

Supply

conclusion is there when we are helping to develop and to test the Cruise missile in Canada?

I want to clear up a misconception that some people have about Canada in this regard. I recently read in the paper that Canada is now free of nuclear weapons because the Genie nuclear missiles have been made obsolete by the introduction of the CF-18 with its conventional missiles. That is not quite true. Canada's hands are not entirely clean.

Just last week, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) confirmed that the Cruise missile will once again fly over Canada in 1985. That is sad news to our Party. In fact, the aid and consent that Canada lends to the testing of this weapon casts a shadow much further than Cold Lake, Alberta. It casts doubt on Canada's role as a peacemaker and makes a mockery of that same Minister's consideration to ask the Americans and the Soviets to ban Cruise missiles from their arsenals.

Not only do we help test the Cruise, we helped to build it. The Defence Production Sharing Arrangement between Canada and the United States allowed a Canadian company to help build the guidance system for the Cruise missile. The Canadian Government helped to make the development of that guidance system possible with aid to Litton Systems under the Defence Industry Productivity Program.

Even now, a group of Pentagon officials are touring our country, with government encouragement and assistance, telling Canadian companies how to follow in the footsteps of Litton Systems. The Government of Canada is directing investment dollars from other areas such as education and health care, which as studies show, would create two to three times as many jobs as investment in weapons production. The Conservative Government is helping sow the seeds of our own destruction and is passing it off as job creation. It is sad hoax and it has to stop.

● (1620)

That is why I am calling for the Government to show that real change for which it was elected. I want the Government to join with the thousands of Canadians who support the nuclear weapons freeze. I want the Government to join with those people who showed their resolve by signing petitions supporting the freeze and sending them to this House.

I want the Government to join with our neighbours to the south in the U.S. Congress, who also support a nuclear weapons freeze. I want the Government to join with those who realize that there is a rough parity in the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union. Even President Reagan recognizes that both sides have enough nuclear weapons to destroy the world many times over. After all, it was he who campaigned this fall a few weeks ago by saying: "America is back. America is strong". So even he realizes that the West is strong enough to negotiate an arms agreement. And, after all, who in the Conservative Government would argue with President Reagan?

I am asking that the Government join with NATO allies, such as Denmark who have the wisdom to support a nuclear

weapons freeze without fear of losing their allies. I ask that the Government show the courage of the Belgian Government, which has had the wisdom to reconsider its position on nuclear weapons. I ask that the Government join with those on its own benches who privately support the nuclear weapons freeze. Finally, I ask that the Government join with us in taking one small step toward peace.

If Canada takes that step and supports this motion for a mutual, verifiable nuclear weapons freeze, then just maybe it will have some effect. Maybe the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union will take notice. Maybe it will tip the balance while there is rough nuclear parity and signs of an East-West thaw. Maybe. We may never know. But we will be able to say that today, Canada has done its part. Canada will have shown the world that it is indeed a strong, independent voice for peace.

There are certain assumptions upon which I believe our defence policy is based. Certainly in the public domain there are some assumptions, and I do not agree with them. I do not believe for one moment that the next war, heaven forbid if there should be one, will be simply or exclusively a conventionally fought war.

Second, I do not believe there is any such thing in practice as a limited nuclear war. We are being very foolish if we think for one moment that if either side is backed to the wall in a conventional war or a limited nuclear war, known I think as a theatre war, it will not push the final button and let everything go.

Third, there is only one kind of war, and this follows from my other two points, and that is, a total nuclear global holocaust. Despite the relative importance and potency of the weapons during the hot summer days of July and August 1914, the great powers still went to war over a single shot fired in a little town in the Balkans called Sarajevo. It can happen again, only this time ending up in a total nuclear holocaust.

Then there is the assumption that the nuclear deterrent has kept us at peace for 40 years. We were reminded this morning that 40 years is but a fleeting moment in time. Even if it has kept us at peace for 40 years, Mr. Speaker, do we all realize what that means? It means that the nuclear deterrent will never fail. That is what it means.

In view of the fact that we are only human and historically we have always only been human, and in view of the fact that man has always gone to war and that we have had so many sophisticated non-nuclear deterrents in the past, is there any human being in this Chamber who honestly believes that the nuclear deterrent will keep us at peace for ever and ever? That is madness. That is why we have to begin today, not tomorrow, not next week, to rid the globe of all nuclear weapons. This motion merely allows us to take one tentative step.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Are there any questions or comments?