



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 008

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, January 26, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, January 26, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### THE LATE G. CAMPBELL EATON

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished Newfoundlander, G. Campbell Eaton. Mr. Eaton passed away yesterday in St. John's.

He served with distinction in the 166th Newfoundland Field Regiment Royal Artillery during the Second World War and received the Military Cross for conspicuous bravery, coolness and outstanding conduct under fire during action in Italy. After the war, Mr. Eaton served as commanding officer of the regiment and later was honorary colonel of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment.

He was a prominent and respected business executive and an energetic and devoted leader in community life in our province, particularly in the fields of health, housing and education. He was made Doctor of Laws by Memorial University, and as well in recognition of his outstanding and distinguished service he was installed as an officer of the Order of Canada in 1978.

I would describe Cam Eaton as a gentleman in every sense of the word. He was a man who stood above the crowd with a quiet dignity formed by wisdom and sound judgment. He was a rare man and therefore leaves a void not easily filled.

I offer his widow, Betty, and his family deepest sympathy.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### SERIAL KILLER BOARD GAME

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay):** Mr. Speaker, opposition to the distribution and sales of the serial killer board game has become widespread across this country.

Parents and grandparents are asking to have this game, which is manufactured in Seattle, banned from the Canadian market.

The game contains a body bag, 25 babies and four figures representing the killers. The player who kills the largest number of babies wins.

The council of commissioners of the Châteauguay School Board, in the riding of Châteauguay, recently passed a resolution to condemn products like these where the purpose is to commit murders.

These products, which promote violence as a way of life, should be banned at all costs. The federal government must act to get rid of these products.

\* \* \*

(1405)

[*English*]

### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE BARRIERS

**Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election to the chair.

I would also like to inform the House that presently there are over 500 interprovincial trade barriers which cost Canadians over \$6.5 billion annually. These barriers make it easier to trade with Mexico and the United States than within our own borders.

Creating a single economic market in Canada would help counter the nation's current regional drift and would allow Canadians to work where they choose.

The federal and provincial governments signed an agreement last week for the removal of many of the 500 barriers. This is extremely encouraging.

The Reform Party caucus is supportive of these efforts and applauds the provincial and federal governments for providing a clear definition of interprovincial trade barriers. As well the commitment of these governments to the June 30, 1994 time line is most commendable.

\* \* \*

### SOCIAL SECURITY

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage members of the House to play a major role in the reform of Canada's social security system.

*S. O. 31*

The speech from the throne set out the government's ambitious two-year schedule to complete the modernization of our national social security system and to make it more responsive to the economic and social realities of the 1990s and beyond.

Our system was first put in place decades ago. It has served us well but times have changed. Canadians will not accept and we must not accept double digit levels of unemployment, signs of a lost generation of youth and rising levels of child poverty. Canadians realize that reforms are necessary. They also want hope for a better future for themselves and their children.

I have already heard many excellent ideas from my constituents and I hope others will come forward. I know the minister has been consulting widely with provincial representatives, social policy organizations, business and labour representatives, academics and Canadians from all walks of life.

\* \* \*

**NOBEL PEACE PRIZE COMMITTEE**

**Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North):** Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 1993 a declaration in principle on interim self-government between the Palestinian Liberation Organization and the state of Israel was signed. It marked an historic moment for both politics and the people of the Middle East. It ushered in a new sense of hope to a region of the world where bloodshed and despair continue to dominate the lives of so many people.

The agreement was the direct result of efforts made by two courageous individuals. They managed to overcome insurmountable pressures from those groups that continued to choose violence instead of peace.

Today I wish to inform my hon. colleagues that on January 20, 1994 I submitted a letter to the Norwegian Nobel Peace Prize Committee nominating both Mr. Yitzhak Rabin, Prime Minister of Israel, and Mr. Yasser Arafat, PLO Chairman, for the 1994 Nobel Peace Prize.

As Canadians we must continue to play a leading role in seeking peace and promoting peace. In so doing we advance the efforts of men such as the late Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson.

\* \* \*

**INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS DAY**

**Ms. Susan Whelan (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join hon. members and all Canadians in marking International Customs Day. As hon. members know our more than 5,000 Revenue Canada customs officers are the first people that visitors to our country and returning Canadians meet.

(1410)

This is the International Year of the Family. Revenue Canada customs officers help reunite families by locating and returning to parents or lawful guardians missing or abducted children. They went above and beyond the call of duty all the while doing their jobs inspecting commercial shipments, processing more than 122 million travellers and seizing more than \$1.3 billion worth of illegal drugs last year.

I assure all members of the House and all Canadians that the government is committed to maintaining and strengthening all components of national revenue so it may be more responsive to the needs of Canadians.

I call on all hon. members to join me in saluting our customs officers on this 41st anniversary of International Customs Day.

\* \* \*

**CURLING**

**Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris):** Mr. Speaker, the sport of curling is enjoyed by approximately 800,000 Canadians and one-third of these Canadians are women.

I am very proud to announce that this weekend the Manitoba Women's Scott Tournament of Hearts will be played in my home town of Verdun, Manitoba. Of the 16 teams registered 7 of the competing skips are former Manitoba provincial women's champions and among them they hold 16 provincial, 3 Canadian and 3 world titles.

There is no reason to doubt that this year's lead up competitions to the Canadian crown and to the world cup championships could be one of the finest ever.

I wish all 16 participating teams good luck and to the Verdun organizing committee a full house.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MULTIMEDIA TRANSACTION NETWORK**

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the House extend its congratulations the Videotron Limited Group and five of its partners who joined forces to develop and establish a multimedia transaction network that will offer consumers direct access to a wide range of services, 24 hours a day, from the comfort of their own homes.

The project is known as UBI, which stands for Universal, Bi-directional and Interactive. The consortium includes the National Bank of Canada, Hydro-Québec, Loto Québec, Canada Post Corporation and Videoway's classified ads services. The consortium will offer a variety of goods and services that are typical of the potential of an electronic information highway.

The services offered by UBI will be transmitted directly to the homes of users via existing cable systems and a multimedia terminal.

The new services, which will be carried by the Videotron cable network, will be made available for the first time in the Saguenay area.

All parliamentarians are aware of the important contribution being made through this project.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### GROUP OF SEVEN SUMMIT

**Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge):** Mr. Speaker, as many of my fellow members know, Canada has the great honour of hosting the leaders of the Group of Seven industrialized nations for a summit in 1995.

It has come to my attention that the exact location in Canada for the G-7 meeting has not as yet been chosen. As the site selection process is scheduled to get under way shortly, Premier Ralph Klein of Alberta and I would like to recommend the Calgary-Banff-Canmore area as an excellent choice for the summit. This region has gained international recognition in hosting the 1988 Winter Olympics.

Alberta can also provide a vibrant backdrop to the meeting. On September 1, 1995 Alberta will celebrate its 90th anniversary as a partner in Confederation. To celebrate this celebration with the prestige of an international summit could only serve to highlight the country's strength. I encourage the Prime Minister to accept the invitation of Albertans.

\* \* \*

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

**Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West):** Mr. Speaker, an issue I wish to highlight is research and development. In my riding we have an industrial research park, the University of Western Ontario and University Hospital.

Long-term economic growth cannot be founded only upon the exploitation of natural resources. The competitiveness of our nation in today's global economy is influenced by its capability to develop and apply new technology. This requires long-term stable investment in R and D and strategic knowledge based sectors.

Over the past decade spending on R and D in Canada as percentage of gross domestic product was less than nearly all other G-7 countries.

I encourage members of the House to support R and D initiatives which will enable industry to compete effectively and ensure future employment for Canadians.

(1415)

[Translation]

#### CIGARETTE SMUGGLING

**Mr. André Caron (Jonquière):** Mr. Speaker, hon. members will remember that, yesterday, we talked several times about cigarette smuggling in Quebec and eastern Canada, particularly in Saint-Eustache and in the Mohawk territories of Kanatasake, Kahnawake and Akwesasne.

I would like to point out in this House that the vast majority of the Mohawk people in these territories, as well as Mohawks living elsewhere in Quebec, Ontario and eastern New York, are peaceful people who are also concerned about increased cigarette smuggling and the violence associated with it.

The problem is caused by a small number of smugglers who take advantage of the laxness of police forces, especially the RCMP, in the Cornwall area and the Mohawk territory of Akwesasne.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### ROD HAY

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead):** Mr. Speaker, last November at the Canadian finals rodeo in Edmonton, the Canadian saddle bronc championship was won by Rod Hay.

This successful young cowboy hails from the heart of Yellowhead country, the town of Mayerthorpe. His parents, Fred and Sharon, were born and raised in my home town of Onoway.

The whole family is involved in rodeo. Rod's sister is a professional trick rider and is performing in Las Vegas. His brother, Denny, also rides saddle bronc and their father led the way.

But what makes last fall's ride so special was that it was the third time in four years that Rod won this prestigious title. Watch for the world championships this fall.

May I ask all members to join me in congratulating this outstanding young performer.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

**Mr. Raymond Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we heard about the vicious murder, last weekend, of the young Sarah Dutil, a girl of 11 from my riding of Verdun—Saint-Paul.

Personally, and on behalf of my constituents and all my colleagues in this House, I offer my deepest sympathies to Mrs.

*Oral Questions*

Lorraine Dutil, Mr. Frank Coculuzzi and all their relatives who must live with the consequences of such a terrible deed.

I notice with satisfaction that yesterday, when answering a question in the House of Commons asked as a result of that murder, the Minister of Justice said that he intends to amend the Criminal Code to ensure that a criminal jury trial can proceed even if the presiding judge is transferred to another court.

\* \* \*

[English]

**VICTORIAN ORDER OF NURSES WEEK**

**Ms. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Canadians I would like to recognize this as Victorian Order of Nurses Week.

For nearly 100 years the Victorian Order of Nurses has provided primary health care to Canadians in the home and the community. The Victorian Order of Nurses is a unique nursing agency in that it is national and a registered charitable organization.

In 1992-93 the VON's 74 branches in all provinces contributed to improved quality of life and health for over 250,000 Canadians and their families. VON registered nurses are specially trained for complex, technological home care, gerontological nursing, palliative care, rehabilitation and foot care.

VON registered nursing assistants and home support workers are critically important to the visiting nursing teams. Over 8,700 volunteers give willingly of their time and talents to VON services.

I am sure all members of the House would want to congratulate the Victorian Order of Nurses for its contributions to the health of Canadians.

**The Speaker:** I wonder if I might put a very small suggestion to my colleagues.

I know I have a very difficult time when I have to read quickly. Could hon. members, if they have the time before they make their statements under Standing Order 31, give the standing order statements, if they are written, to our interpreters. It might help a bit in the interpretation. If they would consider that I would appreciate it.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[Translation]

**CIGARETTE SMUGGLING**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. While governments are hesitating and passing the buck on this issue,

the revolt among shopkeepers is spreading to all regions in Quebec. In the meantime, the implicit, albeit fundamental social contract whereby citizens agree to pay taxes to the state is unravelling. Shaken by the size of the movement, the Prime Minister seemed prepared for the first time yesterday to act to fight cigarette smuggling.

(1420)

My question is this: If he truly intends to take action, could he tell this House today exactly what concrete measures he intends to take to improve surveillance at the borders, an area over which the government has exclusive jurisdiction and where it does not need to wait for the provinces.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General stated clearly in this House that for many weeks now, the RCMP have been under orders to carry out their duty across Canada and ensure that all Canadians obey the law. That is the course of action we intend to follow. There is no need for us to issue any additional instructions at this time. If any new problems arise, we will give them the resources they need. But for the time being, the RCMP are under orders to enforce the law.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister indicated yesterday that after consulting with the provinces, he would be prepared to lower taxes. In light of the urgency of the situation, does he really intend to wait for Mr. Johnson to return from Europe before proceeding? What is the government waiting for to take the action warranted, namely issuing an immediate ministerial statement calling for lower federal taxes on cigarettes?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees that it would be much more effective if all governments would co-operate.

We are presently holding discussions with several provincial governments. The Minister of Finance broached the subject last Friday at a meeting of finance ministers and we will try to find a solution that will please everyone. When we are ready, we will take action. I am very pleased to hear that the Premier of Quebec said he would act as soon as he got back. The federal government is examining its options and as I said, we want to act in this matter in concert with the provincial governments.

Mr. Johnson and I have discussed this subject several times, even at a federal-provincial meeting prior to his becoming premier. We talked about ways of solving this problem quickly and permanently. It is better to act cautiously and methodically than to rush in and make a rash decision.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I understand these honourable intentions stem from a normal reflex to exercise caution, but we are not dealing with a normal situation. Every evening, we see on television acts of open deliberate defiance which foster bad feelings and entice

*Oral Questions*

other taxpayers to take similar action. The problem here is not just tobacco taxes. It has to do with all of the other taxes.

Since it has not always been made very clear what orders that have been or will be given to the RCMP, could the Prime Minister tell this House clearly once and for all and give us the assurance that he has personally instructed the RCMP to lay charges immediately against smugglers when it has the evidence to do so?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** It is not up to me to tell the RCMP what its job is. This police force has earned an international reputation and when it has compiled valid evidence, it takes quick action, as it must. I do not think the Solicitor General needs to tell RCMP officers how to do their job. They already know how to do it.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the week, the Official Opposition has been questioning the government about the very serious events that took place in Kanesatake last Friday.

The minister of defence answered that the matter was under investigation by the Sûreté du Québec but, as we later found out, this was incorrect. The Prime Minister trivialized the incident, saying there were no bullet holes found in the helicopter. He mentioned the use of a slingshot, as you probably remember. At the same time, we are receiving very serious information from reliable sources and we are concerned because it looks like the government wants to keep the whole thing quiet.

(1425)

My question is for the Prime Minister. Now that five days have gone by since the events took place, can he tell us whether or not bullet holes were found on the CC-130 Hercules No. 130310 which took part in the operation over Kanesatake?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, in direct response to the hon. member, there are no bullet holes in either the Labrador helicopter or the Hercules that were involved in this incident.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister agree to table in this House the journey log book as well as the trip reports of the aircraft involved in the operation over Kanesatake?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the hon.

member should know that that kind of information is not routinely available publicly.

I want to clarify one thing that was raised yesterday about the involvement of the Sûreté du Québec. They were involved last Friday with search and rescue after the electronic emission occurred.

Our people landed, conducted a search and determined there was not an aircraft downed in the area. Just before they were about to leave they were approached by the individual—I have stated this in the House—who alleged that shots may have been fired. They left because they did not want a confrontation and were reasonably assured there was no downed aircraft in the area. The Sûreté is not involved today but they were involved last Friday.

\* \* \*

**INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

A memorandum to the Prime Minister from the Secretary to the Cabinet obtained yesterday by the media refers to a serious divergence of views among government ministers with respect to the federal role in the national infrastructure program.

This memo reports that the minister responsible for infrastructure favours a co-operative program where provinces and municipalities would meet federal criteria, but the Minister of Human Resources Development is said to favour much more direct federal and ministerial control over the projects.

Will the Prime Minister tell the House how this power struggle has been resolved and what he is doing to safeguard the national infrastructure program from degenerating into the pork-barrel politics of the past?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the memo was received. I read it and the problem was resolved.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest):** A supplementary question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. That is hardly an adequate answer.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Manning:** Maybe I can be more specific. Will federal ministers in each province have a veto over proposed infrastructure projects in that province, even if the project has nothing to do with their portfolios and is approved and recommended by the provincial and municipal authorities in that province?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the decisions are made by the minister responsible, the President of the Treasury Board. He is receiving representations; he is listening to ministers; he is listening to members of Parliament. But he makes the final decision.

*Oral Questions*

He receives representations from everybody, but he is the one responsible because I am the Prime Minister and asked him to do it.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting reply from the Prime Minister, but my question is a very simple and direct one. Perhaps you could try again. I just asked, does the minister—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** Order. With all respect I would ask the questioner to please put the questions through the Chair.

**Mr. Manning:** Mr. Speaker, my question is just to get clarification from the Prime Minister.

Do the ministers in each province have a veto, yes or no, on these infrastructure projects recommended by municipal—the answer is no.

(1430)

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the answer is n—o, no.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TAX SHELTERS**

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has so far refused to respond to the questions I asked him in this House about his intentions. But he does not hesitate to make statements outside Parliament; in particular, he said that Quebecers and Canadians told him yesterday that they were willing to pay more taxes.

My question is for the Minister of Finance: Did Quebecers and Canadians also tell him that they were fed up with unfair taxes and expected him to eliminate the family trust system and tax loopholes benefiting the very rich?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be referring to yesterday's conference. Canadians made it very clear to us that they wanted to examine the whole tax base and loophole issue and that they wanted jobs, as we said in our red book.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot):** Mr. Speaker, out of respect for this House, for the neediest of Quebecers and Canadians and for middle-income earners crippled by federal taxes, can the Minister of Finance make a commitment here in this House to give all these people a break and tackle the real problems, namely the tax shelters benefitting the very rich? That is the real scandal of Canadian taxation.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, since these conferences started, we have been talking about dealing with these tax loopholes. I do

not know where he is coming from—No, I know exactly where he is coming from. We have said very clearly that we intend to make the tax system more equitable than it is now, by eliminating tax loopholes.

\* \* \*

[English]

**INCOME TAX**

**Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

It was reported in the *Gazette* on January 22, 1994 that a government member for Newfoundland had approached the minister to ask him to change the Income Tax Act in order to have the Governor General pay income tax.

I have received a number of angry phone calls in North Vancouver concerning this report, in particular one from Mrs. Elinor Ryan who was shocked that not only did the Governor General not pay income tax but he could possibly be eligible for a GST rebate cheque since he has no taxable income.

I would like to ask the minister what steps he is taking to encourage the Governor General to pay income tax?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the salary of the Governor General is set taking into account the fact that he does not pay income tax. There is no net loss to fisc.

I would tell the hon. member that I have not discussed this with the Governor General. I have not seen him since I was sworn in and I did not think that the time was particularly propitious at that moment.

**Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver):** Mr. Speaker, I can understand the minister's reticence in approaching this matter.

Last year, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth began voluntarily paying income taxes. It does seem quite contradictory that the Queen is paying income taxes and her representative in Canada is not doing so.

Will the minister approach the Governor General with a view to his voluntarily paying income taxes?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues have suggested that we look at the relative incomes of the Queen and the Governor General.

I take the member's question as a representation and I assure him that the next time I see the Governor General, which I suspect may not be for a long time, I will bring this up.

*Oral Questions*

(1435)

*[Translation]***INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the minister of Indian affairs, I will direct my question to the Prime Minister. The Quebec Minister responsible for Native Affairs, Mr. Christos Sirros, said two days ago that native self-government could be achieved by administrative agreement, that is, with no constitutional amendment.

I would therefore ask the Prime Minister if he still shares the Quebec minister's opinion that native self-government can be recognized through administrative agreements alone.

*[English]*

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, what I said in the House last week was that we can do it without amending the Constitution. It is evident that Mr. Sirros has come to the same conclusion.

*[Translation]*

It is a recommendation that was made by the commission of inquiry on native rights chaired by two people, a judge from Quebec and Mr. Erasmus, who said that we could achieve the same goals without changing the Canadian Constitution.

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was at one time minister of Indian affairs. Does he not agree that establishing native self-government on a sound foundation requires amending the Constitution, as the chief of the First Nations, Mr. Ovide Mercredi, maintains and asserts?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there is a mood at this time to hold constitutional conferences on any subject whatsoever. I think that it would be very prudent to have a system of Indian self-government; after several years, we would know exactly how it operates and that it is working well. If we had to entrench it in the Constitution at that time, we could do so.

It may be more prudent to act that way than to amend the Constitution without knowing exactly all the long-term consequences.

\* \* \*

*[English]***JOB TRAINING**

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development and was inspired by Mr. Bryan Dale of Willowdale, Ontario.

In Tuesday's *Globe and Mail*, the minister is reported as saying that: "an 18-year old dropout has as much right under the

rules of fairness to get access to a good secure job over time as does the Queen's University economist who is working for a stock firm".

Will the minister agree that promising a job irrespective of training is the wrong message to send to teenage students who are considering dropping out of school?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, I am in full agreement with the idea that offering that kind of job opportunity without training is not the proper way to approach it.

That is exactly the reason the government is committed to a major apprenticeship program, a major youth service program, a major revision and restructuring of our employment, training, social assistance programs so we can get to all young people regardless of their status in life real hope for the future. That was the intent of my statement, to make sure everybody in this society is treated and equally. That is the Liberal way of doing things.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island):** Mr. Speaker, as an instructor in a technical institute for many years, I too value the concept of fairness for students of all ability levels.

I would like to ask the minister how he proposes to ensure that there is an incentive for 18-year old dropouts to return to school and upgrade their skills and thereby assure that fairness?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly look forward to drawing on the hon. member's experience in the educational field.

It will be very important as this Parliament addresses the fundamental question of redesigning our training and educational programs to eliminate the disincentives, the problems and the barriers which now exist in many of our income security programs. These barriers provide disincentives to young people to get back into the work force and to get into training programs.

I look forward to that member's and to all members' participation so we can pool our best judgment and those of our constituents to make sure that the many young people who are denied opportunities now will have something to hope for in the months ahead.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***MIL DAVIE SHIPYARD**

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Last week, my colleague, the hon. member for Lévis, alerted this House to the catastrophic impact that the closing of



*Oral Questions*

the MIL Davie shipyard would have for the whole region of Quebec City. Some 10,000 direct and indirect jobs are at stake.

(1440)

The business plan calls for a reconversion from military contracts to civilian contracts provides, among other things, the awarding of the contract to build the ferry for the Magdalen Islands.

This plan received the support of all the business stakeholders in the Quebec City region, as well as of all the Liberal candidates of Quebec City during the last election campaign, including that of Mr. Jean Pelletier, the defeated candidate in the riding of Québec and the current chief of staff of the Prime Minister.

Therefore, I would like to know when and how the Minister of Transport will fulfil the promises made by the Liberal Party, which claims to support the business plan developed by MIL Davie.

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, the issue of the *Lucy Maud Montgomery*, which concerns my department, has been pending for a very long time. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition is aware of that since he was a minister under the Conservative government when the *Lucy Maud Montgomery* was to be replaced.

As for us, our responsibility is very clear. The *Lucy Maud Montgomery* will have to be replaced, either through buying a ship built at the MIL Davie shipyard or elsewhere, renting one, restoring the *Lucy Maud Montgomery*, or buying another ship overseas. My department is currently reviewing all these options.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis):** Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Transport still try to delay the review of this important issue after just stating in answer to the previous question that the federal government has been studying the matter for two years already and that the Liberal government has made a commitment to create jobs, while at the same time shipyard workers in Lévis are very concerned about the impending closure of their shipyard which should happen in a few months, given the fact that preparations have to be made before construction of the ferry gets under way. Given all those facts, how can the minister explain why it is taking so much time to reach a decision?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, it is of course very difficult to explain any delay in making a decision. It is true that we have only been in power now for two months and a half. The leader of the opposition was sitting on this side of the House for several years, yet no decision was taken.

I can assure the hon. member that the decision will be made soon.

[English]

**INVESTMENT CANADA**

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

As the minister is no doubt aware many Canadians are employed by companies that are operating subject to undertakings given to Investment Canada.

The investment review division of Industry Canada is now responsible for ensuring adherence to all undertakings filed when Canadian companies are acquired.

What action will the government take to enforce compliance with written undertakings given to Investment Canada?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member rightly points out that when investment proposals are reviewed, very frequently undertakings or assurances in writing are sought from the firms entering Canada usually with respect to reinvestment, business employment levels, performance of research and development, and so on.

The procedure followed is that usually about 18 months to two years after the investment is completed, Investment Canada officials meet with the company concerned and review the performance of the undertakings.

Where there is non-compliance for reasons which may be beyond the control of the company, efforts are made to redirect and refocus the undertakings and assurances. Where these are in turn not lived up to, remedies are available to Investment Canada under the Investment Canada Act to discipline the companies involved.

\* \* \*

**THE DEFICIT**

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

During the election campaign this government promised to reduce the annual deficit to 3 per cent of GDP within three years. This promise was reiterated by the Minister of Finance in December.

Last week on the first vote of the 35th Parliament each and every government member voted against the motion to limit spending.

Why should the people of Canada believe this government is serious about deficit reduction and its own three-year goal when it refuses to take the first step to reduce spending by just 6 per cent this year?

**The Speaker:** The hon. minister can answer the question if he wishes, but it calls into question all of the members.

*Oral Questions*

(1445)

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development –Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question.

We are going to hit our target through a combination of growth, cutting unnecessary spending and building more equity into the tax system. I can tell you that we are not and no one is going to hit that kind of a target with the kind of savagery the member has advocated.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville):** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In recent weeks the chartered banks have not matched the decreases in the bank rate with similar decreases in their prime lending rates. The banks say they are reluctant to do so because of this government's lack of commitment to specific deficit reduction targets.

Will the minister clearly state his deficit reduction targets for 1994–95 to help alleviate this problem?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development –Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, first of all this government has definite deficit reduction targets. Second, the banks did not say that. Third, what the banks said is that they were waiting to see what was going to happen in the United States. Fourth, the differential between the bank rate and the prime rate today is not by historical standards out of line. Fifth, the fact is that as a result of what this government has done the Bank of Canada is now leading the trend down, not the federal banks.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## CANADIAN EMBASSY IN CHINA

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Monday we heard that construction on Canada's new embassy in China will have cost taxpayers more than \$78 million, twice the amount initially budgeted 15 years ago.

Small luxuries for embassy staff include a swimming pool and gymnasium at a cost of one million dollars, and a garden with imported maples which cost five million dollars. The interior decorating bill alone for this sumptuous embassy will total nearly one million dollars.

In the light of current budgetary restrictions, at a time when the government is about to make cuts in programs designed for the neediest in our society, how can the Minister of Foreign Affairs justify this kind of spending?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I must say I agree with the hon. member who asked the

question. I think some very serious mistakes were made when this project was carried out. Unfortunately, there are now a lot of people who want to be ambassador, just to be in this magnificent building that was put there by the previous administration.

I have asked my officials to ensure that further construction or repairs to government property abroad meet very specific criteria, and that there be no cost overruns.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, the minister may recall that the decision to build the embassy was made 15 years ago, under the Liberal government.

And am I to understand from the minister's answer that he is formally committed to preventing future occurrences?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs):** The answer is quite simply, yes, Mr. Speaker.

\* \* \*

[English]

## AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Yesterday the minister admitted spending \$172,920 of taxpayers' money to deliver a speech at Harvard University. The amount of \$172,920 is approximately three to four times the average annual family income in this country.

While I am new to this House I must admit that I have never heard such a valuable speech. I was wondering if the minister would be willing to redeliver this extraordinary speech for me and my hon. colleagues.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, that was the cost of the trip.

(1450)

However, I think we have to clarify something to be just toward everybody. These planes have been there for a long time. We are trying to spread the capital costs on every trip. The cost was to go there and come back. When the plane is in the hangar not being used the capital cost is there anyway.

It is just as if somebody were to get up in this House today and say that the value of this building is more than a billion dollars and that we have to spread the capital cost among every member of Parliament. If that were the case, for the hon. member who just got up in this House, it is costing us \$3 million.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, obviously we are not going to be able to hear this valuable speech which I was wondering whether we would be able to.

Would the Prime Minister be willing to set a direction for his cabinet ministers to stop such reckless spending when it is not necessary?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, of course we have given very strict instructions not to abuse the utilization of these planes. But they are there for the service of ministers and the government.

That was the case for me for example. I needed a little holiday and wanted to travel on a commercial flight. I was told that for security reasons I had to take a government plane. The headlines in *Le Nouvelliste* were that I had spent half a million dollars to go on holiday. That is very unfair because it is not true. If the plane had been in Ottawa it would have cost exactly the same amount of money.

We have to tell the truth to the Canadian people. When you extrapolate like what has been done with the Auditor General's report you come to that crazy type of opinion that for example the cost to go to Vancouver is half a million dollars and you can do it with a rented plane for \$20,000. Something is not working there.

The hon. member rather than use that type of extravagant figure should be more realistic and look at the real cost of travelling.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

The standing committee of the Senate on fisheries and the Fisheries Resource Conservation Council have both recommended that with regard to the Atlantic inshore fishery there is a need for more information on harvesting practices and gear selectivity.

I would like to ask the minister what steps are being taken by his department to respond to these recommendations.

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his excellent question.

In light of the survey results released in the last few days showing a further decline in Atlantic cod stock biomass this information which the member is seeking is indeed critical.

With respect to gathering more information about the appropriate use of gear to conserve our cod stocks, I in conjunction with the Minister of Human Resources Development announced a pilot project just before Christmas.

We have hired and we have trained a number of fishermen who have been displaced from the fishery, who are currently carrying out a survey of their peers. Initially the pilot project, up to 70 of them, was to call upon the experience and knowledge of the fishermen themselves about gear, gear selectivity, and their experience in the Atlantic.

That pilot project is now being assessed. In the middle of February the Minister of Human Resources Development and I will meet and assess it fully. If the process seems worthwhile, and at this point it does, we may expand it beyond southwest Nova Scotia and Cape Breton and look at further projects in New Brunswick, P.E.I., Quebec, the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

We think it is time to draw upon the knowledge, the experience, and the data base of the fishermen themselves in making these kinds of conservation decisions.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

During the last election campaign, the Liberals, under the leadership of the present Prime Minister, committed themselves to investing an extra billion dollars into research and development over the next four years.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance repeated over and over again that the future prosperity of Canada depended on substantial investments in research and development. My question is for the Minister of Industry. Can the Minister give us his word that the government will effectively commit an extra billion dollars to research and development?

(1455)

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the hon. member would show such an interest in research and development, as well as science, in Canada. I can assure him, and the speech from the throne confirmed it, that we do intend to set up a Canada Investment Fund, as well as research networks and other means to stimulate research in Canada.

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve):** Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer my question, but I will nevertheless remain his friend. I would like to ask him a supplementary question. Will the minister make sure that there is an equitable distribution of these funds between all regions of Canada in order to correct past inequities, Quebec for example receiving only 18 per cent of available funds while Ontario was getting more than half?

[English]

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, I would assure the hon. member that when it comes to looking at the application of funds that are made available for research and development for science and technology in Canada, we will do our best to ensure that every dollar of taxpayers' money is applied so as to give the best possible results, both for the

science involved as well as to encourage the development of an innovative economic base in all regions of Canada.

\* \* \*

#### DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

It was reported in the *Ottawa Citizen* on Saturday and again today that the Department of National Defence has a staff of over 100 military people to administer the household moves of its personnel, yet the department pays more for its moves than do private corporations. Furthermore, private companies exist which say they can provide this administrative service at no cost to the government and that the government would save 10 per cent to 25 per cent on rates over those currently being paid.

What is the minister doing to investigate these cost-saving opportunities at a time of deficit reduction?

**Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** My colleague from Cambridge posed this very same question last Friday and I gave a pretty detailed answer. Perhaps the hon. member was not here.

I do have some concerns that we are not getting the best deal. I have asked my officials to make sure that the concerns of the hon. member who just asked the question and my colleague from Cambridge are addressed very soon.

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River):** I would like to ask a supplementary question of the minister. Would he at least give the reassurance that he would reinstate the pilot project that looked into cost savings which was set up in the last days of the last administration?

**Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** First of all, my colleague is from Waterloo. I hope I did not upset my colleague from Cambridge, who may disagree.

The pilot project the hon. member refers to was one—and I addressed this last Friday—that was established by three ministers of the previous Conservative government without authorization. One of the first things we did when we took over was cancel the pilot project.

I am not opposed to looking into the matter to try and get some resolution to the situation to get the cheapest price possible because the federal government does move, I believe, and is responsible for 35 per cent of all moves in Canada. Therefore we are talking about big business, more than \$100 million.

We will certainly look into it, but the way it was done by the previous government was totally unacceptable. As I said last Friday we do not do business that way.

#### Oral Questions

[Translation]

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Human rights are still being violated in El Salvador, in spite of the 1992 peace agreements. Even the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada recognized it on December 17 last when he talked about the re-emergence of political violence in El Salvador. In spite of the prevailing alarming situation, the Immigration and Refugee Board rejected the request for asylum of about 50 Salvadoran individuals who now face expulsion from Canada. My question is this: Does the minister intend to do something about these expulsion decisions which could endanger the lives of these Salvadoran refugees if they were forced to go back to their country?

(1500)

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his question and to congratulate him on having been chosen by his party to be critic for citizenship and immigration.

[English]

In regard to the 30 or 50 individuals from El Salvador, I should mention a fact that he knows and appreciates I am sure, the privacy laws prevent me from going into the specific details.

These individuals went through a refugee board determination hearing, had full appeal to the Federal Court, have had reviews conducted. They wrote my office seeking a meeting and officials in my department are currently in the process of meeting with these individuals in Montreal—they just provided us with the names a few days ago—in order to receive the proposal they wish to make to us.

[Translation]

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa):** I would like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Why has government suspended all deportations of Chinese, Haitian and Somali nationals and why will they not commit to doing the same for Salvadorans?

[English]

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, concerning El Salvador, it is the immigration refugee board that has the full right to make a determination on who is not and who is a refugee. It is true that individuals from the Republic of China and Iraq are not returned.

*Routine Proceedings*

We have information, from external affairs, from our mission in El Salvador and from the UNHCR, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, that individuals are being returned to El Salvador.

Yes, there has been increased sporadic violence in the lead-up to the March elections. Our officials are monitoring the situation. If the situation deteriorates to the point that we believe it is unfair, unhelpful and dangerous to return those individuals to that country we will not fear on this side to make that determination.

\* \* \*

**CANADA CUSTOMS**

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

It is reported that the justice department has ordered Canada Customs to allow counterfeit documents found entering Canada through the mail, including phony Canadian passports, to be sent on to their destination. The reason given for this is that the seizure of fake documents found during routine searches might be violating the protection against unreasonable search or seizure contained in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is an outrageous use of the charter.

Will the minister explain to this House today what must be done to authorize Canada Customs to seize phony documents entering Canada and vigorously pursue the prosecution of those responsible?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, not only have we also read the same article but the officials of my department as well as the department of revenue have been seized with an opinion from the justice department, which we respect, concerning the letter of the law.

Let me say quite clearly that despite the fact that we respect the law, the impact of the circumstances is clearly unacceptable to me and to my officials. I will seek, hopefully with the co-operation of his party as well, among the officials of justice, revenue and immigration at the earliest possible moment amendments to both the customs and immigration acts so we can protect Canadian borders to the fullest. In the meantime we will work within the law to ensure that protection.

I might add to my answer to the member's question that any one individual caught crossing the border with fraudulent documentation, be it visa or passport, certainly is apprehended and charged.

\* \* \*

**HOUSING**

**Mr. Paul Zed (Fundy—Royal):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of housing.

Would the minister please expand on the government's promise, as outlined in the speech from the throne, to reinstate the important program, the residential rehabilitation assistance program?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency):** Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to thank and congratulate my colleague from Fundy—Royal on his first question.

The RRAP program is comprised of three different elements: the home owner program; the disabled; and the emergency repair. The throne speech has confirmed once again another commitment made by the Prime Minister during the election campaign which is to provide \$100 million over two years for the RRAP. This will provide assistance to low income Canadians in order to make repairs to their homes. It will also provide much needed employment.

(1505)

The start up of the program will commence on the date of the tabling of the throne speech, namely January 18.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[English]***INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS**

**Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canada—Europe Parliamentary Association to the European Bank for reconstruction and development; the preparatory meeting with the Council of Europe's Economic Affairs Committee for the annual OECD debate by the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly and the European Parliament held in London, Paris and Brussels from June 23 to July 2, 1993.

I also have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canada—Europe Parliamentary Association to the European Bank for Reconstruction, Development and the Council of Europe's OECD debate held in London and Strasbourg from September 22 to October 2, 1993.

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34, I have the honour to present to the House the first report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association concerning the North Atlantic Assembly spring session which was held in Berlin May 20 to 24, 1993, and the second report concerning the North Atlantic Assembly annual session which was held in Copenhagen, Denmark, October 7 to 12, 1993.

**CROWN LIABILITY AND PROCEEDINGS ACT**

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-4, an act to amend the Crown Liability and Proceedings Act.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## SENIOR CITIZEN PENSIONS

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition indicating that seniors' pensions do not reflect their true needs. The cost of living index does not reflect their financial needs. They believe that the current pensions, even with the supplement, forces a lot of them to live either at or below the poverty line. As a result many seniors are living in extremely difficult situations.

(1510)

These petitioners request the government to look at the whole of taxation in order to ensure that their pensions are adequate.

## THE SENATE

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie):** Mr. Speaker, I have petitions signed by residents of Naicam, Saskatchewan and area who wish to draw to the attention of the House that the Senate is an unelected, unaccountable institution which has become the home of recipients of political patronage and has long since discarded any notion of working in the interest of taxpayers.

They note that since sections 41 and 42 of the Constitution Act of 1982 provides for amendments to the Constitution in relation to certain matters such as this to be initiated by resolution of the House, they request that the House pass such a resolution and abolish the Senate.

[Translation]

## SOCIAL HOUSING

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay):** I have the honour to table a 20-page petition signed by 173 constituents in the Châteauguay riding, asking the government to forgo any social housing rent increases and lift the freeze on the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation's budget to allow for the building of new social and co-op housing.

[English]

## THE CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House a petition from an organization based in Calgary, Alberta, a voice for innocent children with regard to section 745 of the Criminal Code.

*Routine Proceedings*

The petitioners state that those individuals convicted of first degree murder are sentenced to life in prison without eligibility for parole for 25 years, and further, that section 745 of the Criminal Code allows murderers to apply for a reduction in the number of years of imprisonment notwithstanding having been tried, convicted and sentenced in a court of law; that those individuals convicted of first degree murder or second degree murder and sentenced to life imprisonment can become eligible for parole after serving only 15 years by virtue of section 745. The petitioners therefore request that Parliament pass a law that would remove section 745 from the Criminal Code.

I should add that in the very near future I will reintroduce in this House a private member's bill that would have the effect of removing section 745 from the Criminal Code.

## PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition which has been duly certified by the clerk of the House of Commons as to form and content.

The petition is signed by Canadians from my constituency of Regina—Lumsden and from other parts of Saskatchewan, including Saskatoon, Sedley, Cadillac, Ituna, Lumsden, Spirit Wood, Anaroyd, Lanagan and Grandura, to name a few.

These petitioners are extremely worried about the impact of Bill C-91 which was passed in the last Parliament extending the patent on some prescription drugs for up to 20 years and guaranteeing drug manufacturers monopoly prices and substantial profits at Canadians' expense.

Prescription drug prices in Canada are the most expensive in the world as a result of this bill. These petitioners are calling for the repeal of Bill C-91 to reduce the financial burden on health care consumers in need of prescription drugs and on provincial government drug programs.

## RIGHTS OF GRANDPARENTS

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure, on behalf of the hon. member for Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold, to table two petitions. The petitions are on behalf of the grandparents in the riding who are deeply concerned about the denial of access to their grandchildren in cases where families are separated by virtue of death, separation or divorce.

This concern was expressed by many of the colleagues in the Liberal caucus in the previous Parliament and we remain firmly committed to this cause.

(1515)

## SERIAL KILLER CARDS

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of my constituents. The efforts of Mrs. Debbie Mahaffy to have

*Government Orders*

the importation of killer cards stopped at the U.S.–Canada border and seized to prevent distribution is supported by numerous Calgary Northeast residents.

The concern about the cards which feature serial killers, mass murderers and gangsters offer nothing positive for children or adults but rather depict violence.

Therefore the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon this Parliament to amend the laws of Canada to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale and manufacture of killer cards in law and to advise producers of killer cards that their product, if destined for Canada, will be seized and destroyed.

[Translation]

## SOCIAL HOUSING RENT INCREASES

**Mr. Jean–Guy Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition signed by more than 80 of my constituents from Frontenac, Black Lake, Thedford and Saint–Ferdinand, who are opposed to social housing rent increases.

Whereas the federal government froze the CMHC's budget for the next five years, while asking it to save money, supposedly to provide assistance to young couples, and whereas, to do so, the federal government intends to raise low rents by 20 per cent, the undersigned ask Parliament:

—first, to forgo all social housing rent increases; and

—second, to lift the freeze on the Canadian Mortgage and Social and Co–op Housing Corporation.

\* \* \*

[English]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, once again I would request that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Speaker:** Shall all questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## CRUISE MISSILE TESTING

**Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs)** moved:

That this House, recognizing that a bilateral Umbrella Agreement for Weapons Testing exists between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, take note of the domestic, international and bilateral aspects of allowing the

Government of the United States of America to conduct cruise missile tests within Canadian territorial boundaries, and in particular, two cruise missile tests during the first quarter of 1994.

He said: Mr. Speaker, following yesterday's highly successful debate on peacekeeping this debate today will be crucial for the government to help it in its decision–making process as to whether or not we should continue cruise missile testing.

The Prime Minister made a commitment during the election that Parliament would be more frequently consulted in matters of this nature, general policy matters.

The minister of human resources when in opposition was quite forthright in questioning the former defence minister to say that these tests under the renegotiated agreement of 1993 should not occur before the matter was discussed in the House of Commons. We are discussing that today.

One of the members opposite will waive the word “hearing” and will try to say that what we are going to do today, perhaps until midnight again, is not a hearing. What better hearing than to have all the members of the House of Commons participate live on national television.

Let us not get caught on words. This is a hearing. It is a full parliamentary debate on a very sensitive matter. I am sure the minister of human resources, who led our party in foreign policy in opposition, agrees, by his presence here today, with the procedure we are undertaking.

Again, as with the debate yesterday there is no whip in our party. The members have not been told what to say. I do not want to prejudge any outcome.

The government has to take its own responsibilities and will take those responsibilities in due course. The government wants it fully understood that the views of the members of this House will help it make up its mind when the final decision is taken.

(1520)

I would like to give a little bit of background for some of the members who have not been in the House for many years. I had the misfortune of not being here for the last number of years but was here when the agreement was first negotiated by the Liberal government of Mr. Trudeau.

A cruise missile test is essentially a small, pilotless aircraft powered by a jet engine. Modern long range cruise missiles like those the United States tested in Canada over the past number of years have sophisticated guidance systems which enable them to fly predetermined routes at various altitudes. Indeed, the tests of the cruise missile in Canada have been designed mainly to prove the accuracy of the missile's guidance system.

*Government Orders*

Cruise missiles can carry either conventional or nuclear weapons but I want to emphasize that none of the missiles tested in Canada has in any way been armed in a nuclear fashion.

[*Translation*]

Unarmed cruise missile tests are conducted under a Canada–U.S. agreement called the Test and Evaluation Program. The agreement, signed in 1983, originally covered a 10–year period. It allowed the United States to test and evaluate their weapon systems and other types of equipment on Canadian soil.

The agreement was renegotiated by the previous government in February 1993 and extended for another 10 years.

[*English*]

For the first time the agreement is reciprocal and that is something new. Canada has obtained parallel access to American military test facilities. Furthermore, the same incremental cost recovery procedures now apply to both countries potentially yielding substantial savings for Canada.

Last spring the United States submitted its routine annual test forecast to the previous Canadian government asking permission for two cruise missile tests in the early part of 1994 within Canada.

It is very crucial to understand the sequence of events. In August 1993 the previous government advised American officials that the two tests were approved in principle and that they could proceed with planning. The planning did continue after our government took office.

However, before Christmas an official of the Department of National Defence conveyed to his opposite number in Washington that there could be a problem because of the commitments our party had made previously. The debate today reflects that caution that we gave to the United States.

The U.S. has sought to test unarmed cruise missiles over Canadian territory because our test corridor provides the most challenging operational environment for these systems. Our territory as we all know provides a unique set of conditions for testing not available in the United States. These include high latitude and Arctic temperatures as well as the range and topography needed to fully test the navigation system. Consequently the U.S. has attached a great importance to these tests as well as to the overall testing regime provided by the test and evaluation agreement.

The United States is mindful that a new government is in office in Ottawa that could indeed want to do things differently. All members of this House will recognize that cruise missile testing has always been a controversial issue for Canadians and I

am sure some of that controversy will surface today in the House.

I would like to go back a little bit to retrace some of the recent history to give a better sense of how it has evolved in the last 10 years. When the government first agreed in 1983 to test these missiles, the context was quite different than that of today.

First, the cruise missile test was a cold war issue. It was in the early 1980s that east–west relations were at a low ebb. It was characterized by such things as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the downing of the Korean airlines flight 007 and the controversy over the deployment of medium range missiles in Europe. In this context the Government of Canada justified at the time cruise missile testing as an important contribution to collective defence against the Soviet threat.

Second, cruise missile testing was a nuclear issue. I emphasize that it was a nuclear issue. The air launched cruise missile that was being tested in our air space, AGM–86B was its code name, was a nuclear weapons system, unarmed of course, during the testing within Canada.

(1525 )

Testing then had to be within a context of Canadian policy, not only with respect to deterrents in defence, but also arms control and disarmament. Over time the context of the cruise missile testing has begun to change or it did change most notably when the cold war came to an end. Confrontation evolved into detente, which in itself was rapidly transformed into east–west co–operation on a full range of issues. We have witnessed one of the most remarkable political transformations in modern history. In the space of two short years revolutions in central and eastern Europe gave way to the collapse of the Warsaw pact, German unification and the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

We also saw remarkable progress in arms control. Certainly the state of U.S.–Soviet nuclear balance has improved dramatically with the signing of the strategic arms reduction agreements which mandate deep cuts in these arsenals.

[*Translation*]

Of course, the changes made in the last 10 years were not all so positive.

The end of the cold war resulted in new security problems, including ethnic conflicts and disputes over the appropriation of resources which were unheard of during the cold war.

Moreover, throughout the last 10 years, hostile governments, in Libya, Iraq and North Korea for example, regularly challenged the international community.

As the situation evolved, so did the test program as well as the reasons justifying its very existence.



*Government Orders*

[English]

(1530)

In 1989 the government agreed to test a new variant of the cruise, which was the advanced cruise missile. This missile represents a refinement of the original system. It is more accurate, able to fly farther and harder to detect by radar. In addition, cruise missiles have become significant as part of the conventional weapons inventory of many countries. I will take us back a couple of years to conflicts such as the gulf war. There is an illustration that conventionally armed weapons may be more important in terms of weapons systems than their nuclear counterparts. As we can see, cruise missile testing has never been a static issue.

In case one thinks that in the remarks I have made this afternoon I am justifying the future testing of the cruise missile, that is wrong. What I am trying to do is to put squarely before you—I understand I am supposed to talk to you, Mr. Speaker, and that was always the practice so please do not take offence—how we are trying to underscore the reasons why the cruise has been tested in the past. We want to underscore why the United States would seek to test cruise missiles again.

However, my remarks will in no way reflect upon our government's decision to deal with the specific matter of cruise tests in 1994 in the context of the test and evaluation agreement. In other words, whether or not these tests may proceed in the first quarter of 1984 will be a decision that cabinet will take after the deliberation today.

**Mr. Robinson:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister would be willing to accept a very brief question on this issue.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I would require unanimous consent from the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** No.

[Translation]

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the issue being debated today concerns one of the most significant aspects of relations between Canada and the United States. It concretely involves the framework in which we have developed a system of co-operation for our common security, but it also raises questions related to peace and disarmament.

These questions of peace and disarmament are more current than ever. The world is now painfully torn between the hope for lasting peace and the horror of atrocious massacres, even in Europe, the cradle of civilization. Nevertheless, real hope has been raised by the new order which has seemed to emerge. This hope was fed mainly by the efforts and successes, albeit partial but encouraging, it must be said, in disarmament achieved by the United States and the former Soviet Union, later confirmed by Russia.

All peoples earnestly hope that this effort will intensify. It will go even better and more surely if it is done in an orderly fashion, with each gain consolidated by realistic measures that can assure everyone's security. Disarmament must go together with security, which must still be maintained with a minimum of deterrence.

There is first of all the question of the many solid long-standing ties between Canadians and Americans. Along with the United States, Canada has been a member of NATO since 1949 and of NORAD since 1958. Our mutual commitments therefore bind us both to an integrated defence of North America and of other countries in the North Atlantic region. Under these treaties, our air force, navy and army have for a long time had common modes of operation. Military equipment is often interchangeable and the officers of the various armed services have close working and even personal relations. Training, testing, exercises and manoeuvres go on all the time, and they are all done jointly, as a rule. In short, no two military organizations in the world are closer to each other, so much so that other countries often have difficulty breaking through this close embrace when it comes to selling military equipment to Canada, for example.

In this spirit, a Liberal government in 1983 concluded a 10-year agreement with the United States called CANUSTEP in their awful jargon. It allowed the United States to test weapons on Canadian territory. Each series of tests had to receive permission from the Canadian government to go ahead.

Canada's commitments to strategic deterrence are basically a part of co-operation between allies. Canada has no strategic weapons in its forces. However, in that its defence is based on the agreement among allies and it benefits from collective security, it must voluntarily co-operate in implementing this strategic deterrent force if required. This is an integral part of the national defence policy as found in the 1971 and 1987 white papers on defence and the 1992 defence policy statement.

The arms in question include cruise missiles that, in practically every year between 1983 and 1993, were tested many times in the Canadian north, more precisely inside a 2,200 kilometre corridor including parts of the Northwest Territories, British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. These missiles, that have a 3,000 kilometre range, are launched from bombers and guided to their target by a sophisticated homing device. Because of its size and topography, Canada was and is the only place in the world where the Americans can conduct these tests.

In 1983, the reasons behind the Canadian government's acquiescence obviously had to do with the cold war between the American and Soviet superpowers. It was the era of the nuclear dissuasion strategy in a bipolar world.

*Government Orders*

The cruise missile met all the requirements of the time as it could carry either a nuclear or a conventional head, thus offering the advantage of flexibility. However, the 1983 agreement formally excluded any possibility of testing missiles equipped with nuclear heads.

As we know, the geopolitical environment went through substantial changes after 1989. The dismantling of the Warsaw pact, set up against NATO, deeply altered the strategic map.

Of the two organizations, only NATO survived. But the political thaw gave new life to the disarmament movement so that the START I and START II treaties negotiated in 1991 and 1992 imposed cuts in the number of missiles and nuclear heads deployed by the United States and Russia. Since then, the ceiling imposed on both parties rules out the production of new cruise missiles, except to compensate for attrition. They can only improve the missiles' performance by making guidance systems more precise and reliable.

(1535)

That is why, in 1993, the United States asked the Canadian government to renew the 1983 agreement for another 10 years, to 2013. The Canadian government agreed to do so.

Last year, in its policy statement on security, Canada took a slightly different stand on strategic issues stating that it no longer viewed the strategic scene as bipolar. Since the new nuclear powers were considered unstable by nature, it was becoming problematic for Canada and its allies to dissociate themselves from nuclear deterrence, so nuclear deterrence was dropped from the new policy statement.

*[English]*

One might therefore wonder why the government has opened up the discussion today as Canada, after assessing the circumstances prevailing at the time, has made a commitment in principle which binds it until the year 2003.

What has happened is that the United States, pursuant to the recently renewed agreement, is requesting the Canadian government for authorization to proceed with the testing of an improved guidance system with which they intend to equip the cruise missiles. Now several senior members of the Liberal Party have already attacked those tests.

Is the government trying today to find allies in the House in order to support its refusal which it is already preparing in response to the American request? As a matter of fact certain remarks in the minister's aseptic speech might provoke the prognosis that it will be so.

The Bloc Québécois for its part considers it imperative to examine closely and with objectivity setting aside all abstract theory and preconceived judgments where the real interests and responsibilities of Canada lie in this matter.

Those who are opposed to the resumption of the tests base their argument mainly upon the danger of proliferation of this type of missile, particularly at a time when the nuclear deterrent can no longer be justified. It is true that the basic technology for manufacturing these weapons could conceivably become available to many countries. The Russians have already produced their own version of this weapon, the AS-15 missile, and they do not have to ask permission from anybody when they want to perfect the system because they can carry out their tests over the vast Siberian steppes.

Professor Kosta Tsipis of MIT drew attention in 1992 in the *New York Times* to the risk involved in the proliferation of this weapon. He wrote:

Any country capable of manufacturing an elementary airplane can construct a cruise missile able to transport a charge of one ton over a distance of at least 300 miles and to plant it within 30 feet of its target.

*[Translation]*

In fact, the threat of proliferation does not come from American testing in Canada. It should be stressed that the tests the American government is requesting permission to conduct do not involve any new nuclear technology. These tests contravene neither the letter nor the spirit of the START treaties, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty or the missile technology control regime; thus, they do not contribute to the build up of strategic nuclear forces. In July 1993, the manufacturing of new air-launched stealth cruise missiles was restricted to 460 units, that is 1,000 fewer than initially planned. It is also important to note that, for the past few years, tests have been related to detection, interception and missile guidance. In that sense, any test that enhances the target-acquisition and interception capability of these weapons helps to limit the threat posed by the manufacturing and use of other types of cruise missiles developed in other countries. The capability to detect and destroy such weapons in flight is the only effective means of retaliation.

It should be noted in that respect that the Americans are not the only ones to benefit from any improvement in guidance technology flowing from this testing. Canada also benefits from it since our pilots take part in monitoring and detection operations.

The changes on the international scene were not all positive. For one thing, the political climate in Russia by no means guarantees stability. The recent election revealed the rapid emergence of a strong right-wing movement. Statements made by the Russian leader, Mr. Vladimir Jirinovski, do not bode well for the future of detente in the event of a return to power of the military.

(1540)

This would not be the first time an opposition party formed the government following an election.

*Government Orders*

While the break-up of the U.S.S.R. may have helped to ease international tensions, it has also had a secondary, more worrisome effect. With the crumbling of the Soviet empire, new nuclear powers have emerged. The resistance of the Ukraine is telling in this regard, although it has shown some signs of co-operation.

Mr. Speaker, there have been doubts about how effectively the weapons stockpiles inherited by these republics are controlled and how they are used. As well, a number of other countries either have nuclear weapons or are doing everything they can to become nuclear powers. China, India and Pakistan already have nuclear arms. Newspapers regularly report on the efforts of several other countries, including Iraq, to develop nuclear weapons. We should not dismiss the potential threat of all of these countries deploying short-range cruise missiles armed with nuclear warheads.

The best way to counter this threat is still to refine detection and interception methods and this is one of the positive aspects of the testing process we are discussing here today.

You may recall that the cruise missile can be used as a conventional load delivery vehicle. The focus should be on developing it for this purpose. The planned tests are particularly interesting since, according to the information supplied by the Americans, they will focus on a new guidance system designed to improve strike reliability and accuracy. There is hardly a need to improve the accuracy of weapons of mass destruction such as nuclear arms. To the extent the new geopolitical reality demands alternatives to nuclear strikes, there is a greater need to develop more effective conventional arms.

In that field, to perform better means to be more accurate. Strategists are doing more and more to provide their armies with the means to intervene safely but firmly from a distance. This is the only way to hit a limited but strategic target while sparing the neighbouring civilian populations. The cruise missile is the perfect weapon for the job. During the gulf war, we were able to see the dramatic results obtained with the Tomahawks, those cruise missiles carrying conventional weaponry. Any test aimed at improving this very accurate weapon is therefore part of a strategy especially suited to post-cold war requirements, and I do mean post-cold war.

Moreover, there are practically no direct economic costs related to the cruise missile tests conducted within Canadian territorial boundaries. If such costs exist, they are met by the American government under existing agreements. Conversely, these tests help, at least indirectly, the Canadian Department of National Defence to have access to facilities where military technologies developed here in Canada can be tested.

What about environmental costs? Those costs are, for all intents and purposes, non-existent if one considers the very low

frequency of the flights, merely a few over the course of one year, and over 3,000 kilometres of a nearly empty territory.

But we must also take into consideration of the political side of the issue. Who is asking us to conduct these tests? We must not forget that the United States is Canada's best friend, its only neighbour, its safest ally, its major trading partner, and a great nation which speaks the same language as that of most Canadians. Let us not forget that the United States is the pillar of NATO and NORAD, the two pacts which ensure our security. If there ever was a nuclear threat to Canada, something we hope will not happen and probably never will happen, though there is a risk, to whom would Canadians and Quebecers turn? I do not even have to give the answer, because that answer is so obvious. Should such a situation occur, we would be quite relieved to be able to rely on an ally equipped with cruise missiles which it would have developed at its own expense.

Moreover, abruptly ending the long sequence of tests conducted since 1983 would adversely affect the value of our commitments. I wonder how the Prime Minister would explain this change of attitude to our old friends the next time he goes to Washington. Even if he were accompanied by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, I think he would have a hard time to provide an explanation.

(1545)

I can understand and share this will to distance ourselves from the Americans when it is in our interest to do so, but that is not the case in this instance. Quite the contrary, we have everything to gain by co-operating with the United States to ensure our own protection at no cost to us.

I respect the arguments put forward by those who oppose these tests on the grounds that detente is here to stay, but I do not agree with them. I hope they are right, but I would like to be sure of that. And since no one can be sure, we must consider the issue of security. In any case, I do hope that whatever decision the government makes, it is a decision based on rational and well-thought out motives. Many would be concerned if the government simply tried to say no to those tests, to please an anti-American lobby which still has some roots in certain parts of the country.

More importantly, to decide to oppose the tests would be a sudden and inconsistent move.

We are still waiting for the white book on our defence policy which the government promised to table. Where is this review of our military and international role? What will be the duties assigned to our air force? What will be the role of the navy? What will be the mandate of our army? What will be the nature and the level of our involvement with NATO and NORAD? What will be the level of our commitment in Europe? Are we going to maintain our peacekeeping operations? If so, under what conditions, with what equipment and by which criteria? What contribution are we going to ask of the United States regarding the

*Government Orders*

protection of our security? Are we going to continue to stay under its protection?

All these questions and many others are still without an answer. So, why make an isolated and hurried decision which, by breaking the continuity of our commitments and by being totally out of character, would look like a sudden impulse and would be considered as such.

Therefore, the Bloc feels that under the present circumstances, there is no need to put an end to the co-operation which characterizes our relations with our neighbours. A review of all those issues will have to be undertaken, a detailed and comprehensive exercise which, I hope, will also include a large public consultation.

**Mr. Robinson:** Question and comment, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway to ask a question?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Since there is no unanimous consent, we will resume debate.

[*English*]

In the spirit of fairness and co-operation in the House, the Chair will ask members of the Reform Party who will speak.

**Mr. Frazer:** Mr. Speaker, it was our understanding that the next period is to go to the Liberal Party. Do you wish us to speak at this point?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Yes.

**Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to reiterate a lot of what has been said because it is covering old ground. However I would point out that this agreement was signed originally in 1983. It was renewed for five years in 1988 and was renewed in February of last year for a further ten years. This is an agreement in support of a mutual defence pact which is of great value to Canada. It means a lot to our stability.

The U.S.S.R. by and large has disappeared and is no longer an obvious threat. The area is certainly not under control. There is a lot of volatility there. When we think back to the Russians having constructed a very similar weapon to the one that is proposed to be tested over Canada, we have to consider that there are many countries in that region which have cash balance problems, foreign exchange problems. They are very vulnerable to offers from various agencies that are willing to pay large sums to gather the ability to threaten or to create terror.

(1550)

The fact that the weapons were used with great effect in the gulf war is indicative of what they can do. I refer to what the leader of the opposition has said, that any country with the ability to build a simple airplane can construct one of these weapons which will carry a tonne of dynamite or explosives for a distance of at least 300 miles and explode with great accuracy.

There is another spin-off benefit from the testing taking place in Canada. It provides a platform for our air crews to practice their technology, their interception against this type of threat. This could be invaluable not only within Canada but should we find our forces committed in some other theatre in the future.

There is a spin-off. Ancillary to this agreement, Canada is able to benefit from mutual testing programs with the United States. It pays dividends in information exchanged. It is a productive program.

To my knowledge our constituencies, many of which lie in the path of the overflights, have received no complaints from the constituents who reside there. There are people who are concerned about the overflights and have complained about them but we have not in our constituencies received any direct input on this matter. I believe there is minimal, if any, environmental impact caused by these missiles overflying the country.

If I may go back to my personal experience when I was base operations officer at Canadian Forces Base Cold Lake, I was in charge of the range there. It was a rectangular area some 100 by 60 miles.

On that range live an awful lot of animals: moose, caribou, grizzly bears and so on. I overflew it regularly and I have seen moose in my flight path that stood with its head in the water and completely ignored my overflight. In fact, he was more bothered by a helicopter when I went up to check what was going on than he was by the jets flying over. The jets were flying at an altitude of 50 feet at speeds exceeding 600 knots, over 700 miles an hour. Animals do adapt.

To further exemplify the fact that animals adapt, when I went there in 1976 a herd of eight buffalo were living within the range. By the time I left in 1979 the herd had grown to 13 animals.

In this instance there is a limited window within which these tests can be conducted. It is my understanding that the tethered flights, that is with the missile attached to the wing of a B-52, are conducted in the period between October and December.

Only two of the free flights that we are now discussing take place between January and the end of March. The reason for this, as I understand it, is in case of an accident and the missile crashes. The missile might start a forest fire if it happened outside that timeframe when the snow was off the ground.

*Government Orders*

It is of great concern to the United States military that wishes to conduct the test that we are procrastinating and delaying approval. These tests are in Canada's best interests and should be allowed to proceed.

The agreement was signed in good faith. Canada should honour the agreement to which we have committed and should allow the tests to proceed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before I take the parliamentary secretary's point of order, I would like to ask the assistance of the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. Is the Chair to understand that members of the Reform Party will be splitting their times to ten and five?

