

severe, grander or larger than those faced by Sweden, which is incapable of preventing the Soviets from using its territory at will.

We just do not have any choice in terms of neutrality, weapon free zones or any of those things. We are in fact involved in the contest between the Soviet Union and the United States. What we have to do is choose sides. We have chosen sides, we have chosen to stick with democracy. I hope I never see the day when we as a country feel that we cannot trust democracy and have more trust for dictatorship, even though from time to time we might disagree with the President whom their secret ballot selects. The reality is that it is a secret ballot in an open democracy and it is the country with which we are most naturally allied and must continue to be allied.

A nuclear free zone is simply an unenforceable and undesirable statement of Canadian intent. We cannot enforce Canada as a nuclear free area. If we attempted on our own to enforce it, we would find the treatment the Soviet Union is giving Sweden to be totally minor in comparison with the treatment they would give us.

The second thing flowing from this, if we were to adopt such a Bill, is our relationship with our NATO allies. I do not know if the Hon. Member who introduced the Bill is aware that each year in Canada military forces from our NATO allies train in particular in Wainwright, Alberta. In Suffield, the British army trains; in Shilo, Manitoba, the German army trains; and the air forces of all our NATO allies train out of Goose Bay, Labrador. In Shilo, Manitoba, most of the training is tank training, but part of it is training with 155-millimetre howitzers designed to deliver theatre nuclear weapons and shells in the event of a wholesale tank attack from the Warsaw nations against West Germany. They have the capability and are trained in Canada to launch theatre nuclear weapons with these howitzers against a tank attack. That has been the policy of NATO since 1954. It was designed to deter the Soviets from even contemplating such an action. They have 40,000 tanks compared with a quarter of that number of the NATO nations.

Whether or not it was wise, NATO decided in 1954 to deter the Soviets from contemplating an attack on the West by adopting the policy that it would respond with everything including nuclear weapons to an open attack from eastern Europe. There has not been a war in Europe since that policy was adopted. There has been no attack or threat of attack. Incidentally, it allowed western European nations in particular, but also Canada, to get by with what was a modest defence expenditure in comparison with what otherwise would have been the case if it were not for nuclear weapons. In other words, if NATO did not have a policy and the capability of deterring an attack with all forces including nuclear weapons, it would have had to build up its conventional capabilities to do so. The cost of that would have been vastly more than it has been spending. Those moneys would have come out of social programs, industrial development and many expenditures

Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Act

which instead of being spent on arms were used to bolster the standard of living and the quality of life of western Europeans.

● (1730)

If a deterrent is going to be a real deterrent, if the other side is going to feel it could genuinely be retaliated against in a fearsome fashion, it has to exercise its deterrent capability. That is what happens in Shilo, Manitoba, every year. They practise with howitzers, using simulated nuclear weapons. In Goose Bay, Labrador, year-round they practise aircraft strikes using various missiles, some of which are simulated nuclear tipped. I do not know what would happen to our agreements if we were to adopt this Bill. Presumably all of this activity would have to stop.

What would that do to our relationship with NATO? I do not know whether it still promotes it, but the NDP had a policy in the past of totally withdrawing from NATO. Withdrawing from NATO requires that we either have to protect ourselves, and the cost of that would be absolutely enormous, or not protect ourselves, in which case we give up our sovereignty and independence. We may give up significant chunks of Canadian territory, not to mention self respect and a lot of other things. The neutrality that flows from what they are initiating is simply not an option available to Canada.

Then there is the question of our NORAD agreement, an agreement with the United States in terms of North American air defence. Every day SAC bombers are in the air. B-52 bombers are in the air as a deterrent to Soviet air intervention into Canada. Some SAC bombers carry nuclear tipped cruise missiles, stand-off rocket missiles nuclear tipped. In any event, they are designed to do so. Under this Bill, SAC bombers would no longer be allowed over Canadian territory. In other words, we would not be able to be a member of NORAD. I would ask Hon. Members to consider the cost of—

Mr. Waddell: They are obsolete.

Mr. Andre: The Hon. Member says they are obsolete. He is not aware that today bombers do not drop gravity bombs. Bombers carry missiles to near their target and launch them from there. The Hon. Member is thinking in terms of gravity bombs which are 20 or 30 years out of date.

At best a declaration that Canada should be a nuclear weapons free zone is an empty gesture. The geopolitical situation in Canada is such that we cannot enforce such a policy, so why make a stupid, empty gesture? At worst, it is a signal to the rest of the world that we are dropping out of the western alliance, that we are no longer allied with the western democracies, that we are taking a stand totally out of keeping with 110 years of history, totally out of keeping with the fundamental desire of Canadians to protect and nurture democracies wherever they might exist and to ally ourselves with these democracies.

I ask the Members of the New Democratic Party to contemplate the nature of the struggle between East and West. The bottom line is whether individuals will be respected, whether democracies prevail in the world, or whether dictatorships