

Adjournment Debate

This latter point refers directly to one of the comments made by the hon. member in which he noted that SYSCO has received an order for 88,000 tonnes of rail. He suggested that perhaps this could be extended. There seems to be an indication from the comments of the minister that this is indeed possible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The allotted time of the parliamentary secretary has expired.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—(A) CANADA-UNITED STATES AGREEMENT ON TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILES (B) REQUEST THAT AGREEMENT BE TABLED

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) why Canada had entered into an agreement at the request of the United States to flight-test the new Cruise missile on Canadian soil. This missile is sophisticated, highly accurate and potentially capable of first strike use. This missile, if developed and deployed, will only lead the Soviet Union, the other super power, to try to develop an equivalent weapon. In short, why is Canada allowing the arms race to be further escalated.

• (2220)

Second, I ask why this was kept secret. Why did Canada settle upon what the minister refers to as a framework agreement late last year, secretly, without informing the Canadian public, Parliament or the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, which is at this very moment preparing a report on Canada's position to be presented to the United Nations' special session on disarmament? Was the minister and the government afraid that if they made it public there might be, as indeed there now is, some public opposition to our complicity in the escalation of the nuclear arms race by giving support to the testing of the Cruise missile? Was the government afraid there might be a response here comparable to that in western Europe where a great many people are vigorously protesting the deployment of this very Cruise missile?

The minister says we cannot pursue a course of unilateral disarmament. That is a red herring. We are not talking about unilateral disarmament any more than The Netherlands which refuses to deploy the Cruise missile, or Belgium which refuses to take any decision on it at all—not at all. I would have hoped the Canadian government could have taken an independent stand, perhaps even set an example, since it was Canada which first enunciated the strategy of nuclear suffocation, by saying no, we do not want Cruise missile testing on Canadian soil anymore than we would want Cruise missile deployment. The two are inextricably linked.

In addition, the minister did not answer the question as to whether the reason we so supinely and secretly agreed to this testing was because it was part of a deal; perhaps in return for some benefits we might receive in the purchase of the F-18s. He seemed only confused when I asked whether we were still pursuing a strategy of nuclear suffocation, yet the Prime

Minister (Mr. Trudeau), just on Saturday, according to *The Globe and Mail*, said that Cruise missile testing would contradict that very strategy.

It is absolutely imperative, Mr. Speaker, that the minister or the Prime Minister immediately table in this House—not just “give consideration to it”—the framework agreement drawn up late last year so that we in this Parliament, and through us the Canadian public, will know exactly how we have been further unnecessarily and wrongfully involved in this incredible escalation of the arms race which, as I said, will only lead to the Soviet Union attempting to get an equivalent weapon.

• (2225)

The minister must also make up for the affront both he and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Lamontagne) perpetrated against the standing committee discussing questions of security and disarmament, and come back to that committee this week—because this is the last week of our deliberations—and tell us what is in the agreement and why it was kept secret. Two Canadian journalists found out the truth in Washington. Why was it kept secret, and in what way will it possibly advance the cause of ceasing the escalation in the arms race and working toward arms control?

Mr. David Berger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) I will attempt to answer some of the questions raised by the hon. member.

Throughout her remarks the hon. member kept referring to a secret agreement. It seems quite clear from the answers given by the minister to her questions that there is no such secret agreement and the proposals have indeed been made for the negotiation of a framework agreement under which Canadian test ranges and associated air space may be used for the testing and evaluation of United States defence systems. Such tests would take advantage of Canadian conditions of climate and terrain not available in the United States. Among the tests anticipated under the agreement would be tests of unarmed air launched Cruise missiles.

The Canadian decision in principle to permit such testing, subject to the negotiation and conclusion of the appropriate agreement and arrangements with the United States, demonstrates Canada's support for NATO. I stress the fact again that this is subject to the negotiation and conclusion of the appropriate agreement and arrangements with the United States. Contrary to what the hon. member has said, there has been no agreement to date, and such an agreement remains to be negotiated.

Miss Jewett: The framework agreement.

Mr. Berger: Air launched Cruise missiles are intended to form part of the United States strategic deterrent force which provides the nuclear umbrella for both North American and other NATO countries on which our alliance depends, as it