**Mr. Frazer:** Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I apologize for not having made that point earlier.

**Mr. Mifflin:** Mr. Speaker, a point of order. It is our intention on this side of the House to split our time into 10 minute speeches with five minute question and answer segments because there are so many speakers who want to get on. It is my humble suggestion and I regret I have not had time to consult with the other side of the House. We know where the Reform is coming from.

(1555)

I would suggest that if there is agreement, consideration be given for all sides of the House to go immediately to 10 and 5 which would allow considerable discussion and more speakers who feel quite strongly on both sides of this issue and that would be facilitated.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, does the parliamentary secretary speak on behalf of all parties when he proposes a 10–5 split until 10 o'clock or midnight, depending on whether the sitting is extended or not?

As far as we are concerned, we have no objection to the other parties proceeding that way, but our first three speakers will make 20 minute speeches that will each be followed by a 10 minute question and comment period.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I will say to the hon. member for Richelieu that the Bloc Quebecois can certainly proceed any way it chooses.

On the government side, the parliamentary secretary tells us that the length of speeches will be 10 minutes, followed by a 5 minute question and comment period and I think the Reform Party will proceed in the same manner.

**Mr. Robinson:** Mr. Speaker, since it is very clear that, in the opposition, the leader of the Bloc Quebecois is in favour of cruise missile testing and so is the Reform Party, I hope that the NDP will be heard early in the debate, otherwise we will hear

only from those who say yes to the Americans and yes to cruise missile testing.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I do not believe that is a point of order. I believe that is more a matter of debate.

If I could resume now with questions and comments for five minutes.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague for his presentation.

I have two questions to raise. First, a number of people have been telling me that the original rationale for cruise missile testing is now passe. I wonder if he would care to comment on that.

The other question I want to raise, which is equally important, is with respect to complaints. I must confess that I do not have the whole picture necessarily but I was led to believe that there had been some concerns voiced by the Government of the Northwest Territories and some people in the territories. There may have been others.

If that were the case and recognizing that the Reform Party is unusually sensitive, according to their spokespersons, in listening to the people, how would he react to that.

**Mr. Frazer:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. I very much appreciate it.

He is probably fairly accurate in saying that the original reasons for which the missile was conceived are now passe. However, I think the experience in the gulf war demonstrated a very valid and useful purpose for this type of weapon. It enables the intrusion of the weapon into the area in question. There is reasonable assurance of destruction and it does the job without risking a pilot. If it is necessary for the missile to be committed that is a good reason for having it in the arsenal.

With regard to complaints I take very much to heart what the member is saying. When I made my comments about no complaints from constituents I was referring to constituents which are represented by Reform Party members of Parliament.

I understand there are complaints from the Northwest Territories and I am already on record as saying that if the people who are complaining about the missile test wish to present their complaints to a parliamentary committee I would be more than willing to participate in such a hearing so that I could hear both sides of the story directly from the people concerned. We should take their complaints and concerns into account.

**Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn):** Mr. Speaker, the reason originally for the cruise missile testing in western and northern Canada was because the terrain of that particular part of Canada closely resembled that of the Soviet Union.

*Government Orders*

Since the Soviet Union no longer exists and since the war areas in the world have been comparable to that of Iraq, being deserts, would it not be more appropriate for cruise missile testing, rather than being in Canada to be in areas comparable to that in Nevada.

(1600)

**Mr. Frazer:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that in addition to areas like the Persian Gulf there is also the danger of threats from people who have snow on the ground for a reasonable portion of the year. I mentioned earlier the volatility of areas in the former U.S.S.R. I do not in any way claim they are contemplating attack on the west but it is possible that by some aberration this could happen.

I think that the testing, both in desert conditions and in the north in snow conditions, is a valid project.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this issue which is certainly one that affects all of us in Canada. More specifically, it affects the constituency which I represent, Beaver River, which includes CFB Cold Lake where the cruise missile lands when it completes its flight.

I have witnessed this first hand from the very beginning in my teaching career when the testing first started in the early eighties.

Let us all realize that an extremely important function of any government is to provide for security for the state and its people. Security for Canadians is determined by several geopolitical factors, the principal one being our close proximity to the United States. The deterrence of future threats, no matter how remote they may now appear, can best be accomplished with the help of allies and Canada must be seen as a reliable, effective team player in such alliances.

In short, our security remains bound up with that of our alliance partners. No matter what anyone may say or think, it is essential that we keep the bond we have with the United States.

While the end of the cold war and of the east-west confrontation may offer us unique opportunities to move toward a more peaceful world, regional conflicts and violent nationalism should cause us to pause and reflect.

Let us talk about the actual cruise itself for a few minutes. This is an unmanned self-guided aerodynamic vehicle, continuously powered by air breathing jet engines. This is a vehicle which can travel all on its own. I had a student who saw it come over the trees and came to me and said: "Miss Grey, you can't imagine what I just saw". It was an incredibly moving experience for him. This was several years ago when he was still in high school.

Flying at low altitude, the cruise missile is difficult for radar to spot in ground clutter. The detection requires expensive systems with sophisticated processing capabilities. This complicates developing an effective defence against the cruise missile, which is one of its greatest strengths.

Conventionally armed cruise missiles are equipped with terminal homing systems to achieve even greater accuracy. It is important that we note that because the cruise can employ radar or laser returns to fix on the target. Terminal homing provides improved guidance where the nature of the target or warhead is delivered very accurately wherever it is aimed. Future versions of the cruise missile can be expected to display higher speeds, greater manoeuvrability, longer range, lower radar and other signatures, and penetration aids such as electronic counter measures.

We see there has been a life and a history to the cruise missile. Even though the cold war is officially over, I think we realize there are still some hot spots, which we touched on yesterday, around the world. We have not achieved peace world wide.

Cruise missiles appeal to the military because they have an incredibly broad range of application. Its possible deployment in large numbers is something that makes it very effective as does its potential to combine quality and quantity in one weapon system and its ability to be modified. So you see it is not just a one-system vehicle, it has all kinds of assets of which military analysts speak highly.

The Department of National Defence listed the following objectives for this particular project, and I name some of them.

"They could fly this over a route of realistic length and width with a representative standoff launch distance to the landfall. Also they could fly the cruise over relatively smooth terrain with various types of surface cover to include snow and ice."

(1605)

My hon. colleague addressed this earlier in questions and comments. They need to be able to look at the terrain and they need to fly the cruise missile in winter over ice-covered and snow-covered lakes. They need to fly the cruise missile and test it in operationally realistic weather conditions.

Let me assure all hon. members in this House that during the period of January 1 to March 31 in northeastern Alberta, Beaver River in fact, they will find realistic weather conditions. I live exactly one hour south of CFB Cold Lake where the cruise lands. I can guarantee that when they evaluate their missile radar altimeter operation over snow, trees, and ice-covered lakes, that is exactly what they get in Beaver River.

The flight path, as was mentioned earlier perhaps, includes a corridor that is 2,600 kilometres long through the Northwest Territories down through the Mackenzie Valley and through the

*Government Orders*

northeastern corner of B.C., across Alberta and into Saskatchewan over the Cold Lake–Primrose air weapons range.

I have just mentioned the timing of it but I will stipulate between the two. When it is launched from a B–52 and goes into its free flight and is operating strictly on its own, the cruise missile has to operate within that time element of January 1 and March 31. Captive-carries, that cruise missile which flies all the way attached to the B–52 bomber, is not restricted to that timeframe so it can take place at other times without that narrow window of January 1 to March 31.

They are allowed six flights per year. So when people say the cruise missile is always flying over northern Canada that is simply not true. Under this particular agreement of Canada and the U.S. they are only allowed six per year.

Let us take a couple of minutes and talk about the chronology of this. The first flight was in March 1984. To date 23 cruise missile tests have been conducted in Canada. In February 1986, a couple of years after this program got started, a cruise missile crashed immediately after launch from a B–52. The engine did not start. The federal government imposed a temporary halt to the cruise missile testing program.

In January 1990 a test was designed to test the capability of the Canadian F–18 aircraft to intercept cruise missiles, certainly an important part of the test regime. Also the American U.S. F–15s and F–16s were involved in this. Unfortunately as probably most members in this House will recall, in January 1990 upon take off one of the Canadian F–18s exploded causing critics again to renew their calls for an end to cruise testing in Canada. I remember that well because of course that CF–18 had taken off from CFB Cold Lake to do the intercept. It certainly was a tragedy.

As with all things and of course with the debate we had yesterday, do we cancel these projects because one tragedy occurs?

Again, as was mentioned earlier, in January 1991 there were several cruise missiles used and deployed in the gulf war. The Iraqi conflict demonstrated that guided weapons were very precise and damage to civilian structures was much less than in previous conflicts. We need to realize very strongly that just because the cold war has ended does not mean that peace has broken out across the world. I think we need to be preventive in realizing that some of these hot spots do still occur and therefore we need to realize that testing is essential.

We could ask the rhetorical question: Can this cruise missile be used without testing it at all? I think not. I would like to pay tribute to the communities of the tri–towns of Cold Lake, Grand

Centre and specifically CFB Cold Lake. They work hand in hand with the Americans regularly. We have a military procedure in the spring called maple flag where any number of Americans come up and participate in a rendezvous or military exercises at CFB Cold Lake. We have experienced good relations with the Americans. It is also good for our area's local economy.

Further as a member of the G–7, Canada is obligated to take part in some of these things. We need to realize that as a member of the G–7 we cannot simply slide in under the arm of the Americans and say we will let them do everything, that we will take no part and no responsibility.

Again may I re-emphasize in closing how important it is for our Canadian pilots to be involved in this testing of the cruise missile and that it is essential for the proficiency of our intercept systems in our F–18s.

(1610)

Finally I would just like to pay tribute to Colonel Dave Bartram, the base commander, and the members of 4 Wing at CFB Cold Lake for a job they do well. We must understand how important our military is and so we take our hats off to them. I think it would be wise for the government to continue this good relationship which we have with the Americans.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to read for the hon. member for Beaver River an argument the defence minister of the day made in April 1993 in a letter to Project Ploughshares. As an extract it states:

If collective security is to work. . .the international community must have effective. . .military means at its disposal in order to dissuade potential aggressors and, should the use of force be necessary, to ensure that it is effective and that the risks to allied military personnel are minimal. Over the past three years, our support for collective security has taken Canadian forces personnel into harm's way. It is likely that they will continue to be deployed in dangerous situations which cannot always be predicted in advance and, due to the spread of sophisticated weaponry, our personnel will continue to be at risk as they try to prevent war or restore peace to unstable parts of the world—. Given these circumstances, the renewal of the Canada–United States Test and Evaluation Agreement serves Canadian interests. Cruise missile testing, part of our long-standing tradition of defence co-operation with the United States, is a contribution that Canada can make towards ensuring that the international community has at its disposal the military means to support collective security. Testing in Canada provides a unique set of conditions and will help to ensure that these weapons are effective and reliable.

I suggest to the member that this is an extraordinary statement which clearly implied that the Canadian government was willing to envisage the possible use or at least the threat of use of nuclear weapons against states that in most cases do not even possess nuclear weapons. This would be a blatant contradiction of Canada's official nuclear non-proliferation policy which includes support for negative security assurances, that is, international commitments not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states.

*Government Orders*

I wonder if the member for Beaver River would care to comment on that position.

**Miss Grey:** Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a better memory so that I could remember all that the member said, but I did take a few notes.

It is important for us each to realize in this House that Canada is not going to be in the business of firing off the cruise missile. Canada is offering its unique terrain, the ice, bush, and snow-covered lakes, to be able to give assistance to the Americans so that they can test these things.

Yes, there have been a couple of dreadful crashes in the history of the cruise missile. But when we think about that, how much safer is it to happen in a very sparsely populated area in northern Canada than to have it happen in a very densely populated area where there may be risk of life?

The hon. member also mentioned that Canadian personnel are in danger. There is not one person in Canada's military today who does not realize that his life is always in danger. When one is in the military one prepares for that risk. Many of our military members are far too young to remember World War II, but when they got a chance to participate in the gulf war it came home to them very quickly, very soundly that their lives always hung in the balance. Our Canadian military are absolutely prepared and know that there is a risk involved in anything.

I do not think the member's argument holds true that we should just completely negate any relationship we do have with the United States. Canada is not going to be taking a forward or aggressive role in this but we are helping as a member of G-7 with our allied countries so that we can work together on their behalf.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Laurent Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. member and I must say that her reasoning seems rational to me, just as rational as the reasoning of my leader, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean. In a certain perspective, they seem to make a lot of sense.

(1615)

It is difficult to argue against what was said in either speech. Given the military capabilities of Canada, its striking power, it is clear that should we come under attack we would require American support. We do have agreements with the American defence and an almost perfect co-operation with them, and I am pleased about that.

However, there is a moral side to war, and that is what bothers me a little. Clearly, from a technical point of view, given our mutual agreements, our defence capability in co-operation with the United States, it is logical, defensible and coherent.

However, when I consider that the cold war has recently ended, that we are entering a period of disarmament, that we should strive to achieve peace, I have some doubts about allowing the tests we are talking about today, and that will be conducted over the Northwest Territories. Before I can be convinced that we should accept those tests, I will need to hear more arguments.

There is also the environmental side which remains an unknown quantity to me. When will we deal with the environmental aspect of this issue? You are asking me to hurry up, Mr. Speaker. I would like the hon. member to comment on the environmental issue and on the cost of airplane crashes and losses of military personnel.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** There is very little time left in the question and comment period, so I will ask the hon. member for Beaver River to be brief.

[*English*]

**Miss Grey:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked for my response. Unfortunately, he took all the time for my response.

Let me just finish this up by saying that if we are going to achieve peace we must be prepared for war. This almost seems like an anachronism sometimes but it is very, very true that we must be prepared. The enemy is world-wide.

As we heard last night in our debate we realize that it is not just conflict from state to state. There are internal rumblings. In fact, my friend is causing internal rumblings within this country. So we see that the enemy perhaps is from within. Let us make sure that we are ready for conflict thereby hoping that we never have to engage in it.

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, when I rise to debate this issue of the cruise missiles I find myself in some senses caught in a historical time warp. The cruise missiles almost never existed. They were discussed during the Nixon—Brezhnev Moscow exchanges in 1972. You will find them covered in detail in the Vladivostok summit discussions between President Ford and Mr. Brezhnev in 1974. They are included in the unratified SALT II treaty which, signed by the United States and the then Soviet Union, has probably entered into customary international law, even though not ratified.

I mention the almost or what might have been simply because the proposal then was to trade the cruise missile in which the Americans had advanced testing skills, against the Soviet Back-fire bomber in which the Soviets had a considerable advance over comparable American weapons. In fact modifications were made on both sides and under the SALT II treaty the cruise missiles were limited to missiles not having a range in excess of 600 kilometres and launched from land-based and sea-based launch devices.



*Government Orders*

The issue came as you may remember, before the Supreme Court of Canada in 1985. The Supreme Court ruled in essence though on procedural grounds rather than substantive grounds that cruise missile testing was not unconstitutional. It is back again now and it comes against a backdrop of Canada's achievement as a world leader in disarmament. There has been a move since World War II when the use of nuclear weapons clearly was not illegal, was licit under the rules then existing to a situation where to a very large extent many jurors feel that the use of nuclear weapons is unconstitutional.

There is a law case that is sought to be raised by a group of American lawyers, graduates of President Clinton's law school, testing this issue before the World Court and the Canadian government, I believe the previous government, was asked if it would intervene in the case if it should develop.

(1620)

I am mentioning simply the background, which is the world movement for the progressive development of international law achieved through UN general assembly declarations in which Canada led through a series of multilateral conventions such as the Moscow test ban treaty, the non-proliferation treaty and the moon treaty and outer space treaty which Canada contributed to signally, as well as a series of bilateral treaties between the United States and the then Soviet Union. SALT I is one of these, of course, but most recently there was the intermediate range nuclear forces agreement of 1987 between President Reagan and Secretary Gorbachev.

It reached the stage where, in a work published in 1989 by me and my distinguished friend the then president of the World Court, Nagendra Singh, we posed the question whether the user of nuclear weapons was illegal per se. That is an issue that may come before the World Court shortly.

This is simply a preface to the fact that the present American President has made massive steps since his election to fill in the uncompleted gaps in the outlawing of nuclear weapons. He is moving to extend the IMF treaty to short range nuclear weapons and to the intercontinental ones which are only covered to a certain extent laterally by SALT I and its interim agreement on protocols limiting the numbers of strategic warheads. President Clinton is a man of peace and committed to nuclear disarmament.

This brings me to the present issue that nuclear warheads are not involved in the testing of the cruise missiles in Canada's northern territories. Clearly there is no violation of international law involved.

The issues of political choice and wisdom are what is involved here. I hesitate to draw on my experience as a 19-year old airman and flyer. I have always understood that the tests were authorized in Canada simply because we replicated the

northern approaches to the then Soviet city of Leningrad. I have flown over these northern approaches from Archangel to Leningrad in a civilian capacity. The comparison to northern Canada is very close.

However, that is all gone. The cold war is gone. What we have is an agreement entered into in good faith with a friend and ally whose fulfilment is being asked by that friend and ally at this stage. There is a case, the strongest of cases, for observing agreements if one has entered into them: *pacta sunt servanda*.

On that basis, unless there were an issue of violation of international law or some other high policy reason, I would say one should observe international agreements. I would hope that our government will speak to President Clinton, would encourage him in his move towards completing nuclear disarmament and raise the questions about whether the tests are necessary.

I would warn against any temptation to a unilateral repudiation of an engagement made because it invites unilateral reactions of the same nature. There are American senators who wish to make changes in American law to cut down on obligations that the United States and Canada have entered into in trade and other matters. Retaliation in these sorts of unilateral actions is something one has to bear in mind.

There is a case for the Canadian government to speak candidly to its friend, the United States, and say: "Do you really need these? We will go along nevertheless in good faith if you do".

I am persuaded by two further arguments. One is the dependence, the settled expectations, of communities in the north that have built local economies and local employment on the continuance of these testings. There is a concept of due process that settled expectations should not suddenly be displaced unless there is a good reason to the contrary. I do take note of the economic interests and concerns of people in those northern regions who are represented by some of the members opposite.

I also take note of the views of our colleague, the member for Western Arctic, whose views as published I have read. It is clear that there objections by native communities to these tests and on the *usque ad coelum* principle. To translate simply, if they own part of the terrain below then they own the air space above. To that extent the tests, as an unnatural user without the prior courtesy of asking permission, are something to be avoided at all costs.

(1625)

I would suggest strongly that if the tests continue the Canadian government should consider asking the United States to provide compensation for the infringement of the property rights of the native people through whose territory it passes. I understand the objections of the native people. It may not have been relevant in 1983 but the juridical conscience of the

*Government Orders*

Canadian people and others has evolved and I think we should be respectful of property rights of this sort.

My message is very clear on this. We are committed. It has been one of the main points in Canadian foreign policy formed by a succession of Canadian foreign ministers and distinguished ambassadors for disarmament. I recall General Burns, Doug Roche from the Conservative side and Alan Beesley, my friend who is a career civil servant. We led in nuclear disarmament. We should lead. We should encourage the American president who has a forward looking and constructive view there.

On the cruise missile test, I do not think it is a major issue. For nuclear disarmament groups I would recommend attention to the potential World Court project launched by the Ileana group. I would recommend attention to the concerns of our native peoples and on that basis I am prepared to continue to support the continuance of the missile tests at this time.

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the hon. member opposite for a very well crafted and informative presentation. I do not have a question. I merely wanted to rise and tell him it was a very illuminating and very well crafted presentation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm):** I listened carefully to the speech by my colleague, the member for Vancouver Quadra. He gave a partial answer to my question but I still do not know if he is for or against those tests. Since he is from the Vancouver region, I would like him to tell us if his constituents gave him their opinion on that issue. Did he speak with them, did he get any information, can he tell us if yes or no his constituents agree with such testing?

**Mr. McWhinney:** I spoke about this very often with my constituents. On that point, I can tell you that I had agreed, before I was elected as member of Parliament, to be legal counsel before the International Court of Justice of The Hague if ever there were legal proceedings on that issue. And that does not go against what I just said. I tried to bring a balanced contribution to the debate; yes or no is too radical. Under the present circumstances, I think we should be allowed to say: "Yes, respect the agreement with the United States; it does not violate international law and does not go against our foreign policy objectives." If we want to change the international policy on disarmament, I believe there are better, more efficient ways of doing so. And I still hope Canada would take legal steps before the International Court of Justice of The Hague, and enter into what would be the case of the next century, to determine if nuclear testing is legal.

[*English*]

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his speech and I would like to point out first of all that while I welcome this parliamentary debate, I think that certainly what the member for Winnipeg South Centre promised one year ago and committed the Liberal Party to and called on the Conservative Party to implement was in fact public hearings to enable members of the public to be heard, whether it was peace groups, aboriginal peoples or northerners, on this important issue. While it is important that politicians be heard, I would have hoped that the Liberal government would have given an opportunity to ordinary Canadians to be heard.

(1630)

There is a more fundamental issue here and I want to put the question directly to the member for Vancouver Quadra. It is a question about political integrity and political honesty.

I have a document which was sent out by the Liberal Party of Canada dated September 15, 1993. It is a document which is in response to a questionnaire from End the Arms Race. In this document is this question: "Canada is allowing the United States to test its nuclear capable cruise missiles in Alberta as well as low level flight training by NATO in Labrador. Will your party cancel further testing of the cruise missile and low level flight training in Canada?" The answer of the Liberal Party of Canada, presumably including the member for Vancouver Quadra, was as follows: "Liberals have opposed further testing of the cruise missile since 1987. We will bring this testing program to an end".

I want to ask the member for Vancouver Quadra what happened to that promise?

[*Translation*]

We know very well that the Bloc Quebecois is in favour of cruise missile testing.

[*English*]

What happened to that promise of the Liberal Party of Canada to bring an end to these tests and what happened to the integrity and the honesty of the Liberal Party of Canada in making that commitment to the people of Canada?

**Mr. McWhinney:** Mr. Speaker, I see no contradiction there. It may be an issue of tactic, including diplomatic usage. It would be in my view a *voie de fait*, or tort unilaterally to denounce an agreement duly made and continued by predecessor governments with a foreign government.

I place great stress as my party does on friendly persuasion. We are not faced with George Bush as the president of the United States. We are faced with a president who had the same teachers I had and who is committed to nuclear disarmament and with all due speed. We will use friendly persuasion in Washington. We have a new relationship with Washington that is not one of

*Government Orders*

subservience or of following the line. We will be the candid friend as we were in the days of Lester Pearson.

My answer is that while honouring the obligation, duly established and conserving international law in that respect, we will use friendly persuasion with the United States and I think we will have a friendly reception.

The nuclear weapon tests in my view are anachronistic in military terms. They are out of date. They are not armed with nuclear warheads. I respect that there are consequences for local populations. I have tried to ascertain the views of the native peoples. I have suggested correcting what I think was a deliberate oversight, a discourtesy to them, by the providing of compensation.

Let us face it. There is a new wind in Washington. It is not George Bush, it is not the revived cold war. Let us go to work and ask them to change and using friendly persuasion in the Lester Pearson way I think we can achieve it.

**Mr. Robinson:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe there is still time remaining in the period for questions and comments. I would like a very brief supplementary question to the member.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The time has expired. The members on the government side are splitting their questions into 10 and 5. I realize for all members that 5 minutes is not a lengthy time but we have certainly exhausted that 5 minutes of questions and comments relative to the last speaker.

**Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, it is with some pride that I rise for the first time in this House. I would like to thank the electors of Rosedale for confiding in me the responsibility for speaking in this House and for this first time on such an important motion. I will not take the liberty of the traditional introductory speech for members to speak of the characteristics of my riding. I hope my constituents will forgive me that liberty, but I understand that the rules of this debate are that we are to restrict ourselves to the question at hand.

I would like to begin by saying it is clear from all the debate, from everyone in this House, that we are all concerned with the same matter. That is to say the peace and security of this country and the security of Canadians wherever they may be in a world which is becoming increasingly interdependent and in many ways more complicated and in some ways more threatening.

(1635)

In that context it seems to me we have two debates before us today. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra referred to a time warp. I would say there is an element of a time warp here. There is the old debate about the cruise missile, the one with which we are all familiar. That debate is about whether we will allow

territory of our country to be used to further the development of a nuclear weapon for our neighbours to the south.

Many of us were very troubled by such a concept. With what we can seriously call the end of the cold war we saw no need to pursue such an agenda. I personally would not argue in favour of such an agenda even if it were to support the position taken by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra in terms of respecting international agreements. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is a sophisticated international lawyer. He knows that agreements may be interpreted and discussed.

I would put it on a somewhat different ground. I would suggest there are new considerations we must look at. There is a new agenda. There are new issues which we must examine in the House to decide whether it is opportune today to permit continued cruise missile testing. I would like to review those considerations.

For me the end of the cold war has not made an easier, simpler, safer world in which to live. Various members have referred to that in their speeches today. I see a world in which we have new forms of dangers to our country and to our citizens.

Let me put it in terms of our country. There are new countries. There are new threats. There are the Libyas and the North Korea which have been mentioned before today. In addition there are whole groups of people, I would suggest, in this new technological age who have access to sophisticated weaponry which in previous times was restricted almost exclusively to the great powers. It was mentioned by one former speaker in this debate that many smaller groups with less sophistication and with less money can have access to technology which could represent a serious threat to the integrity of Canada and, I would suggest, to our soldiers who may be serving in conflicts around the world.

I listened with great interest to the debate yesterday on Bosnia-Herzegovina. One clear point from that debate was that Canadian troops, men and women, would be engaged in world enterprises for a long time in the future. The United Nations is developing its format for the way in which we will continue to participate in peacekeeping activities. We owe it to those men and women to ensure that they have the best training and the best technological information available to them to defend themselves.

That raises the question which I think is really the one we must have before us today. In the new environment in which we live where threats are different from what they were before, in this time when there are threats from new forms of enemies, will the testing of this unusual and very sophisticated weapon, which is no longer restricted to nuclear capacity but to conventional

*Government Orders*

capacity, enable Canadians to defend themselves better from the threat of the use of such weapons against them in the future?

From the reading I have been able to do there is a double reason for these tests. One is directed toward enabling the United States to perfect this weapon. The other equally important one about which we must ask ourselves or draw attention to today is to enable us to understand how these weapons work and to provide adequate defences to them.

All of us in the House watched the gulf war, saw the defence of Tel Aviv against the Scud missiles and watched the Patriot missiles work. If by watching this missile work and participating in these tests we would enable Canadian forces either in this country or elsewhere in the world to defend themselves against a similar attack by a similar missile, would not the test of such a missile have been worth while? That is the question that I ask myself. That is the question I would direct to the Minister of National Defence.

(1640)

I urge the government, the minister of defence and cabinet to consider this matter. The minister of defence has clearly said that they are considering the matter. If they can assure the House and assure themselves on the best technological and military advice they have that as a result of these tests we will be obtaining information that will enable us to defend ourselves in this country or our troops to defend themselves elsewhere in the world, we should allow this testing to go forward.

It seems to me that would be in the spirit of what I would call the new agenda of defence that is necessary in a world where new threats are evolving with which we are not yet familiar from sectors with which we are not familiar and from technologies that are being developed and falling into the hands of many disparate groups about which we have no idea in today's context.

That is the new agenda of the debate. It is no longer a debate in respect of the cold war and the testing of a missile device which, in the sort of star wars concept, is to deliver a knockout blow to the Soviet Union. It is the testing of a sophisticated weapon in order to determine our own ability to defend ourselves against it.

It is my personal belief that testing will enable us to do that. I believe it would be in our interest as Canadians both in our own country and in respect of our troops serving in the United Nations or other capacities abroad.

Finally I would like to leave members of the House with one last thought. As other members have pointed out this is a global issue. It is a matter of geopolitics and our relationships with our American neighbour to the south. I will cite the member for Western Arctic, the hon. Secretary of State for Training and Youth. In 1989 she said: "What Canada needs is a defence policy, not in terms of cruise missile tests or nuclear submarines but in service of an overall security strategy emphasizing

economic, environmental and non-military elements of security"?

It seems we have an opportunity, if we expect to allow the Americans to continue these tests, of recognizing that we will get benefits from them. Let us press them as part of that package to participate in the Arctic council proposed by the government, by this party. Let us propose to the Americans, who are the ones presently blocking it, the development of an Arctic council that will recognize the participation of the peoples in the north who must live with northern developments. They should participate in their future and have a say and thereby enable this as a peacemaking, as a defensive measure to go forward and enabling Canada to participate more fully in a area of the world where we are fortunate enough to have an important border and important neighbours.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for his remarks with which I generally agree. I think he is right in saying that there are two debates: the old one and the new one in the context in which we now find ourselves.

I must admit that, in the old debate, I was personally and completely opposed to cruise missile testing because, at the time, they were only adding to a nuclear arsenal already horrible and terrifying for the whole planet.

In those days, in that old debate, as soon as something new happened in the area of armament, there was always someone in the intelligentsia, in Quebec as well as in the rest of Canada, who rose in disgust claiming that we should stop pouring huge amounts of money into armament. That was part of the old debate and at that time, you would have found me on the barricades or marching to protest against cruise missile testing.

In this new debate, with the end of the cold war, there still remain areas of the world which pose a threat for democratic nations like ours. There are countries that rule through terrorism, choking off democracy. We saw an example of this during the gulf war and we saw that with the kind of interventions called for by the UN, we can avoid massive killing of civilian populations. This kind of equipment and its sophisticated guiding mechanism makes it possible to hit a target dead on, with a minimum of civilian casualties.

(1645)

I now think, in this new debate, that to protect democracy as such, in our country and everywhere else, it is important to be equipped with the proper tools, no longer aimed at massive destruction, but at delicate surgery to excise those threats to democracy.

My question is this: After what I have said, do you agree that some countries should increase their activities against terrorism on the international level by using this type of surgical tool to strike down those anti-democratic offenders? Do you think that

*Government Orders*

such a tool could be more useful rather than less useful in the present debate?

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to say how much I am glad of the support that the member of the Bloc has given my argument, but I can tell him that he is following my own line of thought.

I was rather of the same opinion. In the old debate, I was completely against the tests but the situation has now become much more delicate and complex. One of the complexities that must be taken into account is precisely the element of terrorism linked to the multiplication, the proliferation of sophisticated weapons, to which the Leader of the Opposition referred in his speech before the House.

So I come back to my proposition: Can the government give members of this House in the present debate the assurance that the tests in question will improve that type of defence against those weapons? If the government can give us this assurance, I think it would be our duty to accept its explanation and to carry on with the tests until we have the best possible defence in a world which has become more complex, more difficult and to a certain point much more dangerous.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** With less than two minutes remaining for questions and comments, I recognize the hon. member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake.

