

*Supply*

world's build-up in armaments. It expresses most people's desires, namely, a retreat from potential nuclear holocaust.

If it has a serious flaw, it would be that it lacks a *modus operandi* to accomplish world disarmament or world arms control while at the same time not jeopardizing security. But then, most disarmament reports seem to have this flaw.

Life would be so much more sane if we could have the Warsaw Pact members sign and adhere to the minority report, or, for that matter, the majority report. The minority report calls for a "global freeze on the testing, production and development of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles". The report goes on to say that a "freeze is relatively easy to verify".

It would be more accurate to state that without mutual consent it is relatively easy to verify testing, but not production and deployment. Most people would agree that we have enough nuclear bombs. Most people would agree that we do not need any testing of nuclear bombs per se.

From 1945 to 1980 there have been 1,271 nuclear explosions. In warheads, the United States now has the equivalent of 200,000 Hiroshima-type bombs; the U.S.S.R. has the equivalent 430,000; and France, which we do not really consider a nuclear power in the same category as the Soviet Union and the United States, now has 4,700.

The majority report points out that six countries now have the capability of detonating a nuclear device and that within ten years 44 countries will have that ability. That is frightening, Mr. Speaker. The number of bombs does not seem to be the contentious point between nations but the delivery system is.

We are concerned with proximity of weapons and the ability of those weapons to penetrate. This is the case whether we are discussing the SS-20 missile, the Pershing II, the Trident submarine or Soviet submarines.

In a few short years the Soviets have deployed 180 nuclear-armed SS-20 missiles against Europe and China. There is a total of 300 SS-20 missiles in place and approximately 900 warheads deployed.

Incidentally, I notice that since France withdrew from NATO the Soviet Union has not pointed fewer missiles in that direction. This might be something for the NDP to remember—withdrawal from NATO would not make this country any less a target. There are at least 10,000 nuclear weapons deployed for use against Europe and they all point the same way—away from the Soviet Union. As a result, NATO has become quite concerned.

The ratio of military balance between the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. is about 1.3 to 1. The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) gave some figures but I think they show the military balance between the Warsaw Pact countries and NATO in Europe. It is important to look at world parity, however, and that is about 1.3 to 1 in favour of the Soviet Union. We can live with that.

• (1720)

Right in the middle of this, we have to look at intermediate-range nuclear missiles such as the Cruise missile. The ratio there is 600 to zero in favour of the Soviets, and that is our concern. What the allies want the Soviets to do is dismantle those missiles and go to the zero option. In return the allies will not place the Pershing II and Cruise missile in Europe; sort of disarmament in reverse. We support that zero option policy.

In December, 1979, NATO decided to deploy 464 Cruise missiles and 108 Pershing missiles in five West European countries, the U.K., Italy, Germany, Belgium and The Netherlands. NATO felt that since the Russians would not agree to remove their 600-odd missiles, this move was needed for western security. The zero option still exists and is open to the Soviet Union; we have not put those missiles in place yet. But even the sponsors of this resolution will agree that there was no serious debate about the removal of SS-20 missiles until we made a firm decision to deploy the Cruise and Pershing missiles by 1983.

That logically brings me to the next point on the testing of Cruise missiles: Are we to break our agreement with the U.S. on testing of the Cruise missile in Canada? It is a developed missile; it has had at least a dozen successful flights.

**Miss Jewett:** Have we made the agreement?

**Mr. Irwin:** The decision was made in 1979. It is a low-flying missile guided by terrain observation. The guidance system needs more testing, and we have an existing firing range at Cold Lake. I was in Calgary last weekend on the disarmament panel, and there was a presentation by Dr. Cynthia Canizzo. She pointed out that on this range we have devices which will monitor the Cruise missile as it is being tested, along with planes monitoring the missile in flight. The missile can be shut down at any time and, most importantly, there are no nuclear warheads in the missile. They will be dummy warheads. It is a relatively safe situation.

We voted over two years ago to deploy 464 armed missiles in Europe. But the minority report advocates now say: "Let's not even test the guidance system in Canada." At the same time we are quite prepared to let the arms system be installed in allied countries in Europe. This logic is so cynical as to be almost amusing. I heard one remark to the effect of "let it be done in Alaska". The minority report suggests that because we honour our obligations to our NATO partners, we are not honouring our obligation to humanity—and that is the exact wording in the report. I find that to be the most pontifical statement in the whole minority report. NATO is analogous to a family arrangement. If anyone aims a gun at your family, that person must know it cannot be aimed with impunity. If someone tries to break down your door, you do not wait until the door comes tumbling down before you prepare yourself. You prepare yourself as soon as you hear the noise, and the noise of the SS-20 installation preparation in Europe by the Russians, east and west of the Urals, is thunderous.