

Nuclear Armaments

Mr. Speaker, this is why Canada contributes and must contribute to strategic deterrent forces even though it does not have nor deploy nuclear armaments.

Our role and mission in this connection are clear and securely anchored in our geography and in our history.

We must do our share to defend the North American air space, and this we accomplish through our defence effort and our membership in NORAD.

Mr. Speaker, I sit on the Standing Committee on National Defence and in that capacity I was able to tour NORAD bases and centres, not only in Canada but also at Colorado Springs in the United States, and I can attest to the importance of these military bases in North America and on Canadian soil. American support is essential if we are to continue to defend our large territory. Without the help of our American friends we would hardly be in a position to put up adequate defences. This would cost far more than we as a government and as a nation can afford to spend to guarantee our safety and that of our population.

We must protect NATO strategic forces by denying access to our air space, land and territorial waters to potential attackers. Mr. Speaker, this happens to be the thrust of the Government's defence program.

Finally, should the need ever arise, our allies must have ready access to our territory and our facilities.

We meet these obligations and carry out these collective security duties with due respect for our sovereignty and our integrity. In peacetime we contribute to the training and improvement of deterrent forces; in time of crisis Canada might authorize strategic force vectors to fly over its air space and use its defence facilities.

It is essential and in keeping with our policy and our commitments that our air space and firing ranges continue to be used for training and improving unarmed vectors, that our armed forces train side by side with NATO troops, and that deterrent force ships drop anchor in our ports.

This cannot be viewed as a threat against our country, it is part and parcel of its security and peace commitment.

Mr. Rossi: Who wrote that?

Mr. Grisé: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a project concerning the security of this country, yet the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) would rather make untimely remarks. He is not even interested in debating the thrust of this motion on the security of the whole Canadian population. And we are always . . . Such are the Quebec Liberal Members. That is what is left of them. We still have a few of the 74 nobodies of the 1980 administration, and they indulge in heckling while we are debating one of the most serious issues, namely the security of all Canadians.

It has a commitment to peace that is reflected in sustained efforts to negotiate arms control and disarmament. This negotiating process is unprecedented, both by its duration and

its intensity, and it contributes toward maintaining a dialogue between East and West. Our presence at the negotiating table, the opportunity we are given to influence the proceedings and their outcome are also the result of our membership in NATO. Our defence efforts and the fact that we share in a common defence effort have made Canada a valid and credible partner who can and does take initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that leaving NATO or weakening its deterrent force would be the best way to contribute to world peace and security.

However odious resorting to nuclear arms to secure our defence may seem, their presence is essential to provide a balance to the Soviet nuclear arsenal. To withdraw would mean breaking our commitments. It would also mean undermining an equilibrium that is essential to maintaining peace.

In concluding, that is why I believe that the concept of having a nuclear arms free zone, though well meant, is a perilous one because it ignores the realities we must face and would reduce our capability to defend ourselves and, especially, to negotiate. That is certainly not our policy and it is not what this Government intends to do.

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to speak after the Hon. Member for Chambly (Mr. Grisé) who spoke to the motion put before the House today by the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young). We are debating a motion that is not an easy one, because it is very important for the future of this country and the whole world.

First of all, I would like to say that Canada's policy and practice is already in many respects attuned to the particular conditions of this motion, since Canada does not have any nuclear arms.

In normal times, that is, during peacetime, no nuclear arms are deployed or tested or built in Canada, nor are they transported in this country. Similarly, no activities involving nuclear arms take place on Canadian territory or under our country's jurisdiction without the specific consent of the Government of Canada.

I may also remind the House that Canada differs from many of its NATO allies in that it does not have nuclear arms on its territory. As for Canadian exports, our country's policy is firm in this respect. All exports of nuclear materials, equipment or technology must be used for peaceful purposes. They may not be used to trigger an explosion. The strict application of this policy is guaranteed through bilateral agreements with the co-operation of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

[English]

Last Monday at the United Nations, Canada's role was exemplified by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark). He was asked by the Secretary General of the