

Supply

The minority report suggests that our testing the Cruise missile will "only stimulate the Soviets". That is the exact wording. In my humble opinion the Soviets need little stimulation to fuel their expansionist appetite. The thief who breaks down my door may be stimulated to work faster by the noise of my preparations on the other side, but I suggest he will be even more stimulated to discontinue his work. If the SS-20s are dismantled, the Cruise missiles will not be deployed; that is clear. If not, the Cruise missiles will be deployed; that is even clearer.

I wholeheartedly support the objective of bringing the arms race to a halt. Only an insane person would think otherwise. However, I think we should take the time to study these various proposals for a freeze or moratorium on production and deployment of nuclear weapons by the United States and the Soviet Union. It is particularly important to consider, Mr. Speaker, any freeze proposal with caution in the context I have just described to you in order to establish what one is being asked to freeze. While a freeze may be a simple and clean solution with a lot of appeal, some superficially attractive variants—in particular the idea of an immediate global freeze on the deployment of nuclear weapons—would be seriously harmful not only for western security, which is the overriding objective, but also to the case for verifiable arms control, which is the only realistic means to achieve this objective. The task which is in the forefront of the western agenda is the negotiation of a real and balanced reduction in nuclear weapons.

The Soviet president announced that he had decided to suspend further deployment of SS-20 missiles on the European territory of the Soviet Union. This apparent self-restraint is deceptive for two reasons. Deployment of SS-20 missiles continues east of the Urals within striking distance of most of Western Europe, and approximately 300 of these missiles with a total of 900 warheads have already been deployed. NATO's combined intelligence is that that is all Russia originally intended to deploy. So it is not much of a concession.

Moreover, the continuation of this partial moratorium after the fact is conditional on the abandonment by NATO of their nuclear modernization plans. A more acceptable freeze proposal, a version of which was tabled in the U.S. Senate and House, would seek, through negotiations, to establish a balance at the lowest possible level, and then freeze it. As I indicated, disarmament in reverse.

Chancellor Schmidt recently said "the unbelievable Soviet armada is aimed at us." He was right. Last week he said that he strongly opposed an immediate nuclear weapons freeze which would institutionalize the Soviet advantage in Europe, and he reaffirmed his support for NATO deployment of Pershing and Cruise missiles starting late in 1983. Canada has given its support to NATO as of December, 1979. We continue to give that support and we still look at the zero option. And we will still be in Europe if that option is not accepted.

We have also agreed with our NATO allies that a freeze on implementation of the deployment aspect of the December, 1979, decision will remove any hope for the future success of

the Geneva negotiations, and that an immediate global freeze on nuclear weapons would detract from the goal of negotiated and verifiable reductions and limitations.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let anyone in this House think that I support a global build-up of arms. The last ten years have been an arms disaster. We have had a Soviet arms build-up, we have had Afghanistan and Poland, and SALT II was not ratified. That was because of Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. We have had the Middle East, Iran, Iraq, and countries going nuclear. Why? Because it is cheaper to go nuclear than to buy conventional arms. At the same time, since 1945 we have had 130 wars in which 25 million people have been killed with conventional arms. Fifty of those wars have been in the last ten years.

We had this debate last week, Mr. Speaker; it continued in Calgary, and we are having it today. If nothing else, the minority report is stimulating debate. There is an arms madness in this world. We spend \$500 billion per year on arms. That is just madness. We have 500,000 of our best scientists working for the military. That represents 40 per cent of all scientists in the world. The military is the greatest user of the world's natural resources. The annual military budget of the world equals the annual incomes of 1,800,000 people in the 36 poorest countries. When I said on Friday that for the cost of one Trident submarine we could school 16 million children for one year, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) said that without Trident submarines there would be no schools. I would rather have the schools. I agree with him logically, but I would rather have the schools. In two days the world spends 20 times more for military programs than for economic assistance to the poorest countries—it spends \$14,800 per soldier in the world on military expenditures but only \$230 per child on education. We are wasting our resources, our scientists and our money.

• (1730)

Canada has a good record. Last week when the hon. member for Victoria said that we tend to overemphasize our influence, he made a good point. Because we are liked in the world, we tend to think that we have a certain influence. We are liked because we are not colonialists; we are liked because we do not have aspirations. I do not think we should underestimate our importance, but I think we can only operate in the world as long as we belong to societies and groups such as NATO or NORAD where we can exert some influence over this madness.

Miss Jewett: But you do not exert any.

Mr. Irwin: The NDP exerts none. I still do not know the policy of the New Democratic Party; on Monday it is for NATO and on Tuesday it is against NATO. The NDP in Calgary does not even know. I would be pleased to know whether the NDP wants Canada to be in or out of NATO, so that I will at least know what to debate.

Canada was the first NATO country to relinquish nuclear capability. We virtually invented peacemaking.