

I am not going to hypothesize what kind of civil disturbances in Canada might occur which would give rise to this or what kind of disturbances could occur elsewhere which might give rise to this.

All I am saying is that you cannot have a transportation vehicle with no means to deter people who want to throw a hand grenade at it or whatever. That is what this is for. It is not a tank which rushes into an offensive position.

It is a transportation vehicle which is very lightly armoured and has this automatic capacity simply as a defence against any kind of rush that might occur against it.

That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about weapons of mass destruction. We are not even talking about a tank.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, the member for London West says that this is just a transportation vehicle.

Let me see whether he would agree with the following description of the light armoured vehicle: "In its many variations, all of which are included in the Saudi Sale, it can be used as a troop carrier, a communications command centre, a towing vehicle, a mortar launcher or an anti-tank weapon. Virtually all vehicles carry machine guns. Some may carry rocket launchers or cannons."

According to a GM spokesperson: "Military leaders of smaller countries may like its capacity to quell civil disturbances."

Let me ask the minister if he agrees with his colleague, the former trade minister, who said about these weapons: "We are discussing automatic weapons, that is, rifles and other small arms of that nature, machine guns and the like, which are necessary for armies, police forces and civil authorities to have if they are to be in a position to keep order in their own countries."

This bill is not about the vehicles. This bill is about the automatic weapons that are to be placed on these vehicles. The sale of the vehicles themselves was approved before this bill saw the light of day. The change that the government is seeking is a change in the Criminal Code which presently prohibits the export and import of automatic weapons. It is changing the Criminal Code, in section 8 of the bill, to permit a waiver of the Criminal Code provisions in respect to export of otherwise prohibited weapons, namely automatic weapons, to any country the government chooses.

### *Government Orders*

The purpose of the bill deals strictly with the weapons themselves, not with the vehicles. As noted, the former minister of trade says: "We are discussing weapons which civil authorities may need if they are to be in a position to keep order in their own countries". How does the government justify this on any moral or ethical basis whatever?

**Mr. Hockin:** Mr. Speaker, I must ask the hon. member a question. If we have a peacekeeping operation, let us say in Cyprus for example, there are transport troops. If there are terrorists surrounding this transportation vehicle, the troops need some means of deterring those terrorists. That is why it has this turret. It is not a weapon of mass destruction. It is like a policeman who is carrying a gun. The hon. member wants our peacekeeping forces, wants UN peacekeeping forces, to be in a vehicle with no means of deterrence whatsoever. That is all the light armour does. That is all the automatic weapon does.

He would like to ensure that any peacekeeping operation, any NATO operation is completely denuded of this capacity. This bill makes certain that there is a deterrent. As a matter of fact, without this bill we could not allow exports to a country that was going to engage in a peacekeeping activity, for example, in Cyprus, the Middle East or whatever. Without this bill we could not export to our NATO friends.

I know my hon. friend across the aisle does not care about NATO but Canadians support NATO. Three-quarters of Canadians support NATO very strongly. We cannot export this product to them either.

This product allows us to be a centre of excellence in this particular industry. This is a transportation vehicle that is very lightly armoured and can be used for peacekeeping, can be used for police purposes. In nine cases out of ten, if not every case, it will be used in a context which we will approve of, which is primarily peacekeeping in nature.

The hon. member's particular suggestion would mean that our peacekeeping forces, if they use this vehicle, would not have any means of deterrence whatsoever. It would make them a sitting duck and highly vulnerable. Therefore, this bill is responsible. It is transparent and, frankly, it is just a bureaucratic change to remove an anomaly that was in the Criminal Code.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, the minister might well make any observations with respect to this particular vehicle. As I understand this