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be able to take a bit more than two minutes, but I will not abuse the rights of the Chair and will summarize a letter I received today.

My riding is in northwest Saskatchewan on the border with Alberta and contains the Saskatchewan side of the Primrose Lake weapons range, as well as the home of the Canoe Lake Indian Band which some years ago placed a claim on the lands now occupied by the Department of National Defence for the testing of various weapons and training systems.

The member talked about involving northerners and I assume aboriginals in the decision making, et cetera. Therefore I would like to ask him a question relating to a letter sent to the Prime Minister of Canada yesterday by the Chief of the Canoe Lake Band.

The chief indicated that the Government of Canada rejected the claim of the band to those lands but that the Indian Claims Commission established to inquire into this claim and others had recommended the acceptance of the Canoe Lake claim on the Primrose Lake land.

The letter to the Prime Minister today asks the government, in addition to considering the testing of the cruise missile, to

consider the report and recommendations of the claims commission that the claim be accepted. The chief of the Canoe Lake Band indicates that as in similar situations in Canada the Primrose Lake air weapons range testing program has been very detrimental to the people who live nearby the Primrose Lake air weapons range and therefore this program is quite detrimental to them.

(1650)

Would the member indicate whether he is prepared to accept the invitation, put on the table by the Canoe Lake Band, to approach the Prime Minister to discuss as participants in this process the acceptance of their claim?

**Mr. Graham:** Mr. Speaker, there are two elements to the member's question and I would like to start by going back to the finish of my talk which, given the time constraints, I did not have time to address properly.

The thrust of what I was trying to say about the Arctic Council—and I would recommend this to the hon. member because it does not directly relate to the Canoe Lake Band to which he refers—is that it is a proposal which has been espoused in Canada for a long time. It would involve the Soviet Union, Alaska and all the countries and participants in the Arctic Circle. It would enable the peoples of that area, including the aboriginal peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries in the Arctic area, to get together and co-operate.

As a backbencher what I was urging on the government was that if the testing was to go forward an opportunity might be seized to say to our American counterparts that if they proceed with these tests we would like to see some movement on the development of the Arctic Council. This might go some way toward addressing the concerns of the member for Western Arctic to which I referred in my talk.

Forgive me but I am not familiar with the specific concerns of the Canoe Lake Band and the facts to which the member referred. Therefore just in the light of what he told me, it would seem that the position is more than reasonable to say that we should pursue with all vigour an examination of the legitimacy of the claims and do our best to make sure of the result in the light of the debate and see if we can make sure that anybody living in the area where the missile might or might not be tested would be ensured of the full preservation of their rights as was suggested by my hon. friend, the member for Vancouver Quadra, in his intervention.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères):** On my first formal speech in this House, I am pleased to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my most sincere congratulations on your election to this distinguished position.

*Government Orders*

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate those who have been appointed to be your substitute in the Chair. I can assure you all of my full support and co-operation as well as that of the other members from my party.

Allow me to also take this opportunity to pay my respects to the constituents of the federal riding of Verchères who, by putting their trust in me on October 25, have given me the privilege of representing them in this House.

I have been a fervent sovereigntist since I was 15—and as we saw earlier, sovereigntist is used by the hon. member for Beaver River as a synonym for “enemy within”. In those days, I never imagined that some day I would be representing my fellow citizens in the House of Commons, the symbol par excellence of the Canadian federal system. But I have the pleasure of belonging to a political party, namely the Bloc Québécois, whose *raison d’être* happens to be to advance the cause of Quebec sovereignty in this House.

Of course, Quebec has not achieved the status of sovereign state yet. It is still part of this vast country we call Canada. And if I start my speech on cruise missile testing by emphasizing this concept of sovereignty so dear to my heart, it is simply because in certain spheres the testing issue is viewed as an attack on the sovereignty of Canada.

There are people who claim that renewing the Canada–U.S.A. umbrella agreement and periodic authorization regarding cruise missile testing within Canadian territorial boundaries is akin to an unacceptable surrender to the imperatives of the foreign and defence policy of our neighbours to the south, an infringement upon the political sovereignty of Canada.

**An hon. member:** Exactly.

**Mr. Bergeron:** But since any sovereign state must be able to protect its borders, we must recognize that Canada’s political and territorial sovereignty depends to a large extent on its participation in the collective security system provided under NATO and NORAD.

(1655)

We must recognize that Canada does not have the resources required to defend its huge territory by itself.

Canada has been a member of NATO since 1949 and of NORAD since 1958. Cruise missile tests are not strategically tied to NORAD since this organization’s mandate, namely the surveillance of North America, is essentially defensive in nature. The use of the cruise missile must be seen in that context mainly as a counter-offensive measure. However, cruise missile tests improve detection and interception techniques that fall under NORAD’s mandate.

Since Canada does not stockpile strategic arms and bases its defence policy on the collective security system put in place under NATO, it must volunteer to co-operate with its allies in putting in place a strategic deterrent force if necessary.

Under this approach, Canada was asked in 1983 to approve cruise missile tests on its territory despite the fact that this nuclear deterrence strategy was not directed linked to NATO’s strategy. This was aimed at maintaining a strategic balance between the two superpowers in a then bipolar world.

The international situation has changed since the dismantling of the Warsaw pact and the Eastern Bloc. Nevertheless, the nuclear threat has remained and become even more complex with the arrival of new nuclear powers. I am thinking of Ukraine and Kazakhstan, for example. In its 1992 defence policy, Canada recognized that the geopolitical environment had changed considerably and that the global balance of power was no longer based on a bipolar structure. We have witnessed the gradual emergence of new nuclear powers, which are often very politically unstable. Under such circumstances, it was risky for Canada and its allies to question the collective security system their defence policy had been built on since the days of the cold war. The cruise missile is a weapon perfectly suited to the new strategic context and illustrates our current collective security system.

The tests requested by the U.S. administration are not designed to encourage the escalation of new nuclear technologies. The START I and START II treaties already limit the number of deployed missiles. This ceiling cannot be exceeded either in terms of the number of missiles deployed or in terms of striking force, that is the size of nuclear heads.

It must be pointed out that this type of missile can be used for conventional-type missions, which is certainly not without importance. Even though nuclear weapons were not used in the Persian Gulf, that conflict demonstrated the effectiveness of very localized attacks on well-defined targets. We saw cruise missiles used to destroy armed command posts, conventional or chemical weapons storage sites and even conventional, chemical and nuclear, or should I say potentially nuclear, weapons manufacturing plants. Had it not been for these missiles, massive bombing strikes would undoubtedly have been undertaken to destroy these targets. Heavy conventional bombing strikes would have exacted a very high toll in human lives since the majority of the sites destroyed were located in densely populated areas. Because this type of weapon was used, the heavy bombardment which could have resulted in a great many civilian casualties was not necessary.

Although some cruise missiles launched during the Persian Gulf war did in fact miss their targets, there is no question that they proved to be an effective weapon. But the fact remains that certain flaws inherent in the design of the cruise missile resulted

*Government Orders*

in targeting errors. New technologies have been developed to correct these design flaws and the United States now needs to conduct tests, and hence extend new missile development programs. The purpose of the testing over Canadian soil is to improve and perfect the cruise missile guidance system.

These tests are conducted no more than two or three times a year over sparsely populated areas. The impact on the ecosystem and on local populations is therefore minimal.

It should also be pointed out that these tests do not involve any outlay of Canadian public funds, since under the terms of the umbrella agreement, the United States covers all costs associated with tests of this nature. Therefore, the testing would not lead to any increase in our national defence budget.

(1700)

The Bloc Québécois, while firmly opposing the continuation of the arms race, cannot ignore the unstable international environment since the dismantling of the former U.S.S.R. and the potential threats now facing the world. NATO recently wanted to show this spirit of co-operation which should normally exist in the aftermath of the cold war, by making a gesture of openness to the countries of eastern Europe. Mr. Zhirinovskiy, the leader of the Liberal Democratic Party in Russia, replied that admitting these countries to NATO could only lead to a third world war. The rise of the extreme right in Russia and the growing number of nuclear powers mean that it would be imprudent and irresponsible to lower our guard and not to follow global strategic developments closely.

Under these circumstances, Canada cannot afford to call into question its defence commitments to its allies. Its international credibility would be greatly affected as would its special relationship with the United States. A deterioration in political relations between Canada and the United States could have negative economic and trade consequences, at a time when it is already rather difficult for us to have the spirit of the free trade agreement respected and its various provisions enforced.

The present international environment therefore requires us to maintain the collective security system structures to which we belong and as a result Canada must keep its commitments in this regard. Nevertheless, we should follow international developments and adapt our defence policy to new global realities if necessary. On the basis of these new realities, we might even be called upon to review our international defence commitments. It is therefore essential that the government make a formal commitment to repeat annually the exercise in which we are participating today and to submit the question of cruise missile testing to Parliament for discussion and approval every year.

In closing, I wonder about the government's intentions for Canada's defence policy. The speech from the throne announced that Canada's defence policy would be redefined. Barely a week after the speech from the throne was read, even before the government's defence policy has been defined and a public debate has begun on this new defence policy, the government is asking Parliament to deal with two issues that directly concern Canada's defence policy, namely the presence of Canadian UN troops in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia and the authorization of cruise missile tests on Canadian territory. Does the government intend to make a decision on these two important questions before defining a new defence policy or is it just trying to sound out the opinion of the House of Commons on two fundamental aspects of this defence policy before it says where it stands? Although we are glad that the government is consulting parliamentarians on these two important issues, we can well wonder why this exercise is going on at this particular time. This government initiative smells of improvisation and seems like a diversionary tactic.

This debate on cruise missiles is only meaningful to the extent that it is directly related to the Canadian government's defence policy. Since we do not know what the government intends to propose for redefining Canada's defence policy, we think that no real debate can take place and no final decision on cruise missile testing on Canadian territory can be made until the government tables its white paper on defence policy.

[English]

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the member of the Bloc Québécois for the remarks that he just gave. I have a few comments on the back part of the speech and perhaps a question or two.

The member has indicated clearly his position and the position of his party as enunciated a little earlier by the leader of the Bloc Québécois, the Leader of the Opposition.

However he asked a question at the end of it. Specifically he said: "Why are we going through this exercise now? Why the consultation at this period of time?" It is fairly clear that during the election campaign the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party, which is now the government, indicated that this would be a different type of Parliament.

I have been here since 1988. This is only my second term, but I can certainly tell the members that the type of consultative approach that has been taken in just the first 10 days of this Parliament is vastly different than what this place has seen in the past. This is an effort by this government to try to change the way this place does business.

*Government Orders*

(1705)

Yesterday we had a debate in this House concerning the role of Canada's peacekeepers specifically in Bosnia-Herzegovina. I think it was extremely productive.

The first item on the news last night was that this place, which had been far too partisan in the past, far too pro forma in just rubber stamping government policy that was decided in the PMO and in that inner circle of the cabinet, was going to be a little different now.

The consultative process which started yesterday and allows members from this side of the House, backbenchers who are not members of the cabinet to voice differences of opinion on key policy areas is refreshing.

We are having this debate today because the Prime Minister has indicated that as we develop our policy on issues such as this and put our legislative framework together, members from all sides of this House will have a right to input. That is vastly different from what I have seen in my last five years in this place.

I conclude by indicating that the comments the hon. member and others in this House made today will go a long way in deciding the process by which we develop a long-term policy.

The comments the member made that perhaps we should have a defence white paper is an issue that has seized members of this House and the Canadian public in the past. I believe that the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence have indicated that in these matters of defence policy it is not good enough to wait until the entire review is done. Some time early in the session we must ask the members of this House for some input.

I am pleased to see that the hon. member believes in the consultative process. I look forward to his comments as the government gets under way with committees on the comprehensive review of national defence policy.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments. I simply want to say that I understand the enthusiasm of my colleague regarding the fact that the Prime Minister has allowed this House to speak on an issue before the government policy is announced. I understand that the member has been here for a few years and this is the first time he has an opportunity to speak freely on a government policy before such a policy is made public. Consequently, I can certainly understand his enthusiasm.

However, what I object to is not this opportunity to express our views in the House on this issue, but rather the chronological process involved. To use a common expression, I feel that the government has "put the cart before the horse" to the extent that

we start this debate without even knowing where the government is headed with its defence policy.

You will agree with me that if the government decides that the collective security system which has been in place since the late forties is no longer adequate and that we must withdraw from it, such a decision will have a major impact on the continuation of the cruise missile tests conducted over the Canadian territory. Consequently, we cannot discuss this issue without first undertaking a comprehensive review of the Canadian defence policy.

Therefore, the chronology of events is not perfectly logical. I agree that a debate had to be held, that it should be held, and I have no objection to that. However, this debate should take place once we know the general outline of the national defence policy.

Moreover, we are asked to participate in this debate with only a few days notice, and without any opportunity to have access to documents from the Department of National Defence. Consequently, we parliamentarians are not well prepared for this exercise. I hope that it was not the deliberate intention of the government to announce a debate at the last minute and to give instructions to the Department of National Defence to not provide us with documents which might be necessary for the purpose of the debate.

This is what I object to. I certainly have nothing against a debate as such. It is a good thing to allow members to express their views on a government policy, but we have to know what the general outline of that policy is, so as to see if what we are debating will still be part of the policy in a few weeks or a few months.

(1710)

[*English*]

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, I too wish to thank the hon. member, my colleague and I hope, my friend, for his very fine maiden speech. Although he indicates that he did not have much time to be made ready, he certainly did a good job, especially on some of the technical details.

I have a hypothetical question to put to the member, Mr. Speaker, and if I could be forgiven for a hypothetical question I would be happy to accept a hypothetical answer. That is, if this test were to be taking place in northern Quebec rather than in the northwestern part of Canada, would the hon. member's comments, concerns and questions be the same?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bergeron:** I want to thank the hon. member for his hypothetical question, and I will try to be as specific as I can in my answer.

The question is hypothetical to the extent that these tests are not scheduled to take place over Quebec territory. If that were the case, however, we would have to ensure, as has been done in the case of cruise missile testing since 1983, that the tests are carried out under the best possible conditions, which means, as I



*Government Orders*

pointed out earlier, within a corridor away from populated areas, where there would be very little impact on the environment.

If these conditions were met, I think that our answer would be the same as the one we give today for tests in western Canada.

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, today is a very sad day for thousands of Quebecers who support the peace movement.

Personally, I am quite frankly disappointed, and I am even amazed at the position the leader of the Bloc Québécois, and other members of the Bloc, have taken on this issue. The Bloc had a chance to say yes to a new era and no to the cold war. Unfortunately, the voices of Quebec that are very loud in the peace movement in Quebec are not reflected in the Bloc's comments.

I have a question for the hon. member who just spoke. I heard one of his colleagues who disagreed with the very conservative position taken by the Bloc Québécois. I have the following question for my Bloc colleague. We are talking about nuclear missiles. Would he agree that this would be very destabilizing, as was even suggested by the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel, now Minister of Foreign Affairs, when in 1988 he mentioned the destabilizing effect of cruise missile technology on the international strategic balance. And he was right.

Today, we have Mr. Zhirinovskiy who is a threat in Russia. This would give Mr. Zhirinovskiy a very important argument: "Look, they are testing cruise missiles in Canada!"

Why does the Bloc Québécois not consider the peace movement's position on these changes and recognize the significance of a new strategy that would reject cruise missile testing in Canada?

**Mr. Bergeron:** Again I want to thank the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway for his question which seems to be about the conservative position of the Bloc Québécois on the issue of cruise missile testing.

First of all, I get the impression that he did not listen properly to what I said, because we do not want to go back to the context of the cold war and use that as the basis for our policy. I made it quite clear in my speech that the Bloc's response to this particular question was based on a new global context, and I referred to the presence of Zhirinovskiy in Russia and to the existence of new nuclear powers to justify continuing the tests.

I also pointed out that the purpose of the tests was basically to improve and refine the missile's remote control system and that

consequently the tests had no direct impact on the nuclear arms race.

I would also like to say to the hon. member that if the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel makes contradictory remarks, that is his problem, not mine.

(1715)

[English]

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** It is a pleasure to rise on debate today. Yesterday when we had the first day of debate on national defence issues I was not able to formally get on debate. I was up and down like a jack-in-the-box on questions and comments so I think I got most of my comments in yesterday.

This is an important debate. As I just said to my hon. colleague from the Bloc Québécois and the Official Opposition, this is a different House. We started off this term in government with this Liberal government trying to uphold the rhetoric we had spouted while in opposition. That was that this House had to act differently and if we wanted to put some respect back into the way this place worked, we had to recognize that the 295 men and women who were elected to be here had the right to speak on issues that affect them and convey wherever possible the interests and points of view of the people they are here to represent.

It is quite clear that today's debate on cruise missile testing is another example of the commitment given during the campaign. The issue of cruise missile testing, as my colleague from Rosedale indicated earlier, is a new debate. Many people who would have been getting up during the course of the day to support at least in the short term the continued testing of U.S. cruise missiles over Canadian soil, just a few short years ago may have been getting up and saying something quite different in debate.

We have to recognize that the world has changed dramatically in the last five years. We have seen the collapse of the Soviet Union. The cold war has ended. I remember just a few short years ago listening to many of my colleagues, mostly from the New Democratic Party, who time and time again were preaching about a peace dividend and how the government of the day should withdraw, downsize, even do away with whole aspects of the defence establishment.

I wish that their comments had borne fruit. But the reality is that the world has changed. The cold war is over, but the world today probably is even a less safe place than it was during the cold war.

Previous debates that the public and parliamentarians have been seized with dealing with cruise missile testing in Canada are quite different from the debate today. The debate was whether or not the Canadian government by allowing cruise missile testing over Canadian soil was adding to or aiding in the escalation of the nuclear armament between the two superpowers. Indeed, it was a consideration and a concern we all shared, even though we had different points of view on it.

*Government Orders*

However, today's debate is not on that at all. We saw just two years ago in the gulf war that the U.S. technology, the cruise missile technology, can also be used in delivering strategic surgical, very precise blows to the arsenals of the opposing forces, in that particular case the Iraqis. I dare say that the technology that was developed yes, initially to deliver tactical nuclear weapons was used with conventional weapons in a way that minimized the loss of life and probably decreased the length of that war.

The reality is that as Canadians, as parliamentarians, we are now facing a crisis in Canada. We are trying to develop, and we are inviting input from all members from all sides, a national defence policy, not just for this year or next, but for the future.

The reality is that for a long period of time we have relied on our membership in international organizations like NORAD and NATO to provide us with collective security as a nation. I would go so far as to say that as a nation we probably spend very, very little on a per capita basis for our defence in comparison to other countries that are in the NATO alliance or NORAD.

As part of a team, there is give and take. Yesterday we heard a lot about the give. Canada has given to the world a thing called peacekeeping in the great Pearson tradition. We debated that yesterday. We are the country with a small population which has excelled around the world and has gained support and credibility from our neighbours through the United Nations for our military efforts, not at making war or being an aggressor state, but as peacekeepers. That is the contribution we have made through the international community and through our NATO and NORAD agreements to peace and security. Let us be fair. The Americans, the giant that lives next door provides us, because it is in their strategic interest, with most of our national defence. We have to give something in return for that. What they have asked for in the past, and which has caused great concern among Canadians, was that we allow them to test the cruise missile on Canadian soil.

(1720)

What we are being asked to debate is whether it is the opinion of members of this House that the 10-year agreement which was renewed last year by the previous government should be upheld. Indeed we should try to stimulate debate in this place about what type of defence policy we do want.

It is fairly clear. It was the Leader of the Opposition who quoted physicist Kosta Tsipis. The quote he used is important. It deals with the available technology that is used in the cruise missile itself. Mr. Tsipis indicated that any country that can manufacture simple aircraft can construct a cruise missile that can carry a ton of cargo at least 300 miles and land no more than 30 feet from its target.

It is clear that we are dealing with the second generation of testing of cruise technology by the United States. We know that other countries have the technology to develop cruise type missiles. We know that some of those countries which have the technology to have cruise type missiles are not friendly or stable countries.

We know with the collapse of the Soviet Union that much of the arsenal which was at least protected by the former communist government through force is now or perhaps will be up for sale. It would be foolhardy in seeking to maintain some type of international peace for the Canadian government not to at least in the interim until the defence policy is fully fleshed out through a review to uphold the commitment to allow the American government to come in and further test the cruise missile.

What are they testing it for? Are they testing it because they want to put a nuclear warhead on it? No. That is not why they are doing it. From all I read this round of testing is basically to ensure that the United States will be able to develop some methods to better detect cruise missiles and similar technology from other countries.

Is that a valid observation? I think it is and it is something that we have to agree to. If we look at where our Canadian troops are currently serving, we do not know if in a year, six months, or two years time that we are not going to see an aggressor force or some radical group in a civil war somewhere where our troops are using cruise technology against us.

In this case the best defence is an offence, to look and see what it is we can do to aid the Americans in developing the second tier of technology in order to be able to detect low-level cruise type missiles that are coming from other countries.

It is also important to look at what is going on today as a prelude to a much larger and much more necessary debate that will take place in this House.

During the course of the campaign, the military and military expenditures became a major issue. One question kept being asked. I represent an area where we have all kinds of people that work in the Canadian military, probably over 10,000 or maybe 15,000. We have the Canadian navy. We have CFB Shearwater. There are lots of individuals who are in the Canadian military.

With the changing geopolitical situation, the Canadian government must seize the initiative and ensure that we have a modern defence policy. What we said during the campaign is that as a government we would initiate and conclude through broad consultation, not just the parliamentarians but all Canadians, what it is we should be doing through the United Nations in the interests of global peace and security and also in the interests of protecting our national sovereignty.

Until that review is completed I would submit to the House that it is in the interests of international peace and security and it is in the interest of Canada's standing in the world community through its adherence to international agreements that the

*Government Orders*

decision made by the previous government to continue to allow the American forces to test cruise missiles on Canadian soil be upheld. The decision to uphold it should be subject to the results of a comprehensive cross-Canada debate on what we want for our Canadian forces as a national policy in the future.

(1725)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member just gave a speech with which I am in agreement for the most part. However, shortly before him, the hon. member for Rosedale, who is seated a few rows behind, used an expression with which I disagree, and I will ask his opinion on that.

The hon. member for Rosedale was talking about the testing of a new weapon. I disagree with that, because this is not a weapon, at least that is what I understand from the hon. member's speech: It is not a weapon, it is a delivery system. In fact, it could probably deliver anything, even the mail for Canada Post. I can already see the name "cruisolator".

What I am trying to say is that it could lead to civilian applications of the guidance system. Let us look at that element. It is a computer that knows the ground and can therefore find its way across land.

We are already talking about cars that could follow a given itinerary with the help of automated guidance systems. We are told that the systems could even work within cities, not just in the countryside. This would be very convenient to come to the House every morning; we would not have to watch all this traffic on the bridges. I mentioned bridges because, as you might know, I live on the other side of the river.

My point is: Has the hon. member considered the civilian applications that could possibly result from these cruise missile tests?

*[English]*

**Mr. MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite raises some very interesting observations about the technology. I think he is right. We are talking about the testing of technology as it is embodied in the cruise missile, a jet-propelled unmanned rocket, with a guidance system on board.

I am sure he would agree that most of the innovative technologies developed by the defence establishment have most times found applications within the civilian industrial complex.

I am pleased he raised that. One of the things the Liberal Party, which is now the government, clearly indicated during the campaign is that we would have a program of defence conversion. Many of the industries that relied during the cold war on defence procurement and research and development on defence

will get the necessary government assistance now that there is a change in the geopolitical situation around the world. We will give some assistance to those industries to take new and innovative technologies that have been developed for a military purpose and help find applications for a civilian purpose.

We on this side of the House believe by doing that we will ensure that the technologies that have been developed will not be lost as a result in the changing political situation around the world and that jobs for Canadians will be found with government assistance in bridging the gap between defence industries and civilian industries using defence technology.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, while I agree with his conclusion that we should continue within the framework of this agreement as passed by the previous government, he seems to be contradicting himself when he says: "Let us continue until we review it". The agreement is supposed to be in place until 2003.

Is the hon. member suggesting that we just agree to it for a year or two, or for six months? Do we have to go through this debate again in another 10 months to make another decision about whether or not we should continue? Are we putting this to rest for the whole term or are we just putting it to rest until the government gets a chance to review it further?

I do not think the Americans would appreciate that kind of a decision.

(1730)

**Mr. MacDonald:** Mr. Speaker, I will make it very clear. The debate today is about policy direction. We have a legal agreement with the United States but I am quite certain that a sovereign Government of Canada, if it felt it was the will of the Canadian public or part of an overall framework on defence policy that they could not fulfil a commitment, our neighbours to the south would understand and hopefully allow us to abrogate it.

I am saying I support this agreement. However I do not want to prejudice the debate that will follow. It has to be an unencumbered debate that will take place during the defence review. I do not think you walk into a defence review saying we have decided ahead of time that 14 of these things are sacred cows so they cannot be touched, that 22 bases cannot be touched and you cannot talk about cruise missile testing in Canada.

We want to engage parliamentarians and Canadians, both inside and outside the defence establishment, to develop a defence policy which first and foremost looks after the sovereign needs of Canada. I would hope that defence policy would focus quite heavily on things such as fisheries patrol, on drug interdiction in our coastal waters and on our commitment to the international community through the UN on peacekeeping.

*Government Orders*

From my view what we have to do is say that the agreement that is in place is one we will uphold but let our American counterparts know there will be an open and free debate in this country about what it is we want to do as a nation with our defence policy.

**Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga West):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the residents of Mississauga West for seeing fit to honour me by electing me to come to the House. Mississauga West is the second largest riding in the country and I am beginning to feel as though winning over 140,000 residents was probably a lot easier than winning over my colleagues in the House. I feel like a dove among a lot of hawks.

I am speaking today on a matter which I believe to be of great importance not only to the people of Canada but to Canada's enviable reputation in the world of international relations. I am speaking from my heart today rather than from a position of profound technical detail.

As we know, for many years the American government has had ready access to Canadian airspace to test cruise missiles. Testing has been ongoing and evidently without conclusion. Every year we and our American neighbours continue to co-operate in this project despite the fact that hundreds of thousands of Canadians are fundamentally and vehemently opposed to our participation in the arms race.

I congratulate the Prime Minister on his openness and willingness to discuss this important issue in the House of Commons. Canadians everywhere are watching this process and judging us on our commitment to parliamentary reform.

The cruise missile testing question, despite some of the concerns, is an excellent example of this new process because I am, in fact, speaking against the majority of my party, from what I can gather.

I urge all members of the House to carefully consider the facts, the implications and the future possibilities associated with cruise missile testing. In the 10 years since the testing agreement was signed, the world is a profoundly changed place. It is hard to imagine even as recently as five years ago the fall of the Soviet empire, the return to democracy of much of eastern Europe or the new freedoms finally beginning in South Africa.

Nearly everywhere there is a sense of excitement and hope and a belief in a future which is finally free from the prospect of global war. Against this backdrop the American and former Soviet governments have pulled back from mutual mistrust and the daily brink of confrontation. The Americans have elected a new president, a president committed to world peace, the reduction of the military and the pursuit of domestic improvements in health, infrastructure and education. The resulting peace dividend will likely finance these new, more human programs in the United States.

At no time in the recent past have both the governments of the United States and Canada been so similar in their stated goals of improvements in health, infrastructure and education. Our government must support these objectives which are the dividends of peace and real global security.

The cruise missile and other related nuclear weapons belong to a bygone time in world politics. It is doubtful that they ever really belonged in our nation. Since the beginning of such testing Canadians have been wary if not opposed outright to all forms of nuclear weapons and warmongering. Previous Liberal and Conservative governments have refused to accept nuclear warheads on Canadian soil.

(1735)

Since the end of World War II Canada has been an independent, sensible and trusted middle power nation with an unassailable record for fairness and participation in world peacekeeping. At a time when Americans were busily hunting down suspected communists, destroying reputations and lives in the process, Canadians were serving in the middle east working toward a peaceful settlement in the Suez. In the 1960s Canada led the world in opening trade with China and the Soviet Union at a time when Americans were embroiled in the Vietnam war.

Throughout our history Canadians have cherished our reputation and our independence. Right now we need once again to assert that independence and sovereignty over our domestic affairs and over our territory. It is time to cancel the cruise missile testing agreement with America. It is time to send a positive message of support and solidarity to people of such fragile democracies as Russia and Ukraine, nations which need positive reinforcement in their struggles to establish a democracy.

We ask the members of the former Soviet Union to dismantle their nuclear weapons. We ask them to work toward peace and democracy. Yet we continue to send very mixed messages when we continue to allow missiles to be tested over our territory.

Cruise missiles are designed to be used against the nations of the former Soviet bloc. That is why they are being tested over our land which is supposedly similar in terrain and weather to the former Soviet Union.

The hypocrisy of preaching peace and demanding universal disarmament while continuing to test fundamentally offensive nuclear weapons is unacceptable to many Canadians. At a time when we should be leading by example we are instead blindly following the policies and practices of another time and another political reality.

It is time to set a better example, to answer a higher call and to extend a hand of peace and friendship to our global neighbours. There are no winnable nuclear wars. There are no good wars. There is no such thing as them and us. We are all part of an ever-shrinking world where weapons of the past and the policies of hate, mistrust and propaganda must now be put to rest forever. Canada has always been a world leader in peace. We must not

*Government Orders*

lose this opportunity to make a fresh commitment to a safer future.

We have all seen the terrible pictures from Bosnia and Ethiopia. We have heard the stories of torture and hate. Canadian peacekeepers are routinely caught in difficult situations where their lives and safety are in jeopardy. Who knows from day to day when the goodwill of foreign powers will run out? Who can predict when Canadian peacekeepers will suddenly not be welcome on that foreign soil? We need to do everything possible to ensure the overall safety of our soldiers no matter where they serve.

The banning of cruise missile testing sends a strong message of disarmament and peace. In the eyes of the world we will be asserting our sovereignty and our commitment to global peace.

In addition, our native people who have been overlooked during the past testing will finally enjoy the peace of mind that comes with not worrying about a missile buzzing overhead. Past governments have ignored native leaders. Their complaints have been trivialized and their legitimate environmental and safety concerns have been overlooked. We talked loftily about native self-government. We pat each other on the back whenever a dispute is settled with indigenous peoples. Yet we destroy whatever goodwill has been established by routinely violating their airspace with foreign aircraft and missiles. Over the Mackenzie Valley and delta and Beaufort Sea and over the lands of the Dene, Inuit and Métis cruise missiles fly at low levels in outrageous military war games.

I wonder how long Americans could test missiles over the cities of southern Ontario. Can one imagine the outrage? Of course it is an unfair example but it does illustrate my point. Native people despite being vastly dispersed have a right to enjoy their lives and their environment without the potential of a disaster. We should be applying the same principles across all of Canada for all of our people.

