

Government Orders

In the past, Canada authorized these tests because it felt that our security was inseparable from that of our allies within NATO.

Second, the agreement for weapons testing is an important element of our relations with the United States, which are close, complex and unequalled in scope. We are partners under the most important bilateral trade agreement in the world. We share a whole gamut of political, social and cultural values, and we are allies in the defence of North America and Europe.

Third, these tests bring financial benefits to Canada. The cruise missile tests are the *raison d'être* of the weapons testing agreement. The agreement now includes a clause on additional costs, whereby Canadian taxpayers could save thousands of dollars each year by reducing the costs of tests conducted by Canada in the United States.

In my opinion, those are three conclusive arguments which confirm that the position set forth by our leader in his speech this morning, which was again a remarkable speech and which my colleagues supported throughout the day, is a clear and logical position which is in the best interest of Quebec and Canada.

[English]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot): Madam Speaker, I am very impressed with the speeches that have been given on this issue so far, both on the pro and the con. I want to thank the hon. member who has just finished speaking.

Some of the speeches tonight have been very vivid and to the point. I would like to address part of the speech given by the hon. member for Davenport when he asked a very important question. He referred to the threat to our security and he asked who is the enemy.

Who is and what is the threat to the security of the child who has been molested? What is the threat to the security of the women who has been raped or the senior citizen who has been murdered?

Mr. Allmand: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With all respect to the hon. member, I think the rules provide that the 10-minute question and answer period is to comment on the previous speech or to ask questions of the member who has just spoken, not to comment on speeches that took place earlier in the day.

I respect the fact that the member is new member, but I think the purpose of the 10-minute question period is to deal with the speech that has just been given and not with an earlier speech.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce is quite right. Would the hon. member for Crowfoot care to continue discussions and comments on the prior speaker's remarks.

Mr. Ramsay: Madam Speaker, my understanding is that this debate or this discussion is open for all comments.

The real threat to our security that we must guard against lies in the unwillingness of the individual to respect the legal and human rights of others. As long as we have people like Saddam Hussein, Joseph Stalin and the other tinpot dictators we have seen through the annals of history, we will have to protect ourselves against their unwillingness to respect the rights of the human individual.

That begins right here in the House. I have watched the operation of this House on television for a number of years and I have watched it since I have been here.

● (1905)

When hon. members in this place do not have the tolerance to respect the rules of this House and then violate those rules, that in fact is the threat to the security of the individual. It is simply a degree. One magnifies that degree and it becomes the real threat to the security of individuals, communities and nations.

I would like to ask the hon. member who has just spoken this question. It is on a different issue. During the cold war we had the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. They controlled the majority of the nuclear weapons in the world. Since there has been the break up of the Soviet Union, I would like to ask the the hon. member if he feels that there is a greater threat of nuclear attack upon the nations of the world now or before?

[Translation]

Mr. Plamondon: I first wish to thank my colleague for his comment and for his question.

I think that he has touched on a point that can divide people and bring some to ask themselves questions.

Are we still in a cold war and, if not, since the Russian empire has disintegrated, why should we allow these missiles? Some are asking themselves this very question. Others will wonder whether we should pursue a kind of technological race to make war when we should spend our money elsewhere. It is always a question of war versus peace. But, when the hon. member talks about the cold war, we must never forget that, instead of two blocs facing each other, there are now around the world several potential hot spots, often plagued by fanaticism.

I do not need to remind you of the Iraqi leader's behaviour during the gulf war or of certain statements made in Lebanon. Those countries, which happen to lie very close to each other, have nuclear weapons that can be launched instantly.

Is the threat immediate? I would say no, but this guarantee of security can only serve the interests of democracy in Canada, Quebec, the United States and the rest of the western world.

In that sense, the two opposing blocs have been replaced by several localized conflicts that are not controlled as strictly. Ten