

eventually stop nuclear arms on the face of the earth? I am sure that that must be the objective of all people in Canada.

The second question I pose is the following: Instead of Cabinet deciding sometime during the summer, in its own isolation, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has pointed out, why can there not be a decision as to whether or not we test the Cruise missile, a decision of this Parliament assembled in the House, in a vote which is not viewed as being a vote of non-confidence, so that Members of Parliament can freely express their views and that of their constituents on the question of testing the Cruise missile in Canada?

Mr. Hudecki: I do not feel that the whole issue of deterrence is entirely understood. It is a technique whereby the country or the force which is using deterrence must have two components. First, it must show that it has the equipment and the material with which to deter the enemy and, second, there must be a will, both a political will and a will of the people, to use it if it must. If these conditions are fulfilled, then deterrence will work and will not necessarily have to escalate, because with NATO, we have the second track. Using this second track approach, it is anticipated there will be a reduction, not an escalation. What will happen if none of these systems will work is a question that I am not that much of a visionary to be able to answer. But the very fact that for 38 years it has worked, and has some credibility, gives reason to hope for and to anticipate a favourable result.

● (1650)

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a short comment and then ask a question. I found out years ago as a boy that the only way to stop a bully in the school yard was with a strong punch to the nose. Otherwise, you continued to be bullied and there was no stopping a person whose objective was to bully.

In the Hon. Member's speech he mentioned the two superpowers. He did not mention that the objectives of the United States, one of the superpowers, is peace. The U.S. protects people. The Americans have no ambitions to take over the world. The declared objective of the Soviet Union, of communism, is world domination. That is why the communists walk into nations that cannot defend themselves, such as Afghanistan, Poland, Hungary and the Ukraine. I do not want to live in a country in which the communists can march in. I want to be able to protect myself.

Why in Canada do we have a continual bombarding of a nation whose objective is peace, namely the U.S.A., while the build-up of weaponry in the Soviet Union whose objective is world domination is almost ignored?

Mr. Hudecki: Mr. Speaker, I think that is the crux of the whole issue. It may very well be that we in the role of the Department of National Defence and we in the role of Government from a political point of view have not really stated the issues clearly enough. We have not used our educational

techniques in order to get down to the basic issues and to distribute information.

Supply

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Hudecki). In his speech he talked about the need for stability between the two nuclear camps. How does the Cruise missile contribute to that stability when almost every serious thinker and writer on disarmament issues, and indeed people who practise disarmament negotiations for both sides—and another person who made this assertion was a former Secretary of the U.S. Navy—have all said that the Cruise missile in particular is a destabilizing weapon because of its non-verifiability? It does not add anything to the stability of the nuclear camps. There is no denying that it adds to the punch of the nuclear camps. Would the Parliamentary Secretary please explain how these things fit together?

Mr. Hudecki: Mr. Speaker, I think it has to a degree promoted stability in that along with the threat of using a Pershing II missile it has been able to bring the superpowers together at Geneva to the IWF and the Start meetings. It has been very difficult for those who have been promoting peace and who wanted NATO to meet with these organizations and have been unable to do so. When the threat of using these two weapons is made available, the two of them will meet and hopefully it will be the beginning of a de-escalation of the arms race, and that will add to the stability of the country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The period of questions and answers has expired. It may continue if there is unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, we are today debating an issue of the utmost gravity to mankind. In doing so, surely we can agree that no one individual in this House and no single Party has a monopoly on the desire for peace in this world. Surely that is a goal we all seek. Yet I find the wording of this NDP motion before us today demeans and belittles the seriousness of this critical debate.

In the confusion and controversy that presently surrounds the role that Canada may be called upon to play in the testing of the Cruise missile guidance system, we should begin by recognizing that a limited nuclear war in Europe would be disastrous. Not only would it devastate the towns and cities of that continent but it is inconceivable that it would remain limited in terms of the size of the weapons used or of the geographic area. There are no obvious fire breaks that would halt it. There are no sure ways of limiting the use of these weapons to the so-called "little ones". To use the word "limited" is to commit a double error. A limited nuclear war would in all probability destroy western Europe. A limited nuclear war would almost certainly become intercontinental and,