I ask that all members of this House carefully weigh the arguments put forward in this debate, consider the current global situation and weigh the concerns of environmentalists, native Canadians and others who have a vital interest in peace. The world is watching and we should be providing a strong leadership now and not some time in the future when everything is tested and perfect and we are fully armed.

(1740)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix):** Madam Speaker, I agree with the member who spoke before me and who mentioned the sovereignty and independence of our territory. I think that in the Bloc Québécois we all accept this.

Canada's primary mission in the world is peacemaking, peacebuilding or peacekeeping.

May I first mention that before today's debate on missiles, we had yesterday, in this House, an extensive special debate on Bosnia and the peacekeepers' mandate in that country. The purpose of that debate, which lasted over 14 hours, was to find out whether Canada should extend the peacekeepers' mandate in Bosnia after March 31, 1994, in spite of the tremendous cost of such a mission. Are we going to listen to our heart or our wallet?

I think that we will listen to our heart for the following reasons: to protect senior citizens who are defenceless; to protect fathers and mothers whose role is to provide food and shelter to millions of children; and also to protect millions of children who are in danger.

Regarding cruise missile testing, will we listen to our heart or our wallet? Maybe our heart, but then again maybe our wallet. Testing on Canadian territory is done at no cost to Quebec or Canadian taxpayers. Canada cannot afford an army the size of the United States' or Russia's.

Should Canada be unfortunately dragged into war, its main ally would certainly be the United States. For a reason close to our heart, the cruise missiles are being refined to render them more efficient and to weaken the enemy with greater precision, without costing thousands of human lives.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Madam Speaker, a point of order. I think the member should have the floor following the Bloc member. She had the floor for 10 minutes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry, I believe the hon. member is right.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Parrish:** Madam Speaker, my difficulty is that I am only conversant in English so you will have to be patient with me.

There was talk of protecting millions of children and families and about the Americans as our protector. I believe if there is a real war that involves Canada and the United States then nothing will protect us. I believe the Americans have an enormous army and an enormous capacity to be the traditional peacekeepers for the free world. They have done so and I am very grateful to them for this.

I believe it is time we changed. I think to protect the millions of people and children and the next generation and the environment that we have to begin the business of not having standing armies and not having war and not threatening each other with weapons. The true protection, whether it costs money or does not cost money, is complete disarmament. I do not mean what

*Government Orders*

looks like disarmament but in fact is the laying down of all arms in this world for the next generation.

(1745)

**Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca):** Madam Speaker, as this is the first opportunity I have had to address this House I would like to congratulate the Speaker for his election to Speaker of this House as well as those designated as deputy and acting speakers. I am sure your jobs will be challenging and rewarding and I pledge my full co-operation with the House rules and proceedings.

My congratulations also to all members on their election or re-election to this Parliament. I look forward to meeting and debating with them on the important issues concerning Canada in a civil and productive manner.

Also I would like to thank the constituents of my riding of Athabasca for entrusting me with this most important job during this most important and changing time in Canadian political history. I truly feel honoured by the great responsibility with which they have entrusted me and they can be assured that I do not take this responsibility lightly. I will do my best to represent their needs and Canada's needs in this new Parliament.

I would like to send a special thank you to my wife, Evelyn, who has provided so much support and encouragement to me in meeting and accepting the challenges in this new role as member of Parliament.

I became involved in politics and became a member of Parliament because of a great concern I have for the future of our country, the greatest country in the world to live in. Also I have a great concern for this country because of the apparent out of control public spending and spiralling debt at a time of declining of natural resources and high unemployment.

Although this is my maiden speech, I wish to focus on the proposed cruise missile testing by the U.S. Although the Primrose Lake air weapons range, which will be the final destination for these exercises, is not in my riding, the flight corridor over which these missiles fly is in fact in my riding. Therefore these tests are of concern to my constituents and anything that could affect my constituents affects me as their representative in this House.

I would like to commend the government for allowing this debate on such an important topic. I hope that this government will have the same open forum in the future when this government reviews its defence policy as promised.

Before I speak to this issue let me tell a bit about my riding. The riding of Athabasca is in the northeastern part of Alberta and is approximately 196,000 square kilometres which makes it one of the largest ridings in Canada. To put this in perspective, if

one combines the area of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island then the area of the riding of Athabasca would still be larger. These provinces have 25 representatives between them in this House compared to one for Athabasca. You can imagine the enormity of my task in representing the constituents of Athabasca, however, I am ready and eager to accept all the challenges that await me.

The principal industries of Athabasca are agriculture, forestry, mining, oil and gas and tourism. More specifically, the diversity of my riding includes ALPAC, the largest bleach kraft pulp mill in the world. It will soon include a paper mill. Also, some of the most productive conventional oil and gas fields in Canada are located through Slave Lake and High Prairie in the northern areas of my riding. The Fort McMurray tar sands projects are in the northeast corner of my riding. These companies add enormously to the economic viability of the country.

For example, the companies that work the tar sands make a huge contribution to both the federal and provincial governments. These companies employ thousands of people, all of whom pay taxes to support this government's programs. Syncrude, which is only one of the consortiums working the tar sands projects, employs 10,500 people directly or indirectly from which \$1.5 billion has been paid out in corporate and personal income taxes. These tar sands deposits are very significant to the energy needs of Canada. In fact, it is estimated that there are enough oil reserves in my riding to provide self-sufficiency for Canada's oil needs, given the current consumption of 1.5 million barrels per day, for centuries to come.

For example, the four known oil sands deposits are located in Alberta, two of which are in my riding. The total estimated bitumen contained in these four deposits is 1.7 trillion barrels. Of that, 307 billion barrels of bitumen recoverable with today's technology from the tar sands alone could supply Canada's energy needs for 475 years.

(1750)

My riding of Athabasca also has a large aboriginal population with 12 bands, about 50 reserves and a number of Métis settlements. This large population has led to my interest in native self-government and it is why I sit on my party's aboriginal committee.

My riding also contains some of the most productive agricultural areas in Canada. The Westlock-Athabasca area has well known producers and exporters of high quality grain, oilseeds, pork and beef. I have been involved for many years in beef ranching and am proud to say that this is one of the least subsidized sectors in agriculture. It should be a model of free enterprise and free market operation for other areas of agriculture.

*Government Orders*

I agree with the comment my hon colleague from Essex—Windsor made in the House this past Monday when she said that a country that cannot feed itself is soon not a country and is at the mercy of every other nation.

Taking this one step further, I also believe and history proves that a nation that cannot protect its sovereignty cannot long survive. This brings me to the topic of discussion before the House today.

In 1983 the current Minister of Human Resources Development and Western Economic Diversification, who was then minister of defence, signed the original test evaluation agreement with the U.S.

Recently this minister claims that Canada no longer needs these tests because the cold war is over. The cold war may be over but this world is still if not more unstable than during the cold war period.

Instead of having one major threat, we now have many smaller threats. Although the Iron Curtain has fallen and they have opened their arms to us, this does not mean we live in a Utopian world. The recent gulf conflict in which both the Canadian Armed Forces and the cruise missile took part in made us astutely aware of that fact.

Canadian participation in these tests enables us to fulfil our obligations under the NORAD alliance but also to keep abreast of the latest developments in defence technologies. By participating in these tests our forces gain valuable operational experience that would otherwise not be available.

Also, if Canada is to be a member of such organizations as NORAD and NATO, my constituents and I believe we must be willing to participate in these organizations simply because we currently do not have the capacity without the support of our allies to defend our national sovereignty. I am not only speaking for myself but also for my constituents who are in the flight path of these exercises.

The records which I have researched do not contain one complaint, one petition or one letter opposing these exercises from the constituents of Athabasca. My constituents are also aware that there is no environmental threat to them.

The missiles used in these exercises are not armed. In fact, section 8 of the original Test and Evaluation Agreement states: "In no case shall nuclear, biological, or chemical warfare material be brought into Canada, and that the Cruise Missiles shall be unarmed".

Furthermore, the Department of National Defence has informed me that an extensive initial environmental assessment was conducted in 1983 and reviewed in 1989 and 1992. These

studies showed that the cruise missile testing has no significant or adverse environmental impact.

Furthermore, section 13 of this same agreement states that the flight corridors in Canada which are used for testing cruise missiles shall be selected in consultation with Canadians to ensure minimum disruption to civil aircraft operations and minimum disturbances to people on the ground.

If this government were to rescind this agreement, an agreement that was signed by the Conservative government only last year, Canada as a participant in organizations such as NORAD would lose credibility as a nation that can be depended upon by our allies to co-operate in the preservation of peace and sovereignty in North America and the free world.

As I stated earlier in my speech, I have consulted with my constituents. They are willing to accept their responsibility as a member of NORAD. I believe Canada should do the same.

(1755)

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South):** Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member on his first speech. I know this is a productive House that we are working in.

I want to make the general comment that continued cruise missile testing in Canada will contribute neither to the prevention of nuclear war nor to the further limitation of nuclear arsenals. Those were the reasons why this agreement was renewed in February 1993 by the previous government. In fact, this continued testing will instead serve only to undermine Canada's nuclear non-proliferation efforts.

Under our present policy for nuclear proliferation, the Canadian government supports negative security assurances which means that we have international commitments not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states.

On December 16, 1993 this government, of which I am a member, reaffirmed its support for negative security assurances when it voted to support the UN General Assembly resolution 4873.

Would the member care to consider whether or not this agreement, which in fact is a 10-year agreement and requires 12 months notice to cancel, should continue to be supported given the developments over the last few years? Ten years seems to be an inordinate amount of time for this government to have an agreement. Would the member consider amending this agreement or shortening its terms by direction of this House now?

**Mr. Chatters:** Madam Speaker, I believe the debate in the House today is not about nuclear weapons. It is about the testing of a specific weapon known as the cruise missile which is quite capable of carrying non-nuclear weapons as was demonstrated quite effectively during the gulf war, in particular the guidance system of that particular weapon. Therefore, I do not think it in any way affects our commitments of non-proliferation of

nuclear weaponry. I support the continued testing of the cruise missile and the guidance system thereof.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf):** Madam Speaker, I particularly appreciated the speech by the member for Athabasca. Several points he raised are also concerns of mine. I am all the more happy as the member for Mississauga West, who spoke before him, mentioned that she would rather see the world disarm than go on with the testing.

I would like to share a thought with the member for Athabasca and ask his comment on the matter. Let us compare the present situation to a car with a safety belt. I know I am a cautious driver but I know as well that other cars could skid and bang into mine. That is why, even though I am a careful driver, I buckle up and I am awfully happy to know that this device underwent the appropriate testing.

This is my question to the member for Athabasca: Would he agree that, in the present context, this testing is giving us a better guaranty of safety, even if we know that we will never live in a perfect world?

[*English*]

**Mr. Chatters:** Madam Speaker, I very much agree with the hon. member that in a perfect world there would be no need for armed forces and there would be no need for weaponry. Unfortunately, we are in a far from perfect world and as long as there are greedy people in this world with aspirations to conquer other countries and take over territories we will always need a means of defending ourselves. I support the testing on this basis.

(1800)

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River):** Madam Speaker, as this is my first speech in this House, I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the Speaker on his election and as well, to you, Madam Speaker, on your appointment.

I would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate all members who have just been elected to this 35th Parliament of Canada. It is a historic time for all of us and a new era. I am certainly looking forward to the opportunity to participate with some humility.

I certainly want to thank the constituents of the Peace River riding for their confidence in me and also my family who has given me a great deal of support in the two years it has taken to achieve the goal of becoming a member of Parliament. I would also like to thank a number of friends in the riding.

I would just like to relate the story of when I was home at Christmas. Somebody asked me how I was making out and I said I was starting to feel a little bit more comfortable in the House.

### *Government Orders*

However, they reminded me that I should not really get to feel too comfortable here. I think that is a good piece of advice.

I just want to tell the House a little bit about the Peace River riding. My colleague from Athabasca has told us about his riding. We share a boundary. Together we represent sort of the northern half of Alberta. It is an extremely big riding, one of the largest ridings in Canada. The border on the west is the British Columbia border and on the north the Northwest Territories.

Just a little bit of history about the Peace River riding: Some 200 years ago there were two warring Indian tribes. They had gathered on the banks of the Peace River, a river that was not named at that point, for peace negotiations and therefore the name came about as the Peace River.

It was an area that was a main artery to opening up western Canada. Alexander Mackenzie used that route to the Pacific Ocean in 1793, some 200 years ago.

The area in general was settled in the early 1900s by immigrants from Europe, the United States, as well as people from eastern Canada developing a new territory. They were looking for new opportunities.

**Mr. McGuire:** All maritimers out there.

**Mr. Penson:** Some from the Ottawa area I believe as well.

They were very innovative people. As a result of living in the northern climates they have had to be. Agriculture is probably the main industry, oil and gas is the second and forestry is very important to the riding as well.

The city of Grand Prairie is the biggest centre in the riding. It is a city of some 30,000 people.

The discussion today is very pertinent to my riding in that the cruise missile test does take place over a major corridor within the riding. Although, as somebody said earlier, the northern area is sparsely populated this is the most populated area along the cruise missile test route.

I also want to say that this area is very similar to the area that the Americans were looking at in their test. It has a similar climate to that of Russia, particularly Moscow. We are on the same latitude.

I just want to remind hon. members that I read the other day that Canada has the coldest capital of anywhere in the world so although I live in northern Alberta and we have a climate similar to Moscow that still makes it warmer than the climate here in Ottawa.

The terrain is very similar as well.

I would just like to say that the major debate over the cruise missile testing really took place 10 years ago. I really think to some degree this is a bit redundant today. The matter was raised and discussed to a great degree in 1983 before the testing took place and I do not think things have changed significantly since that time. As a matter of fact when the treaty was renewed in



*Government Orders*

February 1993 the debate should have taken place at that time if it were that important.

(1805)

I do not hear any complaints or any concerns from people in my riding. I just came through an election campaign where I campaigned extensively and this issue was not raised on one single occasion. I do not know anyone who is opposed to the testing. There was little support in the riding for the ban of testing in 1983 and I think there is even less now.

I do want to say that I welcome the review of defence policy that is coming up. We certainly encourage the government to do that, but we do have commitments that have to be met in the meantime. We have to honour those commitments. We signed a renewal in February and I believe we are bound by it.

We heard yesterday in the peacekeeping debate that there still are trouble spots in the world, trouble spots that could develop into something major. The former Yugoslavian republic was the area where World War I started and that is a trouble spot again. We know it has the potential for growing.

We know there is some potential for problems in Russia although we certainly hope that democracy has taken firm root there and is going to continue to develop. However I do believe we have to be prepared.

I wanted to say as well that we have relied heavily on our neighbours and friends to the south for help with our defences in the past. We need to continue to do that. We do have partners in NATO that we rely on. We are part of greater defence organizations and I believe we have to honour these commitments.

It is my view the people of the Peace River riding support cruise missile testing in our area and in Canada. It is part of our defence. It is a deterrent. We have seen that deterrent used in Iraq very effectively. The UN had a mandate to go in and Canada was part of that UN mandate in that situation. The cruise missile was a big part of that deterrent.

I support the continuation of the cruise missile testing in the riding. In my view that is backed up by the people in the Peace River riding as well.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse):** Madam Speaker, we have been dealing with the concept of sovereignty on the opposition side for some time now and obviously we are in a good position to place the debate in the context of protecting Canadian sovereignty. Our concept of sovereignty is not, however, fragile or timid, but open to the world. Our vision of sovereignty would allow us to get along with our neighbours and friends, and particularly in this instance, with the United States.

Because we have a great deal in common with the United States, Quebec sovereigntists can easily understand why the

Americans did what they did two centuries ago. We too will soon be taking similar action, that is clear. We also understand that the defence of a country cannot be confined to geopolitical boundaries that begin at a certain parallel. The issue here is the defence of a continent which we share with the United States of America and we will continue to defend it and be good friends with the U.S. when we achieve sovereignty.

This being said, I have a question for the hon. member for Peace River. I did not quite understand the thrust of his remarks in support of cruise missile testing. I got the impression that he was in favour of allowing testing to continue simply because we have already signed an agreement.

(1810)

Can the hon. member for Peace River tell me if he agrees with some of the substantive arguments put forward in support of continued testing or if he simply feels bound by the legal and technical aspects of the question and believes we must respect the existing agreement with the United States?

[*English*]

**Mr. Penson:** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. It is a good question. I want to leave with him the reassurance that I believe strongly in the reasons for the testing. It is part of a deterrent that we need to continue to develop in terms of our own sovereignty and of peacekeeping roles we as Canadians undertake throughout the world.

I also believe in it because we signed a commitment in good faith and I think we need to honour it. I very strongly want to say that I believe it is an important part of our defence. It is something that should be part of the overall review when defence is reviewed. I would make the case that I support it on the basis of a strong defence of Canada and a need for peacekeeping.

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport):** Madam Speaker, when this proposition surfaced for the first time in 1981 within the restrictions imposed by cabinet solidarity I opposed it tooth and nail. I still oppose it. I appreciate very much the opportunity the government is offering us to debate the matter on the floor of the House today.

The reason for opposing comes from two beliefs. One is that Canada is committed to arms control, to disarmament, and as a peace loving and peace promoting nation it should not lend its territory for the testing of weapons which could carry nuclear warheads and which could launch a disarming nuclear strike against another country.

We all know that Canada has a fine record in the world for opposing any form of nuclear warfare. We voluntarily refrained from using nuclear weapons. We eliminated from Canadian territory the stationing of nuclear weapons. Canada was among

the first nations to sign the non-proliferation treaty and the nuclear testing ban treaty.

Considering this record how can Canada lend itself to allowing the testing of a weapon which could be used to deliver nuclear warheads? In addition, now that the cold war is over the question must be asked who is the enemy, as I asked earlier the member for Beaver River. Why should such a weapon be used?

It is somehow ironic this debate should take place today when last night President Clinton said in his speech: "Russia's strategic nuclear missiles soon will no longer be pointed at the United States. Nor will we point ours at them". He went on to say: "Instead of building weapons in space Russian scientists will help us build the international space station". Mr. Clinton stressed last night that ultimately the best strategy to ensure security and to build a durable peace was to support the advance of democracy elsewhere.

(1815)

I submit that cruise missile testing is a relic of the past. It is a relic of the cold war. It is from the days when there were potential threats to security from nuclear weapons in other countries, when Canada's terrain was considered a facsimile of Soviet Union geography. However today the political situation has changed considerably as other speakers have said before me.

My second reason relates to security in the nineties. The concept of security must change from an exclusive stress on national security to a much greater stress on the concept of people security as was indicated in the 1993 UNDP report on human development.

I suggest the real threat to security comes from other quarters. It comes from unsustainable management of natural resources, fisheries, forestry, water shortages, desertification, climate change, ozone layer deterioration, decrease of arable land and reduction of forest covers.

It comes from population explosion in some parts of the world at the total rate of 92 million people per year, with resulting pressures on finite resources coupled with increased insecurity of food production. It comes from lack of support for international proposed legislation such as the Law of the Sea. It comes from megaprojects in parts of the world which are launched without proper environmental impact assessment. Last but not least, it comes from chronic poverty in Africa, Central America, South America and so on.

It seems that rather than spending time and resources on testing missiles in 1994 national governments should devote energies to the agenda of our times, namely how to apply our energies against hunger, ignorance and poverty on planet earth.

### *Government Orders*

Peace is not threatened by the lack of cruise missiles. Today global peace is threatened when governments pay attention to the wrong agenda, and this item today is part of that wrong agenda.

The agenda we should be paying attention to consists of how to achieve food security, how to achieve family planning in the developing world, how to achieve sustainable natural resources exploitation, how to achieve safe management of toxic waste, how to achieve the prevention of climate change and the concomitant consequences in many regions of the world, how to achieve the restoration of water quality, how to achieve the protection of biodiversity, and how to achieve the elimination of poverty in many nations of the world community and a better distribution of wealth. All these factors together could lead or contribute to global insecurity, to global instability, and possibly to conflict.

I repeat that global peace is not threatened by the lack of updated cruise missiles. That is not the issue. We must worry about the threats I mentioned a moment ago. In that report on human development of 1993 by the UNDP, you will find a quotation which I think is quite relevant to this overall discussion: "That preventive diplomacy is needed to defuse tensions around the globe before there are blow-ups".

(1820)

It means that instead of lending support to archaic solutions and outdated agendas, the developed industrial world should instead invest its time and energies in eradicating the causes of potential conflict.

Therefore, in conclusion, I urge the Government of Canada to deal with the potential threats to peace. They have nothing to do with military hardware, but everything to do with environmental damage and social economic disorders which stem from increasing poverty, increasing dislocation and which could lead increasingly to threats to global security.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat):** Madam Speaker, I commend the hon. member for the passion with which he spoke. He talked a lot about the environment and certainly his goals are admirable. I commend him for that.

I would like to touch on some of the points he made respecting the possibility of nuclear war. Who is the enemy? Why should we be testing a weapon that can carry a nuclear warhead? Is it not better to support the advance of democracy than it is to prepare for war? In many respects I believe the gentleman is right. Certainly liberal democracies do not fight wars against one another.

It is also a sad truth that many of the countries in the world are not liberal democracies. We still have many countries that are ruled by men who have no compunction about killing people and invading other countries.

*Government Orders*

In trying to answer some of those questions I think we have to test weapons that can carry nuclear warheads because we will also be, at some point in our future sad to say, faced with the possibility that we may have to intercept those types of weapons as they come into our air space. I think it is very important that we have defensive capabilities against those weapons.

I also point out that there are many places in the world, such as the former Soviet Union—the hon. member was talking about who is the enemy—and I think many places in the former Soviet Union, particularly now with the rise of Vladimir Zhirinovskiy in Russia, should all give one pause when we talk about how peaceful the world really is.

Having said all that, and considering there are many places in the world that are not likely to become liberal democracies any time soon, countries that have the capability to produce nuclear weapons and all kinds of other weapons, does the hon. member agree that we should be prepared to intercept those types of missiles that could come from some of those countries?

**Mr. Caccia:** Madam Speaker, I would be glad to answer the question by the member for Medicine Hat.

If the cruise missile were a weapon of interception, he would have a valid question. But the cruise missile is not a weapon of interception, it is a weapon of attack, it is a weapon to deliver, if necessary, warheads. Therefore his question is invalid because he is addressing the wrong weapon.

As to intercepting weapons which come into our Canadian space, we would have to use other weapons but certainly not a cruise missile because that is not the intent or the qualification of that weapon. It is used to attack and deliver nuclear warheads to certain specific targets in other countries.

(1825)

The member for Medicine Hat failed to demonstrate to us that this is the weapon he would rely on in order to intercept, but more importantly he failed to identify the enemy for us. He very vaguely mentioned that there could be an attack. I urge him to identify the enemy for us. I submit to him that collectively the enemy is us and our fear. It is time to stop talking like cold war cavemen and cavewomen because we are living in another decade.

The agenda has shifted very rapidly. It is no longer the agenda on how to prevent a strike or an attack that we should be concentrating our time and energy on. It is how to prevent the elements in the global community that have to do with, as I mentioned, poverty and environmental degradation, that have to be addressed and the energies of governments need to be focused on that agenda.

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me once again to rise in this Chamber and take part in the debate on the policy of government which has implications for our defence policy.

First, I would like to thank the Prime Minister and the leadership of the government for giving all members of this House the opportunity to express our views on this topic. Much has been said this afternoon about our defence policy. Some believe it might be redundant. Others say there should have been a policy set out which we could have debated.

I served some time in provincial legislatures and in this House and I believe this is what most members of the House with whom I have associated over the last number of years wanted to do. Today we are putting forward our views. We do not all agree. We all have different opinions. This is allowing us to state our opinions and hopefully to give the minister, the department and the government our ideas. It makes it easier for them to come forward with a policy which at that time will be debated. That is what we are doing here today.

We all appreciate this new and open policy toward the House of Commons, this great institution to which we have all been elected. All hon. members agree that the respect being shown to us by the government is certainly in contrast to what we have seen here over the last number of years.

The question which has been put before us is a complex one, a question which cannot be answered in the course of a one day debate, or even in a week long debate. It is a question that arouses all sorts of passions in all hon. members and indeed in the public at large.

The question has been asked today, why we would talk about this when we have signed the agreement with the United States? We have an agreement that has been talked about here by people who are much more eloquent than I. If for some reason we cancelled the agreement or we agreed to let it go ahead without debate such as this I am sure that all hon. members who have been in public life any amount of time would realize the uproar this would cause in the media and in the public at large.

I mentioned yesterday during the debate on peacekeeping that the time has come when we must assess the role of our armed forces both in Canada and abroad. We must provide them with the direction which is necessary in a troubled world. We must have a multi-level approach in our defence policy and we must always be sure that our defence policy is sufficiently adaptable to conform to a changing world.

(1830)

As I noted yesterday, the world has vastly changed from what it was five short years ago. When the Berlin wall came down and the communist regimes in eastern Europe fell there were those among us who proclaimed that peace was at hand and that total victory in the cold war belonged to us. Unfortunately not all of the world's problems have been solved these past five years.

*Government Orders*

World tensions which have come and gone in cycles seem again to be on the rise.

There are many places around the world today, as has been said, where military activity is going on. This has been mentioned many times today. Relations between some of the former republics of the Soviet Union are hostile to say the least. The situation in the Persian Gulf area is, as we all know, far from settled.

Several other trouble spots have appeared around the world causing all of us great concern. There is the new nationalism and old ethnic hatreds arising in many parts of the globe and who is to say in what place or by what spark a new and dangerous conflict may be touched off.

What I am saying is that the changes we approached with such optimism only five years ago have not automatically brought about a new world order, nor have they brought about a guarantee of peace in our time. We always hope that Canada will be at the forefront of seeking the diplomatic solutions to the world's problems, but we must, I fear, be prepared in case these solutions fail.

I do not envy the Minister of National Defence for the decisions which he will have to make in the coming year or two because the sad state of the Canadian economy and the huge deficit is going to cause problems with long-range planning and with maintaining the defence establishment which we have at the present time.

I know from his remarks over the past few days that the minister is struggling with the long-term defence policy and with the decision which he will have to make. That is why I urge on this matter that we take a long-term look at the question and not force precipitous action on the minister, action which may not be in the long-term interest of Canadians.

I spoke yesterday about the fact that the high point of Canadian prestige abroad came at the time of the Suez crisis in 1956. The high point of Canadian military power was at the end of World War II when this nation had mobilized and fought as a full participant in that conflict.

Since that time our military capacity has declined and we have come more and more to rely on the protection and the technology of others for our defence. We were from the beginning a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and a member of the North American Air Defence Command. However we have allowed ourselves to be more and more dependent upon others, particularly the United States, for the technology which we need for defence.

Looking back for instance at the cancellation of the Avro Arrow fighter plane in the late 1950s, we might be able to see a starting point toward our eventual military decline. Since that time our military technology has been tied more and more to

the United States and we have depended on them to provide us with the largest advances.

I do not intend to engage in a philosophical debate over whether or not we should be that dependent. What I am saying is that the practical realities of geography and economics dictate that our defence policy be tied closely to theirs. It is, in the words of a former Prime Minister, like sleeping with an elephant; you are very aware of every little move.

As we look over the deficit projections for the next year or two, it becomes rather obvious that we will be unable to start many new initiatives in the defence field ourselves. Therefore we will remain as long as we retain our present defence and diplomatic policies very closely tied to our American friends.

That brings me to the main point of this discussion: Should we or should we not allow the testing of cruise missiles over Canadian soil?

(1835)

What I attempted to do by way of my introductory remarks was to establish my position rather pragmatically. We should allow the tests to continue while the Minister of National Defence, this House and the relevant committees study our overall defence policy. It would be folly to cancel these tests now when we do not know where our long-term policy is going and we do not know where the political situation around the world is leading us.

After saying that, I hope hon. members do not take my remarks as those of a hawk, to use that old term. Rather I hope they see them as the legitimate concerns of someone who watches the world scene and our armed forces with a great deal of interest.

We need to develop a clear direction and a clear defence policy. For the moment I think it would be in the best interests of this nation if the agreement were allowed to continue until such time as our government has decided on our future defence policies.

As I stated yesterday the fundamental cornerstones of Canadian foreign policy have not changed substantially over the years. We are still committed to defence and collective security with our allies. We remain committed to arms control and disarmament and we are committed to peaceful resolution of disputes.

We must not therefore take any hasty action which would fundamentally alter our policies without that careful examination I noted earlier. I know other hon. members hold strong views in this matter and I look forward to hearing them along with all the others.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member is the first speaker today to look at the issue from an angle that is close to my heart.

*Government Orders*

[English]

The hon. member said we need a multilevel approach in our defence policy.

[Translation]

Which brings me to a concern I have that I would like the hon. member to address.

We know that these cruise missiles will be guided by a computerized system that will recognize terrain and shapes thanks to artificial intelligence technologies. This extremely sophisticated software is under research and development in the United States. The tests to be conducted over our territory will allow Americans to check the quality of their programs. In return, contracts will be awarded to suppliers of the U.S. armed forces.

Talking about a multi-level approach in our defence policy—I am coming to my question—I think we should focus not only on the military but also on the economic aspects of all this. Jobs are tied to these technologies. Will the Liberal government ensure that some of these jobs are created here in Quebec and in Canada?

[English]

**Mr. Proud:** I thank the hon. member for his comments and question and the point he has raised.

We talk about sharing our territory for testing. Two years ago Canada sent troops down to California to train for the Somalia peacekeeping mission. As the hon. member says, they have developed this sophisticated equipment and the money goes to the American contractors to build it.

In the new global community that has developed over the last decade I believe it would be possible for us to get involved in this or other types of operations to get Canadian companies some of the contracts to build the sophisticated high-tech instrumentations. That is where our future lies. We talked about this on another matter, an economic matter. Canada's economic future is in things like these high-tech, innovative telecommunication systems. Yes, I believe that Canada should have a part of that on a multilevel. Other countries are going to want it too. I believe it is as much ours as it is anybody else's.

(1840)

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his clear comments on this. It seems that many of the speakers tend to get confused on the issues or some of the rationale they are using.

The previous speaker whom we heard from that side of the House seemed to want to make this into a nuclear issue. I hasten to point out to the hon. member that we have many delivery systems in our own military capable of delivering nuclear weapons, if it was the choice to do so. It does not have to be just the cruise missile.

The cruise missile is not a nuclear weapon. It is simply a deliverance system. We saw it being used in the gulf war for conventional weapons in such a way as to be deadly accurate so that innocent people did not get injured.

Earlier we heard the hon. member for Mississauga West speak emotionally. I understand and I accept that she spoke from the heart and not necessarily to the facts of the matter.

What particularly interests me and is kind of curious is that yesterday we heard the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway speak with regard to the Bosnian issue where it was suggested that we should have air strikes in defence of our humanitarian aid in order to ensure that it gets through. Yet today the same member spoke against cruise missile testing and it is the very system that can make accurate delivery of the kind of strikes he was calling for.

I would like to thank the hon. member who just spoke for being clear and concise and for not trying to cloud the issue.

