

• (1120)

I do not think the ink had dried on the negotiating papers leading up to the statement that was to be made on acid rain before we had an official from the State Department already saying to American journalists: "Don't be taken in, fellas; President Reagan has not changed his position on acid rain at all". There has been no departure in terms of policy for the Americans on acid rain, no change; it was all one massive PR exercise.

It seems to me the Canadian Government realized who it was dealing with when it comes to acid rain. Mr. Reagan has all the sensitivity in terms of the environment that you could expect of a man who said not many years ago when he was a politician in California and the problems of the forests in California were brought to his attention: "When you have seen one tree, you have seen them all". There is a man who is sensitive to the needs of the environment; his name, Ronald Reagan.

I am saying that our approach is not good enough. We should have demanded proportional action, and if we did not get it our Prime Minister could have come back with dignity. He could have said: "I went to bargain with the Americans. I did my best. We have our act together on acid rain here. We asked them to do proportionately what we did, but they said no". "I regret" he could have told us, "that we have decided to agree to disagree. I promised the people of Canada that I will continue with the struggle to get the Americans to pay their way, to do their share and to stop putting their garbage on our side of the fence". He could have come back with dignity even if he had lost the particular battle, as we do from time to time with our strong neighbour to the south, and he would have maintained the respect of all Canadians who are concerned about acid rain. Instead, he attempted to do a great smokescreen exercise, a PR exercise, that is worse than useless because it leaves the impression that something might be done with acid rain when it will not deal with the issue one bit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: I want now to turn to the second part of our resolution, and that concerns the issue of star wars. This brainchild of President Reagan and a handful of his advisers was first launched upon the world a year ago this week, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Deans: Two years ago.

Mr. Broadbent: Two years ago.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): That is the first mistake.

Mr. Broadbent: There he is, the master of facts, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark). We will hear his brave contribution in a minute. A couple of years ago this scheme was proposed by President Reagan. Almost the whole world knows about it now. It is a plan to destroy ICBMs and intermediate range missiles before they reach the target. That is the scheme. It is also a scheme that is likely to involve the

Supply

spending of some \$70 to \$100 billion between now and 1993 in the United States, according to the priorities set out by President Reagan.

The important point about this scheme is that it came from Mr. Reagan and a handful of his advisers. It was attacked by the Republicans in Congress. It was attacked by the Democrats in Congress. It was attacked by defence experts. It was attacked by church groups. It has, in fact, been attacked by western allies of the United States, who have temporarily kept quiet, as being either totally irrational as a concept for defence on the one hand, or destabilizing on the other, or both.

John Lamb, Executive Director of the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament, when he was echoing a widespread sentiment by defence experts on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean, said this about it:

It is clear that star wars would severely upset the balance of East-West deterrence.

Even our late and unlamented former Minister of National Defence said last fall in one of the early give-aways that it would "fundamentally change the strategic relationship". If that does not mean it would be destabilizing in terms of East-West discussions in *détente*, I do not know what else it could mean.

• (1125)

The recent debate in Canada has focused on the link between star wars and our own defence policy, particularly with the updating of the DEW line of the North Warning System.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to advise the Hon. Member that his time has expired. He may proceed at this point only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the consideration of all Hon. Members of the House. Of course, we will reciprocate in terms of the other principal speakers.

When it comes to discussions of the star wars project and its linkage, or potential linkage, with the updating of our own DEW line, U.S. officials have repeatedly said that there was a linkage. On the other hand, Canadian Cabinet Ministers have repeatedly said the opposite. I would just like to put some of these comments on the record.

On January 16, Secretary of Defense Weinberger said that star wars, if deployed, would have to be backed up by an updated DEW line. He saw a linkage. The former Minister of National Defence, the Hon. Member for Cumberland-Colchester (Mr. Coates), said just about a week later that there was no connection between star wars and the DEW line. Act three—Paul Nitze, key adviser on defence matters in the United States and a distinguished gentleman, said on March 6 that he acknowledged there could be a connection between star wars and the DEW line in the future. Our own Secretary of State for External Affairs, who always has his facts right, then