

POSSIBLE TESTING OF NON-NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask another question concerning the agreement which was signed yesterday. It suggested that tests could include "surveillance and identification systems and advanced non-nuclear munitions". As the Minister well knows, the super powers are heavily involved in developing anti-satellite systems and non-nuclear anti-ballistic systems. Could the Minister tell the House whether or not either or both of those weapons are potential candidates for testing in Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Madam Speaker, I cannot tell the Hon. Member that, because—

Miss Jewett: The U.S. has not told you what to do yet.

Mr. MacEachen:—before we can know what proposals are to be considered, they must be made by the United States, which has requested these possibilities. The United States has not yet made any proposal with respect to weapons testing systems.

Mr. Wilson: And you did not even talk about it.

Mr. MacEachen: I suspect that such proposals will be made, but they have not yet been made.

NEGOTIATION OF CRUISE TESTING—RELATIONSHIP TO GENEVA ARMS REDUCTION TALKS

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton South): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Could he inform the House when the specific negotiations with regard to the Cruise testing will take place between the two Defence Departments? When will they start under the terms of the framework agreement?

As there are many Canadians who are seeking clarification on this point, I would also ask the Secretary of State what is the relationship between the specific Cruise negotiations and the arms reduction negotiations in Geneva. Is there a relationship and, if so, what is it?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, the first question asked when will the negotiations begin. I presume that if the United States makes a request—

Miss Jewett: It already has.

Mr. MacEachen:—to enter into an arrangement, the negotiations will begin shortly after that request has been made, but it is not in hand at the present time.

The Hon. Member asked a second question—what is the relationship between Cruise testing and the negotiation in Geneva? The relationship, of course, is quite close and obvious. As the Hon. Member knows, at the NATO meeting in December, 1979, the Government of Canada agreed with the NATO decision to modernize the weapons system of the Alliance and to place the Cruise missile and the Pershing II in Europe. That

Oral Questions

decision was taken in 1979, calling for the deployment of Cruise missiles land-based in Europe. That, of course, was in response to the considerable deployment of SS-20s placed in Europe by the Soviet Union.

What Canada will probably be asked to do will be to agree to the testing of the guidance system which will be used in the Cruise missile to be located in Europe. The Hon. Member should understand, and I am sure he does, that part of the decision by NATO in 1979 was to pursue negotiations with the Soviet Union with the objective of totally eliminating or substantially reducing all existing land-based missiles in Europe or planned missiles in Europe. Obviously, if these negotiations succeed in 1983, then that success will change considerably, possibly make unnecessary, or reduce the necessity for deployment of Cruise missiles in Europe. Therefore, from our point of view, the most important thing that can happen this year is to put our full weight behind those negotiations so that they will succeed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST FOR REFERRAL OF CANADA-UNITED STATES AGREEMENT TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, I share the concern expressed by the Hon. Member for Victoria in that the Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs have not agreed to a parliamentary debate with respect to this matter. I think it is a matter that he should reconsider.

Perhaps the Minister is aware of the provisions of the new Standing Orders of the House of Commons, wherein Standing Order 46(4) states:

Reports, returns or other papers laid before the House in accordance with an Act of Parliament shall thereupon be deemed to have been permanently referred to the committee designated by the Member tabling the report, return or paper.

If there is not a debate in the House, there should at least be an opportunity for the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence to examine this exchange of notes which are now part of the parliamentary record. I therefore ask the Minister if he would designate the papers which he filed yesterday, as it is recorded in *Hansard*, to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence so that the committee can at least begin examination of the matter? At the same time I would like the Minister to give his undertaking that he and his officials would appear.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, I would like to consult the Government House Leader before making a final determination on the Hon. Member's request. I would like to consider it and consult with the House Leader before making a final response. I believe that, in one way or another, the Standing Committee will have an opportunity to