**Mr. Proud:** Madam Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke for his remarks. I believe, as I said earlier when I opened my remarks, that there are some very different opinions here. I have my opinions and am very pleased to be able to bring them forward.

The argument can be made that the cruise missile does or does not carry nuclear weapons. My point is that we have an agreement. We need our allies and we need to make exchanges with them. Until this House, this country and this government decide down the line how our defence policy is going to go forward, I do not think we need to get into any arguments with our neighbours.

[Translation]

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** Madam Speaker, allow me to join my colleagues in congratulating you on your new position and wishing you all the best. You can count on the co-operation of the entire Bloc Québécois.

Before getting to the core issue, I would like to say a few words about the relevance of this debate. I have been constantly surprised since the beginning. First surprise, the minister's speech. During the first five minutes, we were led to believe that he supported the tests and then, for the next five minutes, that he had doubts and later, that he did see the tests as useful after all. In the end, he said he would abide by the wishes of the House.

But behind all this wondering on the part of the minister, one could detect a desire to gain time. So I wonder.

(1845)

On one hand, I had only praise for the government yesterday with respect to yesterday's debate because of the need to re-evaluate our peace commitments by April. But in this case, it seems to me that we could have had a more global debate on our military role, our international commitments and especially our agreements with the U.S. I cannot help but wonder, because the government does not seem to have a definite policy in that

respect and it is gaining time by holding this debate to sound out the House. We have people asking us: "Where are those Liberals who, during the last campaign, were waving their little red book as if they were disciples of Mao and, whatever the question, invariably answered, and their leader was the first to it: It is in the red book. Check in the red book for economic matters. Check it for defence issues. It is all in there"? The red book contained all the answers.

Here we are now, and both the Reform Party and the Bloc Québécois start off by saying that we are open to a change in the member participation process, but let us not go overboard in the other direction and have day-long debates like yesterday and today. And there are three more planned for next week. Three months have gone by since the election, and the people are still waiting for the red book to be implemented. We have had a very vague, non-specific throne speech, yet the government has no bills to table.

It has become a joke among the jobless in my riding. The joke goes like this: What is the difference between a federal Liberal member and an unemployed Joe? The answer is: Unlike the Liberal member, the unemployed once had a job. Has it come to the point where our elected Liberal members do not put pressure on their government any more? Have they lost faith in their red book? What is happening? In the debate today, they are contradicting one another. Where are the big guns of the party? They are quiet. What is the use of debating? The opposition has a clear position. The Reform Party has a clear position and so does the NDP. Incidentally, I am surprised that they are not taking part in this debate. Perhaps are they going to later. I certainly hope so.

**Mr. Robinson:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I simply want to tell the hon. member that we have been trying to participate in this debate for three hours; consequently, it is not right to suggest that we do not want to participate. We are trying. We want to participate because we are the only ones who oppose the cruise missile tests, since the Bloc supports the government's position.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** In my opinion, it is not a point of order from the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Plamondon:** Madam Speaker, I can understand the hon. member's position since I had to go through this for three years. I sincerely hope that he will express his views because he represents a party which, over the past three years, has left its

### *Government Orders*

mark in the history of our country and, on occasion, of Quebec as well.

I want to conclude by discussing the relevancy of this debate, and especially the lack of a government position. When I refer to the government, I mean the ministers concerned. I am surprised that there is no information from the department of National Defence. We submitted requests to the public affairs service of that Department to obtain documents. The department was willing to provide us with all the required documents. Yet, because of government directives, we were not able to obtain those documents. I therefore ask the minister—I see one sitting over there—to convey this message to the Prime Minister's Office. If you decide again to hold such a debate, on this issue or any other one, I would hope that you will be more open-minded so that we can have access to all the necessary documents to have a real debate. We are not playing for time. We really want to express our views and we want the government to do the same. Both sides must give their opinion, but they must also have the opportunity to refer to all the documents which can influence our national defence policy.

(1850)

I will now get to the subject of this debate. I would like to recall the excellent comments made by the hon. member for Saint-Jean when he referred to the old line and the new line on letting the Americans do their tests. At the time, and in fact today, the NDP has not changed its position although the world situation has changed dramatically—there was still a nuclear threat, and allowing such tests was seen as encouraging arms proliferation. Today, we have to look at this from an entirely different angle. The global context has changed, as was said earlier by members for the Reform Party and our own leader. It has changed in that we no longer have two blocs confronting each other but the occasional isolated conflict.

As the hon. member for Saint-Jean said earlier, if we use these tests to enhance our security and concentrate more on ways to defend our democracy, we are less likely to put the lives of men, women and children and our armed personnel at risk.

Earlier today, the hon. member for Portneuf compared the tests and giving the Americans permission to proceed with the seat belt in a car. You may never have an accident, but it always better to put on your seat belt. We approve of the tests as a way to maximize the security of our territory and also on the basis of our military agreements with the Americans and important economic and security considerations.

*Government Orders*

I could also have quoted what was said by the hon. member for Champlain or the hon. member for Lotbinière, who told me last night that he was reading a very important paper on the subject, so we have the hon. member for Champlain and the hon. member for Berthier, who is also a member of our regional caucus, and we had time to outline a five-point agenda with which I will conclude my speech.

I would like to get back to what was said by the hon. member for Verchères, when he made a connection between Canada's sovereignty and permission for these tests. He said, and I quote: "And if I start my speech on cruise missile testing by emphasizing this concept of sovereignty so dear to my heart, it is simply because in certain spheres the testing issue is viewed as an attack on the sovereignty of Canada."

And he went on to say: There are people who claim that renewing the Canada-U.S.A. umbrella agreement and periodic authorization regarding cruise missile testing within Canadian territorial boundaries is akin to an unacceptable surrender to the imperatives of the foreign and defence policy of our neighbours to the south, an infringement upon the political sovereignty of Canada. But since any sovereign state must be able to protect its borders, we must recognize that Canada's political and territorial sovereignty depends to a large extent on its participation in the collective security system provided under NATO and NORAD. We must recognize that Canada does not have the resources required to defend its huge territory by itself."

That is what the hon. member for Verchères said in his speech earlier today, reflecting what was said by the leader of our party, who also referred to the connection between these tests and environmental issues.

(1855)

I quote: "What about environmental costs? Those costs are, for all intents and purposes, non-existent if one considers the very low frequency of the flights, merely a few over the course of one year, and over 3,000 kilometres of a nearly empty territory."

Referring to the political aspect of the decision, and I think that is very important, he went on to say:

But we must also take into consideration of the political side of the issue. Who is asking us to conduct these tests? We must not forget that the United States is Canada's best friend, its only neighbour, its safest ally, its major trading partner, and a great nation which speaks the same language as that of most Canadians.

Let us not forget that the United States is the pillar of NATO and NORAD, the two pacts which ensure our security. If there ever was a nuclear threat to Canada... but there is a risk, to whom would Canadians and Quebecers turn? I do not even have to give the answer, because that answer is so obvious. Should such a situation occur, we would be quite relieved to be able to rely on an ally equipped with cruise missiles which it would have developed at its own expense.

That is what our leader had to say this morning about the political aspect.

He also made a very interesting comment on the strategic aspect, which was well received by our caucus, when he said:

Canada's commitments to strategic deterrence are basically a part of co-operation between allies. Canada has no strategic weapons in its forces. However, in that its defence is based on the agreement among allies and it benefits from collective security, it must voluntarily co-operate in implementing this strategic deterrent force if required. This is an integral part of the national defence policy as found in the 1971 and 1987 white papers on defence and the 1992 defence policy statement.

These were some short and straightforward comments made by our leader and a number of new Bloc members, either in their 20-minute speeches or in pertinent questions to members upon conclusion of a speech.

Since I have five minutes left, I would also like to consider some statements made by other members. I am surprised they are not in the House. The statements were made when they were in the opposition, but it seems as soon as people sit on the other side, there is a kind of alchemy that takes place which turns red books into blue books.

It happened to the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who said: "End cruise missile testing now. There, I have said it." It is as though he regretted having said that, back in March 1987. Does he still feel the same way? If this debate is so important, why do these people who took a stand not rise in the House today to reiterate their commitment or explain their reasons for taking a new approach to these agreements?

There is also the hon. member for Saint-Maurice, the leader of the Liberal Party, who said: "Will the government confirm"—he was referring to the Conservative government then in power—"that Canadians are diametrically opposed to using Canadian territory for these dangerous tests?" Does he still feel the same way? If he does, that is the position the government will take. So why bother with a debate? Is it just window dressing?

I am surprised that the party's so-called big guns are not taking a position. However, I did see the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, who has always taken a stand, and I am glad to see he is about to do so again.

I am surprised that the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, who embodied Liberal party policy when he was in the opposition, is not taking a position today in what was announced as a crucial debate.

Madam Speaker, since I have three minutes left, I will wind up my speech with three main arguments in favour of cruise missile testing.

(1900)

First, Canada has always considered cruise missile tests as an opportunity to demonstrate our support for collective defence.

*Government Orders*

In the past, Canada authorized these tests because it felt that our security was inseparable from that of our allies within NATO.

Second, the agreement for weapons testing is an important element of our relations with the United States, which are close, complex and unequalled in scope. We are partners under the most important bilateral trade agreement in the world. We share a whole gamut of political, social and cultural values, and we are allies in the defence of North America and Europe.

Third, these tests bring financial benefits to Canada. The cruise missile tests are the *raison d'être* of the weapons testing agreement. The agreement now includes a clause on additional costs, whereby Canadian taxpayers could save thousands of dollars each year by reducing the costs of tests conducted by Canada in the United States.

In my opinion, those are three conclusive arguments which confirm that the position set forth by our leader in his speech this morning, which was again a remarkable speech and which my colleagues supported throughout the day, is a clear and logical position which is in the best interest of Quebec and Canada.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot):** Madam Speaker, I am very impressed with the speeches that have been given on this issue so far, both on the pro and the con. I want to thank the hon. member who has just finished speaking.

Some of the speeches tonight have been very vivid and to the point. I would like to address part of the speech given by the hon. member for Davenport when he asked a very important question. He referred to the threat to our security and he asked who is the enemy.

Who is and what is the threat to the security of the child who has been molested? What is the threat to the security of the women who has been raped or the senior citizen who has been murdered?

**Mr. Allmand:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With all respect to the hon. member, I think the rules provide that the 10-minute question and answer period is to comment on the previous speech or to ask questions of the member who has just spoken, not to comment on speeches that took place earlier in the day.

I respect the fact that the member is new member, but I think the purpose of the 10-minute question period is to deal with the speech that has just been given and not with an earlier speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce is quite right. Would the hon. member for Crowfoot care to continue discussions and comments on the prior speaker's remarks.

**Mr. Ramsay:** Madam Speaker, my understanding is that this debate or this discussion is open for all comments.

The real threat to our security that we must guard against lies in the unwillingness of the individual to respect the legal and human rights of others. As long as we have people like Saddam Hussein, Joseph Stalin and the other tinpot dictators we have seen through the annals of history, we will have to protect ourselves against their unwillingness to respect the rights of the human individual.

That begins right here in the House. I have watched the operation of this House on television for a number of years and I have watched it since I have been here.

(1905 )

When hon. members in this place do not have the tolerance to respect the rules of this House and then violate those rules, that in fact is the threat to the security of the individual. It is simply a degree. One magnifies that degree and it becomes the real threat to the security of individuals, communities and nations.

I would like to ask the hon. member who has just spoken this question. It is on a different issue. During the cold war we had the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. They controlled the majority of the nuclear weapons in the world. Since there has been the break up of the Soviet Union, I would like to ask the the hon. member if he feels that there is a greater threat of nuclear attack upon the nations of the world now or before?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Plamondon:** I first wish to thank my colleague for his comment and for his question.

I think that he has touched on a point that can divide people and bring some to ask themselves questions.

Are we still in a cold war and, if not, since the Russian empire has disintegrated, why should we allow these missiles? Some are asking themselves this very question. Others will wonder whether we should pursue a kind of technological race to make war when we should spend our money elsewhere. It is always a question of war versus peace. But, when the hon. member talks about the cold war, we must never forget that, instead of two blocs facing each other, there are now around the world several potential hot spots, often plagued by fanaticism.

I do not need to remind you of the Iraqi leader's behaviour during the gulf war or of certain statements made in Lebanon. Those countries, which happen to lie very close to each other, have nuclear weapons that can be launched instantly.

Is the threat immediate? I would say no, but this guarantee of security can only serve the interests of democracy in Canada, Quebec, the United States and the rest of the western world.

In that sense, the two opposing blocs have been replaced by several localized conflicts that are not controlled as strictly. Ten



*Government Orders*

years ago, each of the two blocs controlled half of the world, but today, in some places, there is no control from one bloc or the other.

That is why, as my colleague from Saint-Jean was saying about the old and the new way of thinking, we must look at these tests in the new global perspective. We must see this testing not as a yearly event that pushes us closer to a nuclear war but as a way to enhance security, since the missiles tested are not necessarily equipped with nuclear heads.

Also, civilian applications are eventually found for the sophisticated technologies often developed by the military. Will there be civilian applications in this case? We can hardly see any at the present time, but could the computerized systems, the maps charted and the aerial photos taken from satellites tracking these low-level missiles be used for other than military purposes?

(1910)

This does not represent, like it did in the past, a stepping up of the confrontation with the communist bloc. It is not as far reaching since, as a result of disarmament initiatives and various treaties signed recently, the number of missiles is limited to 460. This is a thousand less than previously. They will be replaced as they become obsolete, but the number will never exceed 460. In that sense, the tests are done more to refine the missiles, to make them more effective, better targeted, and therefore better able to spare human lives.

[English]

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Madam Speaker, I want to start by congratulating you and your colleagues on your appointments. I assure you you can count on my full co-operation at all times.

I also want to give credit to the government for arranging this debate today and the debate on peacekeeping yesterday. This is a welcome departure in involving the whole House in policymaking before a policy decision is made or before an agreement is terminated as I hope the case will be in this instance.

I especially welcome the opportunity to speak on the question of cruise missile testing. As hon. members might know I have opposed the testing of cruise missiles from the very beginning in 1983 and on all previous occasions when this matter was before the House I voted against the testing.

Since the cold war is now fortunately no longer with us I am even more opposed than I have been in the past. Why is this so important and why am I so opposed?

First of all the cruise missile is an extremely dangerous weapon. It is small. It is easily concealed. It is mobile. It is accurate. It is capable of avoiding radar detection because it

flies close to the ground under the general radar beams and pickup. It also can carry a nuclear or a conventional war head.

Since these missiles can escape detection by radar they can be used for a successful first strike and as a result totally knock out the opponent's weaponry.

I originally opposed cruise missiles because in my view they contributed in a very serious way to the arms race. They contributed to international instability and they were also, in my view, contrary to the principles of the non-proliferation treaty which was signed and heavily supported by Canada.

Canada originally agreed to test these weapons for the United States by an agreement concluded in February 1983. It was said at that time that the United States wanted to test these missiles in the northwest of Canada because the northwest of Canada had a terrain similar to that of the northern Soviet Union.

In February 1988 the testing agreement was automatically renewed for another five years and in 1993 it was continued by the former Conservative government for a new 10-year agreement. Since 1983 there have been 23 tests, about two or three per year, with the most recent test in March 1993.

I want to make clear however that this agreement between the United States and Canada is not part of our NATO obligations and was never part of the NATO agreement.

I said I was originally opposed to cruise missile tests and I am now more than ever opposed.

In the last Parliament on January 24, 1989, our Liberal Party took a position against further cruise testing. I quote the first paragraph of the document which was issued by our party on January 24, 1989: "The Liberal Party of Canada today called for the Conservative government to finally shake off its cold war mentality and cancel further cruise testing in Canada as a tangible and positive gesture to improving the climate of east-west relations and ongoing disarmament negotiations". This is under the sponsorship of the leader of the opposition at that time.

(1915)

This was a change of policy. Up until that time the Liberal Party had supported cruise missile testing. I had not personally supported it—I opposed it—but the party did support it. I felt I had some part in bringing about this change in party policy.

I also want to point out that our party at a major policy convention in 1986 passed two important resolutions. I will not read them because time is short but they are in our resolution book of 1986 opposing cruise missile testing.

The reasons for the change in our party policy given by our leader in 1989 were the following:

First, the cold war was over.

*Government Orders*

Second, as a result, the requirement for terrain similar to Russia was no longer necessary since Russia was no longer our enemy.

Third, continued testing could contribute to a renewed arms race, not necessarily with Russia or the Soviet Union, but in other parts of the world including China, North Korea and other countries.

I must point out that there are 15 nations on the threshold of developing nuclear weapons. Missiles are the principal delivery system for those weapons. Both are essential to a successful strike.

How can the United States and Canada, if they continue to test these weapons, say seriously to these 15 nations that they should not develop these nuclear weapons? By the way, they are urging the 15 countries to sign the non-proliferation treaty. How can they urge those countries to do that when they are continuing to test new weapon technology themselves that can deliver a nuclear weapon? They cannot do that very well.

Not only will the continuation of cruise missile tests give justification to other countries to develop new dangerous weapons, but once tested and developed, they will become potential products in the international arms trade.

After the Iraq war we discovered that 90 per cent of the weapons used by Iraq against our own troops were sold to Iraq by the five great powers: the Soviet Union; China; France; the United Kingdom and the United States.

It is well known that most of the weapons purchased by poor Third World countries are developed, tested and sold to them by richer First World countries. They do so because in developing those weapons, such as the cruise, they have to develop a surplus of them to make it economically feasible and then they sell them to other countries that might want to buy them.

The United States and NATO now have a considerable military edge over the former east bloc countries and other countries that are their potential enemies. We do not need any new, improved cruise missile to maintain that edge. It will only justify as I said the development and spread of these weapons to other countries.

Some people have argued in this debate that the cancellation of this agreement will offend the United States. President Clinton and the United States government acknowledge themselves that the cold war is over. They have worked with Ukraine and the Soviet Union to reduce the weapons in those countries. As a matter of fact they have just concluded an agreement whereby they will no longer point weapons at each other. They have closed bases in the United States. I have been in various cities in the United States where Mr. Clinton is closing bases and they talk about the peace dividend.

When we co-operate in the furtherance of the arms race, which is what testing of cruise missiles is, we put in jeopardy our Canadian role as an honest broker internationally. We put in jeopardy our credibility as a peaceful nation.

Yesterday we debated peacekeeping and Canada has a long and very enviable role in peacekeeping. We are considered one of the outstanding nations of the world with respect to peacekeeping. We also have an excellent reputation with respect to international development. When we proceed again with cruise missile testing, we put the credibility of those other very good qualities into jeopardy.

I have here the hon. member for Nunatsiak and I have spoken with the other hon. member from the Northwest Territories. It is over their territory that these missiles are tested. They are both very much opposed to these weapons.

(1920)

Let me say this in conclusion. The Prime Minister said he wanted a free debate. Without a doubt, he is getting it on this side of the House. However, I have not seen very much freedom from the Reform Party which has spoken about a free debate. They have all sang the same party line from beginning to end. As a matter of fact in all the votes in which they have participated so far they voted as a group on every occasion. Today they are all singing the same song. I have a bit of doubt about their sincerity concerning free votes and free expression.

I was very much dismayed by the statements made by some of my Liberal colleagues, particularly those who were here with me in the last Parliament and who approved of the policy we adopted in 1989 to oppose cruise missile testing. I could understand if they put forward new arguments that would allow them to bury the policy that they were in favour of last year. However, I heard no such new arguments.

The continued development and testing of cruise missiles in Canada are no longer necessary. It will contribute to a continuing arms race and to world instability.

I urge the government in assessing this debate not simply to count heads but to assess the arguments that are made by hon. members in this case.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Caron (Jonquière):** I want to thank the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce for his remarks. I congratulate him on standing by the position he has held since 1983. I was surprised, however, by some of his arguments and I will quickly explain why. But I do nevertheless have a question for him.

The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce began by listing the reasons why he is opposed to cruise missile testing. He described the cruise missile as a very dangerous, highly accurate weapon that is difficult to detect and that can carry nuclear warheads. I am somewhat surprised by this description because weapons are supposed to be dangerous. I do not think his is a strong argument because what makes a weapon effective is its

*Government Orders*

mobility, its ability to quickly reach its target, the enemy, its strike power and its invulnerability to enemy attacks. I fail to see how one can object to testing on the grounds that the weapon itself is dangerous. If the weapon were not dangerous, would anyone object to it?

Second, the hon. member claims that since the cold war is over, there is no further need to develop weapons. But the cold war ended four or five years ago. One could quibble about the dates. The thaw came fairly quickly and if we look at the international situation, it is quite possible that the freeze could be on again, as happens quickly in Ottawa, judging from what I have seen.

The hon. member argues that allowing cruise missile testing will restart the arms race. I think this is somewhat of an exaggeration because we are talking here about allowing something that has gone on for the past ten years. We are not talking about an escalation here, merely about allowing our American allies with whom we have an agreement to conduct a certain number of tests each year. Our duly elected government renewed this agreement last year for a period of ten years. I do not see this as any kind of escalation in the arms race.

Lastly, in referring to statements made recently by U.S. President Clinton, the hon. member argues that the Americans will not be upset if we refuse to allow the testing to proceed.

I find these arguments somewhat debatable. Given the fact that these tests are restricted, that we are not dealing here with a new weapon that has suddenly been added to the world arsenal, does the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce not think that he is being a little alarmist in raising all of these arguments when similar tests have in fact been conducted in recent years?

(1925)

[*English*]

**Mr. Allmand:** Madam Speaker, while the cold war is over with the Soviet Union, as I pointed out there are 15 nations called threshold nations and North Korea is one of them. They are on the verge of developing nuclear weapons.

None of these 15 nations are signatories to the non-proliferation treaty. The United States for many years has been trying to encourage China, North Korea and other countries to sign the non-proliferation treaty.

My argument is this: How can we ask these countries to renounce nuclear weapons, renounce the development of new technology with respect to the delivery of nuclear weapons when we continue to fine-tune cruise missiles? By the way the cruise missile they are testing now or have tested in recent years

are not the same as the ones they tested years ago. They continually improve on this cruise missile.

I am saying that while the cold war is over with the Soviet Union, there are still countries that want to develop nuclear weapons and the means to deliver those nuclear weapons. We do not help the situation by saying on the one hand "don't you do it" but by God we are going to do it ourselves. That does not help. It only contributes to the arms race.

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton):** Madam Speaker, at the outset I believe we should acknowledge that this is a debate that has no right or wrong side or answer. Whether this government endorses or refuses to endorse the acceptance of cruise testing over Canadian territory is, whatever the outcome, neither right nor wrong.

We are discussing today on one level our national role in contributing to the aggregate military technological base of our American neighbours. These tests are part of their military research and development. On another level it affords Canada the opportunity to define these tests, having regard to our national values.

With the end of the cold war arguments either for or against cruise missile testing have quite simply lost much force. Hon. members here will recall the history of the modern day cruise, that it evolved from the buzzbombs of second world war Germany and that the Americans and Soviets engaged in a protracted period of technological one-up-manship which resulted in this low level flying missile.

From the development of the cruise has evolved a technology which has military and technological applications which are quite simply American based. To allow this testing to proceed will without doubt and I say this without putting forward a positive or a negative opinion, ensures that the United States continues in its position of pre-eminence in terms of being the number one military power.

From a perspective of fortress North America it could be suggested that the agreement with the United States in 1983 to allow cruise testing was correct. That agreement was renegotiated, as we heard, in 1993 for another 10-year period, putting us through to the year 2003.

The reason for choosing this Canadian corridor as a test site was quite simple. The terrain and weather conditions in the 2,200 kilometre long corridor is similar to that of the Soviet Union, as the speaker before me noted.

In 1983 NORAD was vitally concerned about the security of North American having regard to the then perceived Soviet arsenal. I would like to pose this open-ended question to members present here today: Are we as North Americans threatened by the former Soviet military?

*Government Orders*

To allow this test to proceed in my opinion is simply to confirm the political reality which existed in 1983 but has vanished in the intervening years.

From a military perspective what can be the logical explanation for this testing? There is the argument that other countries can and are developing cruise capability which then, by implication, requires the United States to continue to be technically superior. If we, and I say this as a Canadian and as a member of this House, want to allow this testing to proceed then I suggest we should also ask what is the perceived or real benefit to Canada. Is it to counter the former Soviet Union and maintain the security of North America? Alternatively, is it to facilitate the very specialized American-based industries which are dependent upon military programs for their very existence?

(1930)

The global political reality of 1983 has substantially changed. Canadians must therefore acknowledge this in determining whether these tests should proceed.

These musings of mine reflect the politics of another era, a time when there was an arms race, a time when there was a perceived threat to our national security and a time when NORAD had some continental importance. These factors today have simply either vanished or diminished to the point where they are meaningless.

The other factor I would suggest requires consideration is quite simply this: As Canadians, is it beneficial in any way from a security or economic perspective to allow these tests? This is not a matter of abrogating a bilateral agreement, as has been suggested here today. The agreement dictates the technical and financial terms but states specifically that each test must be approved by the Government of Canada. I ask: "What is the perceived benefit to Canadians?" or more directly and simply, "What is in it for us?"

Yesterday in the House several speakers discussed the humanitarian aspect of peacekeeping, that is in certain circumstances Canadian military peacekeeping represents a positive influence in areas of the world. Many of the opinions put forward yesterday reflected a desire to improve the plight of many people in countries undergoing conflict. Those are very laudable and humanitarian objectives which we, as members of the United Nations, have collectively stated in a global perspective are in the best interests of all nations.

These peacekeeping roles mesh or coincide with the common values shared with other member states of that body. Yet as a Canadian I ask: Where does the testing of a cruise missile fit into the objectives of the Canadian government? Is there a national interest which is being served if these tests proceed?

American governments over a period of several administrations have quite overtly inserted a quid pro quo into their

relationships with other national governments. Foreign aid, whether it be monetary or technical, is often tied to events occurring in the other state. For example, the extension of American aid to China was jeopardized by China after the Tiananmen Square incident. The interventions by American forces in Grenada and Panama in the late eighties are also examples of a more direct nature. These actions were simply as a result, in my opinion, of serving the national objectives of the United States.

I therefore ask members present today to reflect on the broader issue of our relationship with the United States and with the Americans. I have heard from many of my constituents on this issue and though I cannot say that I am a member of the third party, I can quite safely say that my opinion is here reflecting the greater consensus that I am hearing in my constituency that in our dealings with our American neighbours in the broadest and most general sense of the word and of the idea, that we must become more self-centred, even more specifically that we must ask "Is it in the Canadian interests?"; in the most basic sense "What's in it for us?"

My riding is a narrow wedge of real estate on the Ontario-Michigan border. I would venture to say that 75 per cent of the people in my riding live about a three-minute car ride from the United States. I would also point out that in my riding anyone can purchase a *Detroit News*, a *Detroit Free Press* at any corner variety store just as easily as I could buy the *Globe and Mail*. My riding is the third busiest crossing along the Canada-U.S. border, in fact 15 per cent of all trade between Canada and the United States crosses the border in Sarnia or Point Edward in my riding. Yet despite this overwhelming presence, which we call the American influence, it is abundantly clear to me that we are not Americans. My constituents tell me that. We are not anti-American, we are simply not Americans.

Through a process of national evolution we have stated that our priorities are not always identical to their priorities. We have stated that our national values are not the same as their national values.

As a result, I am aware of Americans attempting to enter some of the health clinics offered by the local health unit in my riding in an attempt to take advantage of the health services and treatment programs offered anonymously to walk-in clients.

Obviously our priorities are not their priorities. I am aware of the significant collection of hand weapons seized daily by our customs officials from American vehicles entering Canada in my riding. Obviously our values are not their values. As a result I must ask once again: Where does the allowance of cruise missile testing over Canadian territory as an objective of American military policy coincide with Canadian priorities and values?

*Government Orders*

(1935)

It has been stated that the role of the Canadian military—and I stress Canadian—must and will be reviewed during the course of this Parliament.

As an extension of this objective, I would state that the Canadian government must also examine our national objectives under the 1993 bilateral agreement with the United States relative to cruise testing. Notwithstanding that agreement, as stated previously, we reserve the right to say no.

In the 1992–93 fiscal year the Department of National Defence spent some \$148 million in modernizing our air defence systems as well as an additional \$175 million for low level air defence systems.

It is possible to conclude that by allowing these tests to proceed we will constantly find ourselves in need of more sophisticated air defence systems as a result of the technologies we are allowing to be tested by the Americans over Canadian territory.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Prime Minister for affording the members of this House the opportunity to speak on this important national issue, knowing that when a decision is made he will have heard a broad cross-section of views from all of Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue):** Madam Speaker, since the early afternoon, I have been listening carefully to all the speeches on the need for these tests to be conducted within the Canadian territorial boundaries. Before putting a question to the hon. member, I would like to say a few words about the debate.

I think this piecemeal approach to Canada's national defence that we have had since yesterday could be dangerous. We should have a much broader outlook. It is always better to set a problem in a global context than to narrow our focus too much. This prompts me to say that I hope that eventually the Minister of National Defence will undertake a comprehensive defence review.

We are presently dealing with a more specific case. Earlier, the hon. member for Portneuf clearly described in his speech the technical aspects of the testing to be conducted over Canadian territory. It is aimed mainly at developing a technology that does not increase the power derived from nuclear energy. It is a guidance system that could have applications in other areas.

I think we must be careful not to get side-tracked on the issue of proliferation of nuclear weapons. That is not the point. Of course, missiles can have a nuclear capability. That is true, but from the point of view of wanting to achieve disarmament someday—and no one can have anything against being virtuous—we should not ignore the power of our American allies in most of the military operations we take part in. We must also

work extremely closely with them. Co-operation could take such a form. Their power of deterrence has been tremendous.

This leads me to my question: Would we not be sending out a dangerous signal to the whole world if we were to object to and oppose these tests, perhaps weakening our alliance with our American friends? I am neither pro nor anti-American. I am just pro-peace and realistic. Would we not be sending out a dangerous signal if we were to say that we do not want this kind of testing to be conducted over our territory because we are for the peaceful resolution of conflicts? Has the U.S. policy not succeeded to some degree in recent years in advancing the cause of disarmament?

[*English*]

**Mr. Gallaway:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member raises an interesting point and makes an interesting quotation, that is that with respect to the Americans we must co-operate with them.

I do not know in terms of Canadian objectives that we must in all cases co-operate with the Americans. Certainly recent history has indicated to us that the Americans do not reciprocate with Canada. I can think of many examples the hon. member may not be aware of.

(1940)

For example, about a year and a half ago the American border patrol at all crossing points decided that it would take direct action against Canadian trucking firms. The method of doing that was simply to check the record of every driver crossing the border. It happens that a number of Canadian truck drivers have rather insignificant criminal matters in their past, such as the smoking of cannabis, impaired driving, or minor theft and assault charges. In any event, under American law the American border patrol can prevent them from entering the United States. That is one very trite example of the Americans not co-operating with us.

