, while continuing the policy not to store or deploy nuclear weapons on Canadian soil, we also provide support for the development, testing and training in the use of nuclear weapons. We place no restrictions on Canadian industrial involvement either in the production of U.S. nuclear and nuclear capable delivery systems or, indeed, their components. Even though we have policy restrictions with respect to the export of fissionable material, there is clear evidence that this material is finding its way into arms production in France, South Korea and in the U.S. In addition to that, U.S. and British warships which are nuclear-capable, and some suspected of being actually armed with nuclear weapons, are allowed to visit Canadian ports.

It is also the policy of nuclear nations within NATO to "neither confirm nor deny" the presence of weapons on their vessels. They also apply this policy to aircraft. Yet while we as Canadians reject this policy for aircraft over Canadian territory, we seem to find it acceptable for naval vessels in our waters. I have never heard a satisfactory answer from either Government as to why this contradiction in our policy exists. However, it does.

I can provide numerous other examples where Canada's policies are a departure from her stated principles, but I will leave that to other speakers who will be rising in the course of this debate. It is sufficient to say that these few examples I have given illustrate the numerous inconsistencies in our stated principles as opposed to our developed policies.

• (1710)

Another central argument which has been made against Canada dissociating itself entirely from this nuclear policy development is that it would threaten Canadian jobs. That is also an argument that was used in the initial stages of the debate on whether Canada should or should not be involved in the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative or, as it is more commonly known, Star Wars. That argument was made even after many studies showed that military spending is one of the least effective ways to create employment.

One of those many studies conducted by the U.S. Labour Department showed that for every \$1 billion spent on military procurement 28,000 jobs could be created. The same \$1 billion would create 32,000 jobs if it were used to upgrade transportation systems, 57,000 jobs if it were spent on consumption of goods and services, and 71,000 jobs if it were spent on education.

Apart from any other consideration, I think it is irresponsible to talk about the need to create jobs through nuclear arms production when we know full well what the results of their use would be to mankind. However, it does bring me to another related point which I think brings into sharp focus the insanity of the global arms build-up and the developed world's wrong-headed setting of priorities. I am referring to the