Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Act

committee and not continue with second reading debate. I ask this because I think it is the opinion of Members, regardless of whether they agree or disagree with this Bill, that this is an important and pressing issue which has been discussed throughout many countries of the world and which needs discussion in the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

I would ask the indulgence of Members of the House to let the Member for Vancouver-Kingsway refer this Bill to the appropriate standing committee at the end of the debate today.

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish), in introducing this Bill, talked about the horrors of nuclear war and the concern which he and many others share in regard to that possibility. While it certainly is a horrifying possibility, when the Hon. Member moved on from describing the horror of nuclear war to a possible solution or first step toward a solution which would reduce or eliminate that nuclear war, I am afraid that he was not very convincing in his argument. Perhaps, more accurately, he did not really make the argument at all.

I am afraid that one of the steps toward the solution as proposed by this Bill, namely to make Canada a nuclear weapons free zone, would have precisely the opposite effect to that desired by the Hon. Member, by myself, and, I am sure, by every Member of the House. That desired effect would be the reduction of tension in the world, the movement toward an elimination of nuclear weapons and a world which is free from the threat of the holocaust that a nuclear war would undoubtedly bring.

First, I want to make the point which is frequently forgotten that, to the Government's credit and with the approval of everyone in the House, Canada has made the decision that our military forces would not use nuclear weapons. In fact, we still have an inventory of a few nuclear tipped missiles for the CF-104 and CF-101 fighters. But these are being phased out as these old aircraft are replaced by CF-18 fighters. Canada was one of the first nations in the world with the capability of manufacturing nuclear weapons. We did not make use of that capability. We made the decision not to develop independent nuclear forces. We have recently made the decision that our military personnel would rely solely on conventional weapons for our defence and would not equip our forces with nuclear weapons. It is a decision with which I agree and I am sure everyone in the House agrees.

Therefore, what is the purpose of this Bill proposed by the Member that Canada become a nuclear weapons free zone? What is the effect of that? The Bill states that it shall be against the law to develop, test, manufacture, import, transport or store any nuclear weapon, nuclear weapon system, nuclear weapon support system or components thereof within Canada. It goes on to propose that if an individual breaks the law, that individual is subject to a \$10,000 fine and a government is subject to a \$100,000 fine. If this law were to be passed, it would mean that should the Soviet Union come into Canadian territory with a nuclear submarine—which it does frequently under the Arctic ice in Canada's North—or if the Americans were to fly over Canadian territory with an aircraft containing nuclear bombs, we would fine them \$100,000. I question how one could contemplate enforcing such a law or, knowing that things like that have happened, passing such a law. Passing a law which is unenforceable simply brings contempt at best. There is absolutely no way to enforce it, and I think the Hon. Member understands that.

• (1720)

I would like to examine for a moment the position of Canada in the world. We are, like it or not, in between the two superpowers. We are exactly in between them, with the Soviet Union to the north over the pole and the United States to the south. Does the Hon. Member actually believe—and I am sure he does not—the suggestion in the Bill that, by simply passing a law in Parliament and declaring we will not allow nuclear weapons to come over Canadian territory, somehow it will have an effect upon the superpowers and they will immediately start planning the trajectories of their missiles to go around Canada?

Mr. Friesen: They will overfly.

Mr. Andre: They cannot overfly, because it says Canadian airspace as well; they have got to go around.

Mr. Friesen: Put it on a Cruise and it can dodge Canada.

Mr. Andre: It is absurd. It will provide as much protection as the declarations of neutrality of Belgium and the Netherlands provided them against Hitler in the Second World War.

The fact of the matter is that Canada is where it is and we cannot move it. We do not have the option of saying that we will not be involved in this confrontation between the superpowers. We are. For us to declare neutrality, toward which this is the first step, and to try to enforce that neutrality would require defence spending beyond our comprehension and beyond anyone's ability to pay. For us to have the capability on our own, even knowing about the intrusion of foreign aircraft or foreign ships into Canadian territory, is impractical. It would require billions and billions of dollars for us to acquire the capability of knowing who was in Canadian territory, and many times those billions for us to acquire the capability to intercept anyone who intrudes into Canadian territory.

Declarations of neutrality are of absolutely no use. I remind the Hon. Member of the situation in Sweden. That country declared itself neutral. It does not belong to NATO or to the Warsaw Pact; it is a democratic nation. Its declaration of neutrality has not stopped Soviet submarines from intruding into its coastal waters. That is not speculation. The submarine was beached, it was there. Sweden spends three times as much on defence as we do as a nation. It is a much tinier nation than Canada. It is incapable of even knowing for sure of submarine intrusions, and when they know that submarines have intruded into their territory, they cannot do anything about it. Our problems in terms of defence are of orders of magnitude more