We heard about numerous trade matters during the election, including the seven appeals regarding pork bellies made by the United States. There are many times when we do not agree with the Americans.

The suggestion that we must co-operate with the Americans on military matters is not necessarily correct. I also believe that recent history, recent in terms of world history, specifically World War II, would indicate that the Americans did not co-operate with us in the sense that they did not enter into the battle until well after Canada did. So I do not think we must follow blindly.

I suggest to the hon. member opposite that he should consider that there are times when we can and we ought to say no to the Americans and this is probably a time when it should be a very definite no.

**Mr. Allmand:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order. In listening to this debate today I am becoming increasingly

*Government Orders*

alarmed with the use of the 10-minute period following the 20-minute speech. I refer to Standing Order 43 which says:

Following each 20-minute speech, a period not exceeding 10 minutes shall be made available, if required, to allow members to ask questions and comment briefly on matters relevant to the speech and to allow responses thereto.

On several occasions this afternoon I note that members are using the 10-minute period to make a new speech and to make comments which are not relevant to the speech that just came before them.

Many hon. members have talked about setting a new tone in this Parliament and respecting the rules of the House. I hope in future that the comments and questions as the standing order says will be brief and relevant to the speech that has just been made. It is not an occasion to make a new speech. It is supposed to be brief comments or questions relevant to the speech that has just been made.

I hope that the Chair will enforce that rule.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I thank the hon. member for his intervention. I trust that other members in this place will adhere to the standing order.

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Madam Speaker, I will be sharing the 20-minute time at my disposal with the hon. member for Saint John.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate. I congratulate the members who have spoken immediately preceding me, the member for Sarnia—Lambton and the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, on the courageous position they have taken.

[*Translation*]

I believe that it was the leader of the Bloc Québécois who suggested that this debate today was in a sense a charade, that the government's real purpose was not to let the United States test cruise missiles and that this debate would give the government an opportunity to say "no".

[*English*]

I think the agenda is precisely the opposite. I think the leader of the Bloc Québécois is profoundly mistaken. The agenda here today is in fact that the government is prepared to say yes to cruise missile testing and is laying the groundwork for that by betraying in a very profound way the promises that were made in opposition by the Liberal Party of Canada and by leading members of that party to say no to cruise missile testing for the reasons so eloquently set out by the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

(1945)

I want to take exception not only to the process here because I think the fix is in. I think in fact that the decision which has been made and communicated to the United States government is that

yes it can go ahead but there is this little nuisance that came up last week when one of the members from the opposition stood up and reminded the government of the commitment that it made while in opposition.

What was that statement that was made by the member for Winnipeg South Centre? It was this. He suggested in a question to this House on February 15 that:

Given that many Canadians, particularly citizens of the north as represented by the Northwest Territories government, the Dene Nation and the circumpolar council, have strongly opposed any continuation of these tests, why has the minister wilfully proceeded with this agreement contrary to the wishes of these Canadians without any form of public consultation or public parliamentary hearings?

Public parliamentary hearings. This parliamentary debate is not public parliamentary hearings. The voices of northerners, the voices of aboriginal peoples, the voices of peace groups who want to be heard on this issue are not being heard in public hearings.

I note that the representatives from the Northwest Territories, the member for Nunatsiak and the member for Western Arctic, are both strongly opposed to the testing of cruise missiles. Yet their constituents are denied an opportunity to be heard in public hearings.

I might ask parenthetically where is the voice of that eloquent defender of progressive thought in the Liberal caucus, that ardent advocate of an end to cruise missile testing, the member for Winnipeg South Centre? I am waiting to hear his contribution to this debate.

This debate is not just about the testing of the cruise missile. I might say that the position we have taken as New Democrats on this has been to oppose the testing of the cruise from the time it was first started in 1983. It is also fundamentally a debate about political integrity, about honesty and about the credibility of the governing parties.

I say that because I think we have to look at the record. Yes, in 1983 it was the Liberal government that approved the first 10-year agreement to allow for cruise missile testing over Canadian soil. But in 1984 the Liberals went into opposition. Of course Liberals in opposition tend to be a little more progressive than when they are in government. What did they say in opposition? Well the Liberal Party of Canada in a convention in November 1986 said that it would ban cruise missile testing.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Papineau, who was then external affairs critic, suggested that cruise missiles would be destabilizing and that cruise missile technology would have a disastrous effect. I quote the Minister of Foreign Affairs: "The government persists in playing hide and seek on the policy it will adopt with respect to testing of the new cruise missile, this dangerous cousin of the present missile that is faster and better able to escape detection.

*Government Orders*

Letting such a weapon in Northern Canada would raise the stakes even more.”

He was right in 1988; he is right today. It is really sad that the member for Papineau was more progressive than the members of the Bloc Québécois are today on this issue. It is really sad that the very strong and powerful voices of the peace movement in Quebec are not represented here in the House by the Bloc members, who talk about the importance of supporting our great American allies. It is really sad.

[English]

We have heard the glowing statements of the minister of the members in opposition. We have read in the fabled red book that Liberals believe Canadians want their national government to play a more active independent internationalist role in this world of change.

What did the Liberal Party of Canada promise to the people of Canada in writing in September 1993? It said this in response to a questionnaire from *End the Arms Race*: “Liberals have opposed further testing of the cruise missile since 1987. We will bring this testing program to an end”. That was the promise of the Liberals in September 1993. They did not say they would bring it to an end if George Bush was re-elected. There were no parentheses. There were no asterisks. They said they would bring it to an end.

(1950)

What has happened? A month later they gave approval in principle for the cruise missile testing to continue.

Let us be clear about what the issue is here. The issue is not a question of breaking a contract solemnly entered into. I was astonished to hear the very distinguished member for Vancouver Quadra suggesting we would be in breach of our solemn undertakings if we did not allow cruise missile testing to proceed. I would have hoped that member would have read the agreement, because of course the agreement itself makes it very clear.

I quote from the agreement: “Either the Department of National Defence or the Department of Defense in the United States may refuse any testing project proposed under this agreement”.

It is utter nonsense to suggest, as the member for Vancouver Quadra has done, that in some way we would be in breach of our commitments under this agreement. The agreement provides for consent and it provides for withholding that consent.

The issue is about the testing of a dangerous new missile, a destabilizing new missile, the stealth missile, which has first-strike capability. It is nuclear equipped. The reason the Ameri-

cans want to test it over our soil is that our terrain is similar to that of Russia.

I have the original background document from the first agreement in 1983. In response to the question why test in Canada it said that it was suitable for operational testing of air launched cruise missiles over representative terrain and realistic route lengths. Representative terrain. Representative of what? Representative of Russia. Realistic route lengths. What are they? Some 2,200 kilometres, about the time and about the distance it would take to fire those cruise missiles into the heart of Russia.

We have heard it suggested that because Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, a very dangerous man, is now in a position of some influence in Russia we should be testing this nuclear weapon. I say that is another reason for us to say no to the testing of the cruise missile.

In 1992 Boris Yeltsin said they would stop testing the cruise missile. He has appealed to the nations of the world to join in that. If Zhirinovskiy is able to use the argument that we are testing the missile and it is aimed fundamentally at them, how on earth does that help in the pursuit of peace?

It is time we recognized the real enemy. The real enemy is surely poverty. The fact is that 40,000 children die every day on this planet. The real enemy is the crushing debt burden and the increasing gap in wealth and power between north and south. The real enemy is environmental degradation.

I would have hoped the Liberals would have shown leadership on those issues. But, no, they are prepared to say yes to the old ways of doing things. Why not allow the defence and foreign policy reviews to take place before we agree to go ahead?

By saying no we will be sending a powerful signal, not only to the people of Canada, not only to the Pentagon, but to the world, to the community of nations, that we are prepared to take a lead in the pursuit of peace.

It was the member for Winnipeg South Centre who asked this question in February 1993: “Whatever happened to the fresh new thinking about defence matters since the cold war?” Indeed, whatever happened to that fresh new thinking? Let us hope that voice and that view will prevail; that we will take bold new steps to create a nuclear weapons-free zone in Canada; that we will say no to low level testing over Innu lands in Labrador; that we will create a common Arctic security zone, as the member for Yukon has suggested; and that we will respect the wishes of aboriginal people such as the Canoe Lake people as suggested by the member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake.

(1955)

The time has come for new thinking. The time has come to say no to the testing of the cruise missile in Canada.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your appointment.

I would like to thank the hon. member for his eloquent speech. When he was reading from the agreement about representative terrain I was wondering whether we might take a look at what representative terrain means. I have a feeling that the threat today is not so much from Russia or the Soviet Union but from other countries that will have some types of nuclear capability.

I was wondering whether the terrain of those countries might be more like the terrain between Montreal and Ottawa or Toronto. We know the threat is not from the Soviet Union now but more from other countries. I wondered if he would comment on that.

**Mr. Robinson:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Nunatsiak makes an excellent point and it is a point that was made earlier. Some members have made reference to the tragic war in the gulf that was going to dislodge Saddam Hussein and install democracy in Kuwait.

Surely if that is the argument we should not be testing over northern territory. Perhaps we should be testing the cruise missile over the deserts of Nevada. If the threat as suggested is coming from the more urban areas, the member for Nunatsiak is probably asking what about testing over Calgary Southwest. What about testing over Lac-Saint-Jean? What about testing over other areas that are slightly more populated.

It is an entirely legitimate question. I welcome the hon. member's intervention.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat):** Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Zhirinovsky has already threatened the west with nuclear annihilation if we try to interfere with his attempt to re-establish the Russian empire.

Does the member really think he would not follow through with plans to re-arm the former Soviet Union should we quit testing the cruise missile in northern Alberta and northern Canada?

**Mr. Robinson:** Mr. Speaker, it is madness to suggest that we respond to Vladimir Zhirinovsky at this point by testing the advanced cruise missile, the stealth missile, which would allow us to respond with a nuclear attack on Russia.

Surely the most effective way to respond to the Zhirinovskys of this world is to do whatever we can to isolate them. We should make it clear that the community of nations has put behind it the days when we responded to aggression with aggression, when we responded to the very dangerous and destructive threats of Zhirinovsky by simply spending more money on developing nuclear weapons that will respond to him.

We have an excellent opportunity to bolster the forces of democracy in the former Soviet Union or Russia by entering into a common security arrangement with them that would entirely

demilitarize the Arctic and restore health to a very fragile Arctic environment.

That would be the most effective way of responding to Zhirinovsky and to isolating Zhirinovsky along with the other Zhirinovskys of the world.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John):** I would like to thank my colleague from Burnaby—Kingsway for sharing his time with me. This is supposed to be my maiden speech and I am certainly pleased, Mr. Speaker, that you have recognized Wayne's World over here in the corner.

Given the military history of my riding of Saint John, New Brunswick, and our long association with the sea and with shipbuilding, we may have a somewhat different perspective on military matters than many central Canadians. I say that because we are building the frigates for Canadians right in my shipyard. The shipyard in Lévis, Quebec, to which one of my colleagues in the Bloc referred today, is winding down his program. My shipyard is winding down our program. I will have 3,500 people out of work, probably by the end of this year or by May 1995. I hope the Department of Transport and the Department of National Defence will be taking a look at the most modern shipyard we have in Canada when they are giving out the next contracts.

(2000)

The Liberal government and the minister of the day, the hon. Roméo LeBlanc who is a senator today, gave us our first set of frigates and the next government continued on. We do have what is considered to be the most modern shipyard in Canada sitting in Saint John, New Brunswick. We should continue to build on that. I say to my friends across the way in the Liberal government that they should take advantage of what they have done in the past by putting that shipyard in place.

Certainly we in Saint John have never become caught up in the fuss regarding this cruise missile business as others have done. I smile to myself as I listen to everyone talking about nuclear missiles and nuclear power because we have the most efficient nuclear power plant in the world. I just came back from Romania. The government sent me during this past year. We are building nuclear units in Cernavoda, Romania, because we have the most efficient nuclear power plant in the world in Saint John.

I have interest groups that pop up and think we are building nuclear weapons because of our nuclear power plant. Every time we use the word nuclear everyone becomes frightened. Sometimes it seems to me that Canadians do not really know how lucky we are in many areas, to be sure, but certainly in the area of defence policy.

I hope that the government goes ahead with its planned review of defence policy and that the review will both collect the opinions of Canadians and act as an opportunity to inform Canadians in this area. Few of us of today's generation have ever had to go to war or have even been within the range of one. That is a blessing, but sometimes one wonders if that inexperience



*Government Orders*

has given some of our fellow Canadians a rosy view of what it takes to make and preserve peace.

I do not know if I subscribe to the view that the best defence is a good offence, but I subscribe to the view that the best defence is important if war is to be deterred. It is in that context that I put the testing of the cruise missile delivery system. It is reasonable to be prudent until one can be certain that all risks have disappeared.

There are those who believe that the best path to disarmament is for everyone to lay down their arms, or at least stop developing weapons technology, and that one way for that to happen is for Canada and her defence partners in NATO and NORAD to set an example.

I respect them for the sincerity of their belief but I do not share it. I am from the school that believes disarmament in which one can have real confidence requires binding treaties between all countries, a reliable and open verification system, and some collective method for dealing with violations of agreements.

Let us not kid ourselves. Would Canada be at any real risk if we had no army, no navy, no air force? The truth is that we are not far from being at that point right now. Or, even if we opted out of NATO or NORAD, would Canada be at risk? Almost certainly not. That may be God's greatest gift to Canada.

We are members of mutual defence agreements like NATO and NORAD for other reasons than our own defence. There are historical connections, commercial markets, countries where many of us came from, and even the knowledge that doing defence collectively is not only cheaper but to get everyone inside the agreements is best way to forestall war completely.

(2005)

The world has made great progress towards disarmament in the last 10 years aided immeasurably by the changes that have happened in Europe, particularly the former U.S.S.R. But as long as there are armies and weapons, maintaining the peace will require the capacity to defend oneself and one's partners if necessary and that means keeping up with technological developments.

I make no pretence to be an expert on weapons systems or on the cruise, but even a little reading shows very quickly that a great deal of misinformation has been put about regarding these tests over the years.

For example, many of the opponents have argued that the cruise is only designed for the delivery of nuclear bombs—I heard that here all this afternoon and again this evening—and

that to agree to test it is to be in favour of expanding nuclear weapons.

It turns out that the missiles used against Hussein in the gulf war were cruise missiles delivering regular bombs with amazing accuracy as I remember.

I noticed that one member of this House has gone so far as to say that these tests should not be allowed because they would contribute to instability in Russia; that the conservatives there would claim the tests prove the west intends to threaten Russia.

That seems just a little far-fetched to me. In fact, it may be that I should be a little bit worried about why someone would want to make that statement and that case. I completely agree that a democratic Russia peacefully integrated into Europe is in all our interests but it is hard to imagine that testing unarmed cruise missiles could have any impact on what is admittedly far from a stable situation in Russia.

In fact, I cannot find much evidence that supports the notion that the issue is a nuclear one any longer. The real issue as far as I can tell is that the technology may be too simple and therefore readily developable for conventional use.

The excellent reports prepared by the Library of Parliament say this, for example:

As the understandable pre-occupation with Superpower nuclear cruise missiles has diminished over the past several years, more attention has been paid to shorter-range and much simpler cruise weapons. While not comparable to the long-range systems of the United States and Russia, shorter-range (mainly anti-ship) systems are currently in service in a number of countries and even more countries have programs for which cruise missiles could be developed. According to reports, some U.S. officials feel cruise missiles will become an important proliferation threat in the future, and research continues to improve the capability to track them. In April 1992, MIT physicist Kosta Tsipis argued in *The New York Times* that while tremendous attention has been paid to the proliferation of ballistic missile technology, accurate cruise missiles could pose a much greater threat in the future. According to Tsipis, basic technology in the form of commercial jet engines, gyroscopes and autopilots is now widely available to anyone who wants it. In his words, "Any country that can manufacture simple aircraft can construct a cruise missile that can carry a ton of cargo at least 300 miles and land no more than 30 feet from its target."

One of the reasons for continued testing is the tests include testing anti-cruise systems; the capacity of radar and planes to find, follow and intercept missiles once launched. Given Professor Tsipis' arguments, that information alone may be the best reason for carrying on the tests.

I suppose it is imaginable that the full scale review of defence policy that the government has said is coming could conclude that we should take back our defence exclusively to ourselves, that we should leave NATO and/or NORAD, but I doubt it very much.

In any event, it does seem to me and to my party, which may only be two, that one would announce a policy review and then make changes in the implementation of existing policy prior to actually conducting that review. Is that not the whole point of

*Government Orders*

reviewing policy, too find out what both experts and ordinary Canadians think should be done before making any changes?

(2010)

In fact, that is what the then Liberal critic for external affairs, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, said the government should have done before renewing the agreement on testing in February of this year. He did not say the government should hold a one-day debate in the House. He said that if his government was elected it would hold full hearings across the country. That is presumably what the defence committee is going to do, or I trust that is what they are going to do. The Liberal's red book made a big issue out of their commitment to "the democratization of foreign policy".

We take the government at its word on this question, that this debate will be part of the broad, sincere dialogue with Canadians that they were promised during the election. Surely the Liberal government should honour their entire commitment and not make substantive changes in defence policy before those hearings have been held. That, in addition to the wisdom of being prepared for the worst while negotiating for better, suggests to us that these tests should not now be stopped.

In that regard, I note that the *Ottawa Citizen* reported on Saturday, January 22 that the cabinet has already made the decision to allow the tests despite its objection to the test when it was in opposition. For that I am pleased, but while we would agree with the decision, if the report is true it does not bode well for the government's stated commitment to the democratization of the process.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Saint John touched on two aspects that are of particular interest to me. She talked about potential job losses in her shipyard. She also talked about using cruise missiles with more accurate guidance systems. I will address this second point before going back to the first one and asking the hon. member for Saint John for her comments.

The need to make the cruise missile guidance systems more accurate is a very subtle indication that these missiles will not be used to transport nuclear heads. Missiles carrying nuclear heads do not have to be very accurate as any hit within a kilometre of the target is considered a bull's eye, but great accuracy is required to deliver a conventional head for a "surgical" operation. Therefore, the tests requested by the Americans promote the denuclearization of conflicts. That is how I see it and I would ask the hon. member to respond and let me know her views on this issue.

Let us now talk about jobs. We have been talking about war and peace for several hours but, in my opinion, the real issues are jobs and technology. There will be no war in the near future thanks to the diplomatic efforts being made on several fronts to

resolve certain conflicts. In the meantime, however, the huge military-industrial complex needs contracts and the Americans are very good at feeding that beast. As a Liberal member was saying this afternoon, it would be interesting to implement the conversion of the defence industry to civilian uses. The technologies we are talking about, namely the recognition of patterns through computerized programs, could easily be used for computer-assisted work in our plants. There are jobs in all this, as the Americans have been quick to realize while we are talking about war and peace. What does the hon. member for Saint John think of all this?

[English]

**Mrs. Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, I trust that we are not talking about war but that we are talking about peace.

(2015)

I believe Canada needs to stay on top of all high technology. It needs to work with its partners across the border to make sure that peace remains.

As I stated in my comments, we need to enter into agreements and treaties in order to ensure there are no more wars. I believe the free trade agreement entered into by this government will encourage high technology and jobs. I am very pleased that the government signed the agreement about 18 days after the election. I guess it thought the one we negotiated was pretty good. I really appreciated that. It is wonderful. We will now have jobs for our people.

I do not believe that by working with our partners across the border we will lose jobs. I believe we will create jobs for our people.

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the member for Saint John for her speech on this subject. I have been here since the debate began this afternoon and I believe her speech has been the most well-reasoned, well thought-out and articulated opinion on this subject that we have heard or that I have heard in my opinion here this evening and this afternoon.

I believe it is important that we have both perspectives brought into view, but this one was very articulated. I really appreciated her speech.

**Mrs. Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the government has afforded me this opportunity to speak. I believe this is the freedom that we have been looking for.

We are here to represent all our people and this has given me that opportunity. I am hoping that we will all work collectively together for what is best for Canada.

In this case, I will reiterate that I feel it is most important that these cruise missile testings take place. In my opinion and in the opinion of my party, if this happens it will be a deterrent because one never knows what the former Soviet Union is going to do.

*Government Orders*

I was asked by the German government to go to Germany to look at unification. I had an opportunity to be on both sides of the Berlin wall. It is like night and day. On one side the people are living in harmony, but if one crosses over, even today, those soldiers are still living in those homes. When one sees it and feels it, I say to every member in this House, make sure to vote for keeping the cruise missile testing continuing in Canada because it must be a deterrent. Things are not what they appear to be.

We all thought that when the Berlin wall came down everything was all right. That has not happened yet. There is a lot of need there and there is a lot of need for us to be ready.

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Saint John on her maiden speech. It was a very thoughtful speech and indeed she listed some of the arguments that I want to make myself.

I will be brief because we have had a long debate today. Again, I want to congratulate the government on having this debate before the decision was taken. That leads me to the point brought up by the member for Burnaby—Kingsway who said we should take our decision now, a negative decision on cruise missile testing and then have a defence review.

It seems to me that the proper way to proceed is in fact the opposite to within the context of a defence review to examine cruise missile testing and in fact all other agreements and all other defence arrangements that Canada has.

We should be very clear that this is not a debate about a nuclear weapon as has been pointed out earlier. This is a weapon system and it can have a nuclear warhead or it can have a conventional warhead. Therefore, the debate is not about nuclear weapons. In fact, nuclear weapons are not allowed on Canadian soil. That was an initiative that a Liberal government took and it is the law of the land at the present time.

This is not a debate—we have to be very clear about that—about nuclear weapons, but it is about the testing of a weapons system that belongs to a partner of ours in North America, to a colleague of ours in NATO and to a partner of ours in NORAD. I think we should think very carefully about how we treat that particular partner and indeed about how we treat this particular weapon.

(2020)

It may be that we do not want to continue and there is no need to continue all of the arrangements that we have with the Americans at the present time. However, I repeat that the proper examination of that is within an overall defence review and the Liberal Party did commit to a defence review when it was in opposition and it is committed to a defence review now. I submit

that that is the proper context in which to determine the future of cruise missile testing. We may not want to continue to test cruise missiles forever.

However, I think we should be very careful about the discontinuing of any weapon at the present time. The fall of the Berlin wall and the end of the cold war has not brought stability. Rather, I think, we can argue that there is more instability in the world now than ever before. Our forces took part in the gulf war some time ago. It has already been pointed out that a cruise missile was very effective in bringing to an end that war.

There will be more gulf wars and Canada will be involved in them with our partners. NATO was an important part. It was not there with the NATO flag but it was an important part of the gulf war. The unity, training and coherence of NATO was a very important factor in bringing that war to an end. We have to think very carefully about dismantling the weapons and the alliances that we have in view of the instability that is in the world at the present time.

What is the success story? The success story is that our way of life, beliefs and philosophy have gained pre-eminence because of the strength that we had and the strength we were able to demonstrate, but not to exercise. NATO never went to war. NATO is the most successful military alliance in history and it is arguably the best equipped and best trained military alliance in history and yet it never went to war. It was successful simply because it was there and everybody knew it was there and everybody knew what capability it had.

The success we have had is because we have been able to demonstrate strength. We have to think very carefully before we start to weaken our capability. I think it is important to negotiate from strength and not from weakness.

Part of that strength clearly has to be the strength of the United States itself. The United States is not universally popular and there are many people who resent the growing role of the U.S. as the world cop. I would prefer to see the UN become that cop, but it is clearly true that in all of our alliances we in Canada and other allies on both sides of the Atlantic depend heavily on the might of the American military machine for our alliances. We have to think very carefully about reducing the strength of that machine and those alliances in the present circumstances.

I do not think it is necessary to draw this debate out for a long time. I simply want to repeat in closing that the proper examination of cruise missile testing is within the overall review of defence policy. Clearly I think that is the way to proceed and my counsel to the government would be to maintain our agreement. It is a signed agreement and whether it is with the United States or any other partner I think we have to be very careful about our own credibility if we simply break agreements unilaterally.

*Government Orders*

The proper examination of whether to go ahead with cruise missile testing or not in the future is within the defence review and not at the present time.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf):** Madam Speaker, I want to go back to this issue because I would like to hear the views of the members who are taking part in the debate today, with respect to employment.

(2025)

The previous speaker said that NAFTA would allow us to have access to these new technologies. But we must not forget that those are classified technologies, since they are designed for military purposes by the American DOD. Therefore, specific agreements would have to be made with the United States to enable Canadian contractors to have access to this type of high technology and to get the R and D contracts for that technology. I would like to hear the opinion of the hon. member for Labrador on this issue.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rompkey:** Madam Speaker, I am not sure I caught the whole question. I apologize but I wonder if the hon. member would simply repeat the question please.

**Mr. de Savoye:** Madam Speaker, the point is with NAFTA you have access to the markets over there but in the case in question here this is classified technology. It is not obvious that the DOD will give us this access or will give it to our suppliers. What is your opinion on what your government should do to ensure that the Americans give our suppliers access to that technology and to the R and D contracts that go with it?

**Mr. Rompkey:** Madam Speaker, I do not think I was the one who brought up NAFTA. I think it was the hon. member for Saint John.

Nevertheless it seems to me that there are a number of ways in which that information can be shared. We do have defence agreements with the U.S. We have defence production agreements and we have a number of mechanisms whereby information can be shared. I think it is entirely possible within the various co-operation agreements that we have and within the various alliances that we have to ask and to get the United States to share the kind of information that the hon. member is talking about.

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be here to participate in this very important debate. Before I get into my speech I would just like to point out a couple of comments that were made by the member for Saint John and the member for Labrador. They want

to differentiate between cruise missile testing and whether it is carrying nuclear weapons or conventional weapons.

I would like to point out that whether it is conventional or nuclear, it is a weapon of destruction. This is a weapon of war we are talking about. The conventional weapon kills a few less people, but it kills people nonetheless.

I would like to thank my colleague the Minister of National Defence and his parliamentary secretary for this opportunity. I am proud that my party and the leader of my party, the right hon. Prime Minister, is giving the House the chance to discuss this matter before final decisions are made.

The issue of cruise missile testing is a sensitive one for the people of the Northwest Territories. As a member of Parliament from the NWT it is my duty and privilege to bring their views to this Chamber.

The people of the Northwest Territories have a strong and deep conviction on this matter. Since 1984, when testing began over the Mackenzie Valley, the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories passed six resolutions opposing these tests. Numerous letters of concern have been sent from the NWT government and from individual residents of the Northwest Territories.

Despite these clear and frequent expressions of the will of the people of the Northwest Territories, the missile testing agreement has been renewed again and again. Over northern objections, the initial testing agreement was renewed in 1988 for a further five years. In 1989 the Government of Canada agreed to allow the testing of the advanced cruise missiles. In 1993 the government agreed to a ten-year renewal without even consulting the government of the Northwest Territories.

(2030)

Northerners were shocked by this total disregard for their concerns and felt that their voices had not been heard on this issue. At the heart of the matter for northerners is their right to determine what happens on their territory.

The Northwest Territories is a vast land but it is not an empty land. The aboriginal people of the Western Arctic in the region where the tests take place, the Dene and the Inuvialuit, have lived there for thousands of years. Much more recently, non-aboriginal people have chosen to make the NWT their home.

While the population of the region may be considered small by southern urban standards, together, all the peoples of the NWT are working to build a better future for their children. A big part of that future involves aboriginal land claim settlements. While progress has been made in this area not all the

*Government Orders*

aboriginal people have achieved land claim settlements. Work is still proceeding on several outstanding claims.

For those who have not yet settled their claims and for those who have, protection and enhancement of the traditional economy and lifestyle is an overriding concern. While most aboriginal people have settled in communities, their culture and economies take them out on the land at various times throughout the year. Traditional hunting and trapping grounds can be miles away from so-called home communities.

When the cruise missiles fly up the Mackenzie Valley to the Beaufort Sea, they are not flying over unused and unoccupied territory. They are flying over lands that are and have been used and loved by generations of people who live up there.

Northerners also see a future for themselves that builds closer ties with their circumpolar neighbours. While it may be natural for southern Canadians to look south, it is more natural for northerners to look north and around.

The people of the NWT have much in common with other circumpolar peoples. Beside climate, we share many social and economic concerns. We see opportunities to learn from each other and to contribute to each other's development.

The peoples of the north are peaceful people. We do not feel comfortable with our land being used as testing grounds for weapons of war.

We worry about the consequences of accidents and the damage that could be done to our communities, the wildlife and the environment. At this time the threat of an accident from the testing of an American cruise missile is far more real to the NWT residents than that of the threat of an attack from the old Soviet Union and accidents have happened. Let me point them out.

In 1990 a Canadian CF-18 crashed outside of Inuvik while tracking a cruise missile that had been released from an B-52 bomber.

In 1986 two cruise missiles went down during tests. One crashed near Primrose, Alberta and the second one went down in the Beaufort Sea.

Last February, when Canada renewed the cruise missile testing agreement with the United States without consulting the government of the Northwest Territories or northern aboriginal organizations, the leader of the NWT government wrote to the Minister of National Defence. She expressed her disappointment and concern that the views of the people most directly affected by this testing were not even considered.

Other members of the legislative assembly also made their views known. Some very eloquent words on this matter were spoken by the Dene member for Nahendeh, Mr. Jim Antoine. I want to share his views with this House and the Canadian

people. I am excerpting from his statement in the legislative assembly in Yellowknife on February 23 of last year:

These missiles fly through Dene airspace in my constituency. I have talked to people who are in the bush on their trap lines and they have seen these missiles fly above the trees. They are followed by B-52 bombers.

I am opposed to cruise missile testing and I am also opposed to war. I saw the coverage on television which showed how cruise missiles were used in the war in Iraq. I saw how destructive these cruise missiles could be. I had troubled feelings in my heart. I felt like the Northwest Territories had contributed to that destruction by allowing those missiles to be tested in the air over our traditional lands.

Northerners continue to have troubled feelings in their hearts over the role of the military in our territory. While military expenditures have improved transportation and communication infrastructures and have generated employment, training and business opportunities for northerners, these benefits have not been as great as northerners had hoped. For many northerners the negative social and environmental impact of cruise missile testing, low-level training flights and related military activities outweigh the benefits. For years a number of northern organizations, non-aboriginal and aboriginal, have been working toward demilitarization of the Arctic. The Inuit Circumpolar Conference has been a pioneer in this effort.

(2035)

In 1990 the Government of the Northwest Territories released a discussion paper on military activity in the north which proposed the establishment of a circumpolar zone of peace and security. While the Department of National Defence did not respond favourably to the concept at that time, I would ask that this proposal for a circumpolar zone of peace and security be looked at again. Cruise missile testing of course would have no place in such a regime.

In any case northerners do not simply see the need for continued cruise missile testing over their territory. As the NWT government leader recently stated:

In our view, the cruise missile testing component of military activity in the Northwest Territories can no longer be justified given the significant changes which have occurred in the international arena during the past few years.

