

Nuclear Disarmament

Let us talk about what is happening now. I would like to talk about this hardness that exists. There is a group called the Arms Control Association in the United States which has a very distinguished board of directors. That board includes people like Admiral Gayler, the former Commander in Chief for the Pacific of the United States Navy; Gerard Smith, a former arms-control director for the U.S. Government; Paul Warnke, a former arms-control director for the Carter U.S. Government; Robert McNamara, a former Secretary of Defence; and others. These people recently commissioned a study and a report which indicated that the Reagan Government has basically destroyed arms control negotiations. It indicated that such arms-control measures as the START talks and SALT I and SALT II will be destroyed.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The resolution of the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young) deals with establishing nuclear free zone in Canada and with Canadian non-participation in the testing, construction, deployment and transportation of nuclear weapons. The Hon. Member has yet to address himself to the contents of the resolution and I am wondering if the chair would be prepared to caution the Hon. Member to speak to what Canada can do and not to what former American Ministers of Defence can do.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order, please. I will accept the point raised by the Hon. Member if he is attempting to suggest that the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae) is not speaking to the motion. However, the Chair finds that the subject matter is sufficiently broad. The remarks of the Hon. Member are in order.

Mr. McRae: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might explain to the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) that I am trying to deal with the questions of where we must go and of what is fundamental. I support what Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party are trying to do. However, I think that the issue is not fundamental. We have spent four days discussing this particular issue when there are far more fundamental issues dealing with the arms control business at stake.

One thing that has bothered me for a long time is that I have never been able to accept the idea that I can come to the House, stand up and be pure and say that I want this and that without having one iota of consideration for how I will make the change that I want. If I believe in something, then I must fight to make a change. If I am standing back being pure, taking absolutely no notice of what is going on around me and not doing my best to change things, then I do not think that I am doing my job.

I feel that we are facing the most dangerous situation that one could imagine on this earth and I do not think that this motion will change it. I think that there are far more serious things we must address, and that is what I am trying to say. I am trying to break down the issue and I am trying to show that there are far more important things that we can do. If we do some of the things which we all want to do, we might very well wreck our chances of doing something more important.

That is what I am trying to explain to the House. I think it is very relevant to the motion before us.

I would like to return to this serious issue. A two-track decision was made through negotiations on behalf of NATO countries and Warsaw Pact countries by the two super powers. The two super powers came to no solution and the Arms Control Association has indicated that one of the prime reasons for that was that the Government of the United States presented a series of ideas that sounded great to the uninitiated public and made the government look like it was really going after arms control and really making big concessions when to those who understand the issue and have spent years dealing with the issue, the ideas were totally meaningless. These kinds of ideas go on and on. These are the kinds of things that happen, and so we are faced with a situation that is far different from the one with which we thought we were faced, so those talks broke down.

The same thing happened with the START talks. The President of the United States promoted the idea that the U.S. and the Soviet Union should come to an agreement to get rid of most of their land-based ICBMs. That sounded like a reasonable proposition. He said: "We will get rid of ours, you get rid of yours". However, the President admitted to a group of Congressmen in October that he did not know that the Soviet missiles were four-to-one land based and the American missiles were four-to-one sea based. By asking the Soviets to back down on all of their land based missiles he perhaps, as he said to some Congressmen, sounded one sided. Those are the kinds of negotiations that were going on at the START talks. I condemn people in our Government for refusing to push hard to have the START talks and the INF talks together. There were all kinds of quid pro quos in there if one got away from the simple notion of dealing only with talks on intermediate missiles. These are the serious things which have been going on.

● (1740)

When the President of the United States initiates an idea about star wars and states that missiles can be prevented from entering the United States when he knows perfectly well that there is an anti-ballistic missile agreement which will be broken if the star wars program goes ahead, he and this very important group of tough Americans—not soft non-Soviets or anything of that nature—are undermining world peace in a very serious way.

These are the issues. It is not a Canadian problem. I do not think that we as Canadians are going to create a war. Peace is an international problem. I get very worried when I hear that if we as Canadians remain pure and stay within ourselves and do not worry about the rest of the world we are doing our share. That is what is happening in the peace movement. We are becoming less and less concerned about what is happening out there.

If I were looking for a nuclear free zone to create, it would be in central Europe. It is absolutely essential that we reach very shortly that situation so that we will not have Pershing II