

the kind of argument in which there is no empirical evidence to support strongly one way or the other.

The Prime Minister is not an expert in this field, nor am I. The former head of the CIA wrote an article last week in opposition to the Cruise. He can hardly be called anti-American. He said:

The Soviets are certainly not "superior" to the United States in any meaningful way today . . . The present American retaliation potential is absolute.

Considering that Mr. Colby says that in terms of the present weaponry, does this not cause the Prime Minister to question his own judgment? Does it not pose for him the necessity of Canada joining with the U.S. Congress in calling for a freeze at this time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, there are several questions contained in that. The actions of the U.S. Congress, or indeed of Americans who are arguing against President Reagan's over-all nuclear policy, are one thing. I am not supporting President Reagan's over-all nuclear policy. It is not my purpose to do so. I have not been asked to do so. What I am supporting is NATO's two-track policy. That can be accepted even if we agree with some of the statements quoted by my hon. friend.

I have not seen that statement by the former director of the CIA, but some of the quotes would be acceptable to me in the sense that there is certainly power of overkill in the United States now and power of overkill in the Soviet Union now. In other words, either side is in a position to destroy not only the enemy but probably a large part of humanity as well.

• (1430)

I do not know, Madam Speaker, what kibitzing is coming from the NDP. If they want a rational answer they should listen to me.

CANADIAN ROLE IN SEEKING DISARMAMENT

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister has just said that the United States is in a position to wipe out the Soviet Union. Of course the Soviet Union is now in a position to wipe out the United States, and both are potentially in a position to wipe out mankind. If that is the case, I should like to know the logic of the two-track position. Why is it necessary to go ahead with the Cruise? Does it not make much more sense for Canada to act as a peaceful power, to take serious steps to bring about nuclear disarmament in the world, instead of contributing to its escalation in the opposite direction?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, it makes eminent good sense. I hope we are acting as a peaceful power and a power that is seeking the eventual reduction of nuclear arms. That does not contradict my previous assertion that both super powers can destroy each other. That is the rationale of the deterrence that each side holds and which has deterred nuclear war since both sides have had the nuclear power.

Oral Questions

The Cruise, the Pershing II, and the SS-20s are a completely different argument. What NATO is attempting to do is answer a theatre nuclear arm, the SS-20. We are saying that in so far as the survival of the United States the survival of the Soviet Union are concerned, both have cause to fear each other and therefore they are unlikely to start fighting against each other. But what is to prevent the Soviet Union if it wishes to start a limited war in Europe with SS-20s? I do not know how limited it would be, but we know they have 300 or 400 SS-20s, each with three nuclear warheads which are capable of destroying all of western Europe. We know that as a fact.

How does NATO, which includes countries in Europe, counter that? It can only counter it by saying to the United States, "Well, if the Soviet Union attacks western Europe, you send off your big ones and destroy all of humanity."

Does it not make sense, Madam Speaker, in Europe to try to have a counter threat to the Soviet Union so that it will not use its SS-20s on western Europe, any more than it would use its ICBMs on the United States of America?

AGREEMENTS WITH SASKATCHEWAN ON USE OF TESTING RANGE

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I have a brief question for the Prime Minister whose letter I read with interest, particularly where he made reference to hypocrites, and with respect to the statement made by the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam and the questions of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I am sure that the answer to the question is yes.

Do there exist in the Government of Canada four agreements: one of August, 1953; one of October, 1965; one of May, 1975, and one of April, 1981, signed originally by the Government of Canada with the Douglas NDP Government of the Province of Saskatchewan and latterly, in 1981, between the Government of Canada and the Government of Mr. Blakeney, the NDP Government of Saskatchewan, giving the Government of Canada exclusive use of the Primrose testing range in that Province, and making specific reference to missiles' testing, and again, ratified and reconfirmed in 1981 by the NDP Government of Mr. Blakeney, of Saskatchewan?

I think if the Government could table those four agreements, which I do not think affect national security, that would be of some assistance in sorting out the hypocrites and establishing the political stances of the political Parties on this question.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I would not want the Hon. Member to make too much of a phrase in which I said that the anti-Americanism of some Canadians verges on hypocrisy, but I think the question of the Leader of the Opposition stands. He has referred to some facts which are well known. I could not vouch for the exact dates that he mentioned, but I think the case that he intended to make by his question to me stands, perhaps, for the NDP to consider.