

Member for Leeds—Grenville makes a distressing statement on such an important matter.

• (1730)

We know that the world is attempting to combat poverty in Africa and in Asia in particular. It is trying to come to grips with environmental degradation caused by desertification, increased population pressures, urbanization, and poverty in some of the subcontinents like India and parts of Africa. Therefore, this matter is one which must be approached with an outlook that takes into account the enormous inability on the part of our society at the present time to understand what are our priorities.

Evidently our priorities are to find ways of shifting the expenses which go into the military complex to expenses which deal with rehabilitation and development of those parts of the world where the need is so great and the attention is so little. They do not command the attention that nations which have nuclear weapons can command at the present time.

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I express appreciation to the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young) for having brought forward this very important motion. At the same time I express my disappointment with the position taken by the Hon. Member for Leeds—Grenville (Mrs. Cossitt) in attempting to suggest that the proposal that Canada declare itself a nuclear weapons free zone would not change anything, and in attempting to suggest that we are already at the stage where we do not have nuclear weapons on our shore. I will be detailing instances where specific changes must be made if we are to become a nuclear weapons free zone. She also dismissed the possibility of a global referendum on nuclear disarmament. Of course she said quite rightly that there were no short cuts or substitutes for the negotiation process.

We are all fully aware of that fact and very much in favour of the negotiation process. We do not see the global referendum as a short cut to negotiation. We do not see a nuclear weapons free zone as a short cut to negotiation toward nuclear disarmament. We see them as small but important and significant steps which can lead to that kind of final step being taken.

We need to motivate public opinion so that there will be a mass movement of people in Canada and throughout the world demanding that their leaders and their Governments move toward a more stable international situation. The slogan "Where the people lead the Government will follow" is the sort of thing a global referendum would do.

I take issue with the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) who suggested that Cruise missile testing is the one area where we are not a nuclear weapons free zone. There are other areas, and later in my remarks I will zero in on the presence of nuclear submarines in Canadian waters.

### *Nuclear Armaments*

This morning I was talking to a young woman who was visiting my home. She has a little baby; Nicolita will be one year old tomorrow. I told her about this debate and she said: "Speak for Nicolita". In a sense that is what the debate is all about. We are speaking for our children and for generations who are yet unborn. The decision which this House and other Parliaments around the world makes will affect the future of our children and our grandchildren, countless generations. That is what is involved when we talk about nuclear weapons and their long-term effects upon civilization and genetics. We are speaking for Nicolita and for all children in the world.

Two weeks from now will be Remembrance Day. We will remember the contributions made by men and women in 1914, 1918, 1939 to 1945, and in the Korean War so that we could have a second chance to build a decent kind of world. Yesterday the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Hees) quoted the words "To you from failing hands we throw the torch". We must pick up that torch and work to ensure decent peace in our world. It cannot happen if we are constantly threatened by nuclear weapons.

Canada is in a very strategic place, and that is why the motion is so important. Canada has a unique contribution to make to the whole issue of nuclear confrontation, that is, the fact that we are placed between the two nuclear superpowers. We are uniquely placed either to make a contribution toward the stabilization of our world or toward the destabilization of our world. When we allow Cruise missile tests we are in fact encouraging further destabilization and the confrontation between the United States and the U.S.S.R., which they are attempting to defuse at the present time.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) has said: "We do not have a nuclear dimension to our policy. Canada does not have nuclear weapons on its territory, nor shall it during the life of this Government". It is not quite that simple. One policy in particular undercuts what the Prime Minister said. I refer to the presence of nuclear submarines from the United States which visit Canadian ports.

Because I come from Vancouver Island I am specifically concerned with the visit of nuclear submarines, submarines equipped with nuclear weapons, to Nanoose which is just north of my riding and to Esquimalt which is just south of my riding. Both those ridings are presently represented by Conservative Members. I wish they would speak out for the true interests of their constituents in this particular issue.

The United States has a policy of saying that it will neither confirm nor deny the presence of nuclear weapons aboard those submarines. Instead of standing up and saying that we have a policy of no nuclear weapons on Canadian soil or in Canadian waters, the Canadian Government simply honours that policy of the Americans. It honours their policy of not telling us whether or not they are bringing nuclear weapons into Canadian waters, into Canadian harbours.

Next week Greenpeace will be releasing a major study about the possible effects of an accident aboard one of those vessels