

Nuclear Armaments

from NATO: the privilege of discussing with our allies the evolution of East-West relations and making our voice heard—

Mr. Young: Talk about the motion, why don't you?

Mr. Bradley: Mr. Speaker, I was more than willing to sit very quietly and listen closely to my hon. friend.

Mr. Young: But I spoke to the motion.

Mr. Bradley: I would accept that he could make the same commitment to me and allow me to make my presentation.

Mr. Young: At least I spoke to the motion.

Mr. Bradley: We would lose the advantage of an existing consultative process in times of international crisis. We would lose the benefit of being a member of NATO taking part in arms control negotiations as exemplified by the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and the mutual and balanced force reductions. We would lose as a member of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group a voice in the planning process, as well as access to information shared within the Alliance.

In closing, I would argue that there is no way that Canada, deprived of the multilateral means now available through the Alliance structure, could achieve as much on the international stage if we were to follow the lead of the NDP. As our White Paper recently put it so eloquently:

Canada has never been neutral. We have always sought our security in a larger family of like-minded nations.

In light of our position in the world, the values and traditions which have been defended steadfastly by previous generations of Canadians, and our political and economic interest, neutrality would be hypocrisy.

Our security would continue to depend on the deterrents provided by our former allies, but we would have opted out of any contribution to and, equally significantly, any say in the management of that deterrent. As I mentioned earlier, there is a possibility that acceptance of this motion could lead to the loss of that hope and faith we have in our collective securities.

We could turn our backs on the obligation to work for a stable world order. Technology and geography would not, however, allow us to escape the consequences should that order collapse.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Grisé (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, the motion by the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young) before the House today concerns a fundamental issue that is of more than passing interest to all Canadians, and that is the control of nuclear deterrence, Canada's defence and security, and peace. Mr. Speaker, I feel particularly privileged to speak to this motion today because, as you know, the headquarters of Canada's mobile force is located at CFB Saint-Hubert in the riding of Chambly which I have the honour to represent. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to mention the

excellent work being done by all members of Canada's mobile force.

Mr. Speaker, Canada has no nuclear arms, and right away, I want to give Canadians the assurance that we do not intend to acquire any. Canada is a signatory to treaties guaranteeing non-proliferation and prohibiting nuclear testing. Furthermore, unlike most of its NATO allies, it neither stores nor deploys nuclear arms on its territory. Technically speaking, in peacetime Canada is, to use the terms of the motion, a nuclear arms free zone.

However, through its geographic location, it must live with the threat of a nuclear holocaust that in a conflict between the superpowers would not recognize neutrality and would spare no one.

There are only two ways to defuse such a threat: by maintaining a credible force to deter any potential aggressor and by negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, Canadians know, and I want to take this opportunity to talk about Canadians, and I mean Canadians in every sense of the word, not the way the New Democrats and the Liberals use the term when they talk about the ordinary Canadian. Mr. Speaker, according to the dictionary, ordinary means: not special; common; everyday; or average. And that is what the Liberals and Socialists call the people of this country. Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party has never called the Canadian people common or everyday. Canadians are a proud people, and the Conservative Government is proud of the Canadian people. We Conservatives would never speak in such negative and insulting terms of the people of this country.

● (1750)

[*English*]

There are no ordinary Canadians in this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, our present system of mutual deterrence is effective and stable. Through the most acute crises, it has given us over forty years of peace, and the Government believes this should continue. In this perspective, the Canadian Government's priority is not to create nuclear arms free zones but to maintain a peace zone. Earlier, I heard the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) mention a Third World War. Is there anyone in this House or in this Government who wants a Third World War on this planet? The Conservative Government would never dream of bringing a Third World War to this planet, to this country or to this continent.

This being a joint venture—we rely on our allies and they rely on us to deter a potential enemy—we are in favour of developing and maintaining nuclear forces which have every chance of surviving, as required if we are to set up an effective and credible deterrent system.