I agree. Northerners recognize that although the cold war is over other security concerns have arisen. However they question whether the standard military responses are the appropriate or only responses we can make. In many cases an economic helping hand may accomplish more for our long-term security interests than military shows of force.

I suggest that northerners who have a unique perspective on peace and security can make valuable contributions to the upcoming review of national defence policy. Northern views should be fully represented and considered in this review.

By increasing and improving communications and co-operation with our circumpolar neighbours, northerners are building bridges across the Arctic Ocean. Northerners are forging new friendships and renewing and strengthening old ones. For those

*Government Orders*

who may not be aware a northern firm recently built a village in Siberia.

Northerners do not believe continued cruise missile testing in the Northwest Territories will further the goals of enhanced peace and security. Cessation of these tests however could be a bold step toward a new circumpolar security regime.

Cruise missile testing is only one component of the umbrella test and evaluation agreement we have with the United States. It is possible to terminate this specific project arrangement without terminating the other parts of this agreement.

Northerners are not suggesting the termination of the entire umbrella agreement. They are only asking for the termination of the specific cruise missile testing component. Let us take a bold step. Let us cancel the cruise missile testing.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I would like to remind the House that questions should be on the previous speaker's debate.

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex):** Madam Speaker, like many members in this House I have mixed feelings on this question. I certainly appreciate the comments of my colleague. I am sure we all share the anguish he must feel representing the people most directly affected by this important decision. It certainly would not bother me to see Canadian foreign policy by this new government show a little bit of independence at this time from the United States.

I would like to ask the member if he could comment on what I am hearing as one of the strongest arguments in favour of the testing, at least in my opinion, and it is simply this. As a partner in NORAD with the United States are we not bound to some extent, if not very bound, to carry out this test as part of that NORAD partnership?

I wonder if the hon. member could address that concern. I listened closely to his comments. They were excellent comments, but I did not hear that particular argument mentioned. I sincerely would be interested in how he might respond to that argument because I think it is also a strong point.

**Mr. Anawak:** Madam Speaker, we do have agreements with other countries, whether they are of a military nature or any nature. We do have agreements with other countries, treaties, pacts. We have to remember we are still an independent country. I have very strong feelings about the fact that Canada is a free country. We are a nation of people who are peace loving.

(2040)

I do not think we have an agreement with the United States that can be, as I pointed out at the end of my speech, terminated year by year. I do not think we are getting into any trouble. Frankly, I would not care if we got into trouble with the United

States. I do not think we are getting into any trouble if we decide to cancel cruise missile testing in the far north.

As I said earlier in a point to one of the members, the area of possible conflict has changed in the last two or three years. The terrain is not the same. If the Americans had to attack anybody it would not be the Soviet Union.

Despite some concerns about the mad guy from Russia—I cannot remember his name, the fool anyway—I do not think he is a threat. Therefore Russia is not a threat. There is no Soviet Union. The threat is more from other countries that may be developing nuclear weapons.

Why do we not ask the United States to test their cruise missiles over terrain of similar nature. If the terrain is similar to the terrain between here and Montreal or Toronto and Vancouver why not test it through there?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi):** I would like to ask the hon. member a brief question. I also have mixed feelings regarding this issue, and since I also represent a riding which is bordered by the far North, I want to ask the member this question: Since our country and his region have never experienced war, if we had to go to war some day and had not learned how to defend ourselves, either alone or with the help of allies, would the hon. member still think that he made the right decision today?

[*English*]

**Mr. Anawak:** Madam Speaker, when the member for Saint John was speaking she pointed out quite clearly that the cruise missiles that they were using carrying conventional weapons were very accurate.

It is not as though we were suffering from lack of knowledge on how to make a cruise missile that can hit a target within a few feet. It is not as if we are going to lose out by not continuing to test the cruise missile.

We already have weapons that can hit within a few feet from hundreds of miles away. I do not think we will get into trouble if we do not test the cruise missile. I do not think the world will be any worse off if the cruise missile is not tested. If it is used as it is, it still destroys.

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest):** Madam Speaker, it is an honour for me to rise today and speak as the representative for Edmonton Southwest and to represent the citizens of that fine part of the world.

Let me begin as others have before me in congratulating you and all members of the House on winning the election and thereby being entrusted with this high honour, this great responsibility and opportunity.

*Government Orders*

As this is my maiden address in the House, I wonder if hon. members would bear with me for a moment as I go through the traditional greetings and tell them a little about the constituency of Edmonton Southwest.

(2045)

I would like to start, if I may, by thanking the electors of Edmonton Southwest for sending me here, and particularly all those who worked on my campaign so hard and so selflessly. I would also like very much to thank my family, without whose help I certainly would not be here today. They are probably the most interested people watching the debate at this very moment.

Just as an indication of things that may or may not go wrong, even if you think that everything is absolutely perfect, they are watching me today at a friend's. We get our television from the Anik II satellite, which is not working. So the world is not a predictable place. We have to be prepared for contingencies. This is what this cruise debate is all about. I will get back to that in a moment.

I wish to thank the voters of Edmonton Southwest for sending me here and I pledge to them and I pledge to you, my colleagues, that I will represent them with fidelity, with honour and with dignity in this House so as not to betray the trust they vested in me. I also pledge to represent this House with the same honour and dignity and fidelity so as not to betray the trust that we share as honourable colleagues here together.

It is also appropriate and traditional at this time to recognize members who represented the seat in other Parliaments. It is not always done but I think it is very appropriate for me to do so because this seat in the last Parliament and for the previous couple of Parliaments was represented by Mr. Jim Edwards. Jim, while we evolved to different political persuasions, always treated me and his political foes with dignity and kindness. I am sure that other members of this House would join with me in wishing Jim, his wife Sheila and family good fortune in the years ahead of them.

The constituency of Edmonton Southwest is just about 100 per cent urban. It has a bit of farmland on the extreme south and the extreme west ends but it is 90 per cent urban. It has very little industry, but a good deal of retail, and it is the home of the world's greatest shopping centre, regardless of whatever you may have heard about what exists in the United States. The Mall of the Americas will fit into a corner of the great West Edmonton Mall, which is a tourist destination that everyone should take in as they go through the wonderful, beautiful province of Alberta.

Edmonton Southwest has a good mix of people. It is much like this Parliament. It is wonderful to sit here and see the mix that is in this Parliament, which is truly representative of our great country. Edmonton Southwest has aboriginal Canadians. It has recent immigrants. It has children of immigrants who were not

so recent. It is a very pluralistic constituency, and as an example the Toronto-Dominion Bank I deal with is bilingual. The signs outside are in English and Chinese. Our constituency and our country is changing, it is evolving. We should recognize that and we should embrace it. We should not be afraid of it. The electors and the residents of Edmonton Southwest, I think, do embrace the pluralistic nature of our society.

The voters of Edmonton Southwest sent me to Ottawa with a very clear mandate, and that mandate was to represent them in Ottawa and not the other way around. They sent me with a mandate to inculcate a sense of parsimony and of personal responsibility in government. They sent me here to be part of a Parliament that would get a handle on the outrageous systemic overspending that has been a hallmark of governments at all levels in Canadian society for the last 20 years. They sent me here to try and inculcate with all of our hon. colleagues a sense that we cannot go on this way forever. Sooner or later we have to start living within our means. We need to recognize the situation in the world and in our country as it is, not as we would wish it to be.

(2050)

My constituents also sent me here with another mandate. That was to be forthright, direct, and honest in dealing with the Bloc. We want our Canada to stay united but we want it to be united on a solid foundation. That means all of the protagonists in this great debate that is going to rise of its own in a year or so need to get everything out on the table and deal with it honestly so that one way or another we can put the matter behind us and get on with the future.

That is precisely the kind of commitment I make and that I make to my hon. colleagues of the Bloc. I promise them it will be a constructive and honest debate. I wish to be a part of it representing my constituents who, make no mistake, want us to remain a united Canada.

Let me get to the reason for this debate. I will not speak a lot about it because virtually everything I have to say on the cruise missile has already been said by others over the course of the day, many very eloquently and many direct from the heart.

I do not pretend to be an expert on defence and I certainly do not pretend to be an expert on the cruise missile. I asked if I could participate in this debate because I wanted to put forward the feelings of the residents I represent in Edmonton Southwest about this kind of issue, an issue where the word of Canada is really at stake. Make no mistake, that is what we are talking about. We are talking about the veracity of our word when we make a deal in the community of nations.

That is the underlying theme of the position I would like to bring to this debate. When our national government makes an undertaking with another government it is in essence making an

agreement or a commitment on behalf of each of us as individual citizens.

There is a truism therefore that comes into play in a situation like that. The truism is that your word is your bond. We are only as good as our word individually, and collectively as a nation.

Our government at the time committed us to an agreement and we are therefore honour bound to live up to it today. The bottom line is that we should allow these tests to proceed for the following reasons.

We made an agreement with the United States in good faith and we should stick to it. Cruise missiles may be used to deliver conventional ordinances. Many countries now have the ability to manufacture and use cruise missiles and therefore it is in our best interests to learn how to track and intercept them.

There is a defensive nature to the testing of cruise missiles which needs to be recognized. Unless cruise missiles are flown in a test mode how would our pilots and how would our radar interceptors ever get the ability or the knowledge to learn how to intercept them?

The test corridor is in a sparsely settled area thereby posing little or no inconvenience or damage to Canadians or to wildlife. I do recognize the points made by the hon. member who addressed this House prior to me that it is an inhabited territory. There are people who do live there and we should not go through this without at least getting their permission or their leave to do it just as a matter of courtesy.

An extremely important consideration is that we have an obligation to co-operate with our NORAD partner under whose protective umbrella the western world has lived for 40 years. Not to mention the fact as others have made the point before me that we are going into bilateral negotiations with the Americans from time to time. How would you feel if you had been giving comfort to and looking after your neighbour for 40 years and when you wanted to borrow his lawnmower he said no.

There is a quid pro quo here. We have to work together.

(2055)

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe):** Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to the member from Edmonton Southwest in his statement that we are honour bound to our agreement.

It is my contention that we are honour bound to our children and our future children. A group of Alberta physicians once stated that prevention is the only treatment for war.

I would urge the government to consider cancelling the cruise missile testing that is taking world leadership in working toward the prevention of war. I would like my hon. colleague on the other side to consider this as well.

### *Government Orders*

Members of this House had an incredible opportunity yesterday to debate an issue of great global significance. However the substance of the debate dealt with the treatment of war.

As we found out yesterday and indeed as humankind has struggled repeatedly over the millennia of world history, treating victims stricken with the disease of war is tremendously difficult, if not impossible.

The government is undertaking a review of current defence policy. Canada's role as a peacekeeper—peacemaker needs redefinition in the light of changing world conditions.

I am very thankful to the government for encouraging open debate on the topics of peacekeeping in Bosnia and the cruise missile testing.

This debate is especially important to new members like myself and my colleague as it sends out a strong and very real message to not only the member's constituents in Edmonton Southwest but to my constituents in York—Simcoe.

To the people of Canada, the Prime Minister is serious and committed to including input from all members of the House whether on the government side or not, whether in cabinet or not.

The debates of the last two days are crucial because it is only through a comprehensive examination of the totality of Canada's defence policy that we can put the decision whether or not to continue the testing of cruise missiles in proper perspective and make a decision that is right for the times.

I would say to the hon. member for Calgary Southwest that yes, we are bound to certain kinds of agreements. Those are agreements written on paper. Those are agreements that are part of legislated agreements between governments.

I would suggest to the hon. member and I would like him to consider that we are honour bound to our children and our future children as well.

**Mr. McClelland:** Madam Speaker, I will be very succinct.

If the agreement that we were honour bound to live up to were an agreement of disarmament, I am sure the hon. member would have no problem in admonishing this House to live up to that agreement. It is the question that you lie to the devil that you do not like.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Madam Speaker, I do not have much time, but I will try to be quick. The hon. member talked about a defensive strategy and I found his point interesting. I would have liked to learn a bit more about that. There has been a gradual change in the deterrent strategy with which I have agreed for years. The nuclear era started with the bombing of Hiroshima. Then we witnessed a gradual build-up of destructive power to a point where total destruction of a city the size of New York was possible. Nowadays, the deterrent strategy is more and



*Government Orders*

more focused on better-targeted weapons. I would have liked the hon. member to further explain his point of view, as it seems to me that this justifies the testing of cruise missiles over Canadian territory. Could he elaborate briefly on this new deterrent strategy based on precise strikes rather than on total annihilation?

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The hon. member has about 30 seconds to respond.

**Mr. McClelland:** Madam Speaker, I do not think that I can. I do not have the confidence to answer that question as I am sure the hon. member would want me to.

(2100)

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan):** Madam Speaker, I would like to start by complimenting the government on having this the second open debate which I presume is sincerely that, open and not as suggested by our colleague the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway that the fix is already in. I choose to believe there is honour on the other side and that we are going at this in an open manner.

I would also like to address a word to the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce who alluded to the fact that maybe those in this corner of the House were in collusion and we were not having an open debate. Nothing could be further from the truth. In our debate yesterday on peacekeeping we had sincere differences of opinion even though there was some hanging together.

I assure the House it is entirely so with this current debate on the cruise missile. We each have our own opinion. It may happen that it sounds much of the same tune, but it is entirely our own version of what should be done.

The cold war is over. I have heard a lot of comments today about the cold war being over. Let us remind ourselves that we in the west won the cold war and we won it by being prepared. We did not have to shoot off weapons, missiles or anything of the sort. We won it through peaceful means but that meant being prepared and being armed and being armed better than the other side. So it is a successful strategy for peace.

Has the threat in the world diminished? Not on your life it has not. The world is in greater danger today. It is more unstable today than it has been for a long time.

I hear some debates in this House that are very idealistic in nature and I think we should preserve that to the degree that we can. Have our idealists. Have them say we should have peace. We all believe in peace. The soldier is the first one who will throw his arms on the pile if we can ever achieve that moment

when we have agreement in the world to have peace. In the meantime the world is a rough place. Let us see how rough.

The Senate of this Parliament had put out a report, "Meeting new Challenges—Canada's Response to a New Generation of Peacekeeping" and I read from that: "The current crisis has its roots in the proliferation of states which followed the second world war. At the end of that war there were barely 60 states. Through decolonization that number increased to almost 160 states by 1988. With the break up of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union the number is over 180 and climbing".

If you do not believe that, take a little tour of the world with me in your imagination. Let us go across the Pacific and look at the situation between northern Japan and Russia. It always has been tense. Move over a little to North and South Korea. They are still at odds. Look at all of China. We have not even begun to count the factions within China that are a potential problem. In fact look at the Chinas, the People's Republic as well as the other one.

(2105)

If we go through Indo-China, Cambodia and Laos, what do we see? We see more potential problems. We could go to Indonesia and look at the problems it has had. If we flip over from there to Sri Lanka, we see a problem in Sri Lanka that has been there for a lot of years. If we go to India or Pakistan what do we see? Tension. We could go from there to the Middle East. I do not even have to describe the Middle East. It is there. It has been there over, over and over again. If we go from there to South Africa, the Republic of South Africa and all the countries of Africa, what do we see? We see potential for problems.

From there we can cross the Mediterranean and look at what we have in Europe today. We have the situation in the former Yugoslavia that we discussed yesterday. If we traverse the Atlantic Ocean, to finish our tour, and look at the Caribbean we still have trouble spots. We could look at Central America, a continuing problem, and even South America. Chile is quiet now. There is no war in Argentina. We do not hear much about the shining path in Peru, but we can bet our boots we will hear about it again.

The world is an unstable place. Until something magic happens to unite human beings to say that this is the way to peace, we must be prepared.

Let us go back in history a bit to look at our situations before World War I and before World War II. We have to relearn the lessons of history. We say: "This war is the war to end all wars. It is all done". It is not done. Until I see something very special come along I will know it is never done. Therefore let us be prepared.

We are talking about weapons systems such as the cruise. Several people have already differentiated between the fact that it can carry a conventional warhead and a nuclear one. Much of

*Government Orders*

the argument here has been concentrated on nuclear. It carries a conventional weapon and as such it is another excellent weapon in our total arsenal. We cannot predict which weapon in our arsenal we are going to reach for.

We could look at Vietnam. We saw the Americans bringing back C-47 aircraft and mounting Gatling guns in the open doorways. That tells us, if we look at that situation and at the gulf war, that we need a complete set of weapons in our arsenal. We do not know which one we will have to pick.

Thus it is incumbent on us to allow the Americans to continue the testing of this specific weapon in case it is needed. We have the technological lead in the west. How long will we continue to have that lead? We do not know. There are all sorts of other countries or groups working to exceed what we have. If we have a lead, hang on to it.

Finally I ask this question: Has Canada contributed its share to democracy or the defence of the west over the last number of years? If I look at my time before and after being in NATO, I think the answer is no. We have been cheapskating. We have always been down around Luxembourg. This gives us a chance as a country to pay off some of our debts.

I will leave it at that except to reiterate the point made by the hon. member for Saint John concerning proliferation. This refinement of the missile is a means to prevent proliferation if that happens to us.

(2110)

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member on the other side some questions regarding the statement about increased instability in the world and the need to use cruise missile tests as a way of reducing some of this instability.

As I said earlier, prevention is the only treatment for war. The Canadian people through their government have a remarkable opportunity to take a stand against the proliferation of the tools of war by refusing to continue cruise missile testing on Canadian soil.

Contrary to an earlier statement by a member on the opposite side of the House, we do not prepare for peace by preparing for war. In fact the mid-eastern war of 1991 showed that in preparing for war we prepare and encourage more war. Most of the weaponry used by Iraq was manufactured by G-7 countries. In fact, even though we are in a post cold war period, the military industrial complex of western world countries flourishes as the result of sales to Third World countries increasing global instability and jeopardizing the world peace the member on the other side of the floor has recently spoken to.

If we are suffering from so much tension and problems in the world, won't supplying more armaments and guns just be like adding fuel to the fire?

**Mr. Ringma:** Madam Speaker, I understand the thrust of the argument of my friend across the way. We do not get rid of tensions by hiding weapons. If the world could find a way of disarming so that everyone disarmed, I would be totally in favour of it. I said earlier that all people who have borne arms would feel the same way. They would be the first to put them on the pile.

We have not arrived at that point yet, it is sad to say. As soon as we can see it coming we should do something about it. If we could start to reduce the arms in the world I would be the first to join the club, but we have not arrived at that stage yet.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf):** I heard the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan say that we had won the cold war with arms but without using them.

The fact is, if we had not dared—perhaps with an incredible lack of judgment—if we had not tempted fate with nuclear weapons, if we had not chanced it to the point of madness, to the point of the “mutual mad” as they called it, if we had not implemented deterrents, maybe none of us would be here tonight to talk about peace.

Even though this weapons race may be foolish, at least it ensures the precarious parity that now exists and we must take that risk until our planet is completely free of violence. Unfortunately, that is not the case yet; we live in a violent world and if I let my guard down, if we as a country let our guard down, someone somewhere will seize the opportunity. Alas, this is not Disney World yet.

[*English*]

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, it is a real treat to participate on behalf of the constituents of Scarborough—Rouge River in a debate of this nature. Early in this Parliament our Prime Minister said to the House: “Please take this issue, debate it and tell me what Canadians think”. I can see individuals in my caucus over here and in their caucuses over there with views on both sides of the issue. It is unlikely I will be able to address any issue which has not already been covered. I want to compliment all of my colleagues, especially those who have made their first interventions and speeches in the House.

(2115)

What is the cruise missile? It is simply a delivery system. This was not the case 10 years ago. Ten years ago the cruise missile was seen as a delivery system but more importantly a delivery system for strategic nuclear capability. That did not make a lot of us in this country very comfortable.

I know the Liberal Party grappled with the issue for many years inside the party, not necessarily in the House, and in caucus. I can see that its position has changed from time to time over the last one or two decades.

*Government Orders*

Something happened a few years ago that changed my view in relation to the cruise missile. That was the gulf war. As a taxpayer, as an individual who cared a lot about what was happening at the time of the gulf war, for the first time I was able to see right in the opposition lobby something involving a cruise missile that did not involve nuclear or strategic nuclear warheads.

It was at that point that I began to look at the cruise missile a little differently. We are talking about roughly 288 cruise missiles that were used by the United States as part of what was called the allied effort in relation to the gulf war.

Having formed a view that the cruise missile was not necessarily part of the nuclear capability, I began to look at it more as something capable of carrying a payload. In the gulf war it had carried a conventional warhead for very specific tactical purposes.

My colleagues and I realize that it did kill. As I stand here I do not know what the body count was, but there were many killed and presumably many maimed by the Tomahawk cruise missiles used in the gulf war. It was not intentional but there still was death and the attendant destruction.

Is not the cruise missile simply an increasingly sophisticated product of research, development and delivery capability? What if the cruise missile simply carried a camera? What if technologically we got the cruise missile to go out and come back?

I know we can take pictures of the earth from satellites. We do not really need an unmanned capability all of the time, but what if there is cloud cover or what if we are talking about a volcano with all kinds of cloud cover? Perhaps the cruise missile could have the benefit of the doubt in being seen in a more benevolent or kinder content in great contrast with what it has been used as, a weapon of war.

In saying that I want to articulate my general acquiescence in the agreement that permits testing of the cruise missile in Canadian territory. I say that knowing the agreement permits the sharing of the test results with Canada. I am making an assumption, I hope not too naively, that the technology is known to the appropriate elements of our armed forces as a technology that they can work with.

(2120)

There are three sensitivities that I have to put on the record and I am sure some of them, if not all, are shared by all my colleagues here.

First, I have listened intently to the remarks of our colleague, the member for Nunatsiag. I am very sensitive to the issue put that the testing of the cruise missile over northwestern Canada has to be subjected to the scrutiny of residents there. The long term residents there include the Dene and the Inuvialuit and if they have something to say to us through their members then we

have to listen. We must listen. There are elements of safety, environment and morality.

Second, this next item of sensitivity has been mentioned by the previous speaker and was articulated very well. It is that Canada must continue to make its contribution to global stability. It must continue to do its part in terms of ensuring our defence capability and our ability to be there at times when the world needs us as a country. We must participate in that. We must foster that.

I do not think we have been carrying our load internationally in that regard. There were times when we did not really want to when it was a cold war battle between two or three nuclear powers. Times have changed. We know that from time to time the world needs what our country has to offer in terms of global stability.

Third, we have a moral obligation to those who will follow us in this world to do everything possible on our end to remove the nuclear threat from the entire world.

I know there is an overlap here with the way we used to look at the cruise missile, but something tells me that the nuclear threat to this world does not relate so much any more to the cruise missile. It relates more to stockpiles and of previously built nuclear weapons and the potential nuclear weapon to be built that is in a steamer trunk somewhere in the world where it should not be. God only knows what might happen should we go down that road.

Those three sensitivities I leave on the record. In the end, having analysed this and attempting to articulate what I think are the views of my constituents in Scarborough—Rouge River, I am, along with other colleagues in the House who may feel this way, acquiescent and accepting that Canada should stay as part of the current cruise missile testing agreement with the United States.

**Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo):** Madam Speaker, the previous member who represented this Waterloo riding was the Hon. Walter McLean who was preceded by Max Saltzman. In some ways I reflect some of their thinking and the thinking of the community that I represent.

We have to ask this question. When do we have enough armaments?

I heard the hon. member talk about an almost benevolent cruise missile, one which does not have to have nuclear capability.

(2125)

If one looks at what initially instigated the development of the cruise missile, which was the Soviet Union, and if one looks at the Soviet Union today and its break up into many different states, one cannot help but think of Ukraine that has nuclear weapons and the world desperately wants it to give them up. In some sense I wonder how Canada as a nation that faces virtually no threat from Russia can tell the Ukrainians that they should

*Government Orders*

give up their nuclear weapons when we are acquiescing to the testing of the cruise missile.

We were here all day yesterday debating the war in Bosnia and what role this House should take. I really believe that these debates are very refreshing. I am glad to see that the Reform Party is not sticking together on the issue. They are expressing genuinely different points of view and I think that can be said about the House as a whole.

I guess at some point in time we have to say that we have enough weapons of mass destruction. We are just dealing now with the cruise, but there are biological and chemical weapons that exist on this fragile planet. To take a phrase from Project Ploughshares from my community it is time to turn some of that weaponry into ploughshares. It is time to turn some of those swords into ploughshares.

If a country like Canada, with our special standing in the world as a middle power and really of little threat as an aggressor, is unable to do that then my question has to be this. What country is going to take the first step?

**Mr. Lee:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member makes a wonderful point here. The issue of the nuclear stockpile is out there and is unresolved by the entire global community. As I understand it I think the Ukraine has reached an agreement to liquidate, store away, give away or trade away its nuclear stockpile. That was a real plus. I hope they get to the end of their inventory.

However, I fall back on the remarks I made earlier that I view the cruise missile as a delivery system. Maybe it will be the very best delivery system we have ever developed. Maybe the cruise missile and developments of the cruise missile will become the flying saucer of the planet earth because of its ability to move in an unmanned way and guide itself. Let us forget about the sausage shape for now. It does not have to carry a nuclear warhead.

Canada has insisted that none of the cruise missiles in Canada will carry nuclear warheads. Canada is in the forefront in the world in convincing countries to abandon their nuclear capability. I point out the regional dispute between India and Pakistan involving their own alleged nuclear capabilities and the arguments about delivery systems also.

I hope that my children's children will have fewer nuclear warheads to worry about than that which the hon. member and the rest of us have to worry about now.

(2130)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe):** I am pleased to participate as the member for Richmond—Wolfe in this debate

on cruise missiles and I would like to send warm greetings to all the voters in my constituency of Richmond—Wolfe who placed their trust in me last October 25 and gave me a clear mandate.

Obviously, we must examine this particular issue within a broader context. The Bloc Québécois would have liked the government to undertake a comprehensive review of national defence policy. Nevertheless, for a sovereigntist member of Parliament and member of the Bloc Québécois, the Canada—US Test and Evaluation Program, or if you prefer, the agreement on cruise missile testing, is critically important. This kind of debate on the relevance of allowing new tests to take place over Canadian territory during the course of this year highlights in particular the role of a sovereign Quebec with respect to western agreements on military strategy.

There are three distinct types of cruise missiles, namely the surface, sea and air varieties. The cruise missile tested in Canada falls into the third category of weapon. It is primarily the vehicle, or delivery system, which determines whether these weapons will or will not be subject to disarmament agreements or nuclear weapons verification control. The most stringent control measures of all have been adopted in the case of the air and sea version of these missiles.

One of the means available for verifying nuclear arms during the cold war and for maintaining a certain balance between the superpowers was the National Technical Means, that is a verification technique based on information obtained by superpowers about the weapons of foreign countries.

For instance, if a superpower formally announces that it is going to test a specific type of weapon and if the other superpower discovers, through its verification techniques, that the weapon in question is not consistent with the formal announcements made, then the whole balance of deterrence is called into question and the mutual trust of the two superpowers is shaken. And we know how important trust is in such matters.

Therefore, it is extremely important that Canada, as an ally of the United States, stand by its commitment and guarantee its co-operation in the area of strategic weapons testing so that it does not impede international disarmament procedures and in the process fuel the nuclear race.

All of the verification, monitoring and voluntary disarmament techniques to which the superpowers agreed under the SALT I and SALT II treaties have since been superseded by new agreements such as the INF, which stands for Intermediate Nuclear Force, and START I and START II. Today these verification techniques still form the basis of arms control. Canada cannot disregard them. It must ensure compliance with these agreements to limit the nuclear threat.

*Government Orders*

Cruise missiles launched from bomber aircraft are considered strategic if their range exceeds 600 kilometres. The missile tested in Canada has a range superior to 600 kilometres. Accordingly, the Canadian government cannot, under the terms of international arms control and strategic weapons verification treaties, dissociate itself from the strategic nuclear mission of the air version of the cruise missile.

The cruise missile satisfies different objectives in terms of U.S. strategy. The air and sea versions are at the very heart of the United States's strategy of deterrence based on the concept of the tripartite retaliatory force or triad.

(2135)

This offensive triad brings together land-, sea- and air-based strategic weapons. Canada's commitments to the strategic deterrent force are basically a part of co-operation between allies. To the extent that Canada bases its defence on agreement among allies, it must voluntarily co-operate in implementing this strategic deterrent force if required. This is part of the national defence policies of 1971 and 1987 and the defence policy statement of 1992.

Like my colleagues and my leader, I recall that under this approach, Canada was asked in 1983 to accept air-launched cruise missile tests on its territory, although this nuclear deterrence strategy was not officially based on NATO's strategy.

In its 1992 security policy statement, Canada revised its position on strategic issues, recognizing that the world was no longer bipolar. The new nuclear powers were considered inherently unstable and so it became difficult for Canada and its allies to get away from nuclear deterrence.

Cruise missiles made a key contribution to the offensive against Iraq. The non-nuclear air-launched cruise missile was used, showing the need for this missile in local conflicts, although it is not always perfectly accurate in hitting the target. The advantage of using such a weapon is that massive bombing is made unnecessary, thus saving many civilian lives. Strategic flexibility and tactics make the cruise a weapon better suited to the present strategic environment. This flexibility is why the development programs for these new missiles need to be extended. Canada, like our party, must be aware of the different uses to which these weapons can be put.

From what we know, the missile that the Americans want to test in 1994 would have new electro-optical guidance technologies.

International relations are extremely complex and cannot be analyzed from just one point of view. The issue of national defence is revealing in this regard. In 1993, Canada extended a formal commitment with the United States to facilitate the testing of certain types of weapons. Remember that the agreement runs for ten years, so this commitment will end in 2003.

Canada would find itself in a sensitive position with its partners if it broke its commitments, whatever their nature. Canada must act as a responsible state which respects its international commitments. These values are particularly important for the sovereigntist members of the Bloc Québécois.

It is essential to state clearly that the Bloc Québécois, while not agreeing with the continuation of the arms race, cannot totally distance itself either from the unstable international environment which has existed since the former Soviet Union broke up and from the potential dangers which unfortunately threaten our world. The Bloc Québécois's sovereigntist thrust must not mean a kind of isolationism, heedless of our responsibilities to our strategic allies. On this score, it is important to send a clear and unambiguous message to the rest of the world: Canada and Quebec must respect their international commitments, with the possibility of renegotiating them with their allies once these agreements expire, using the appropriate procedures when the time comes.

(2140)

Another argument for accepting cruise missile tests over Canadian territory is the devastating effect of massive bombardment on civilian populations. For example, in the gulf war, massive conventional bombing would have been extremely costly in civilian lives since most of the sites destroyed were located in inhabited Iraqi territory. Surgical strikes such as those carried out by cruise missiles have shown the effectiveness of such weapons, considerably limiting the loss of human life.

The tests which the American government wants to conduct do not involve new nuclear technologies either. Thus they do not escalate strategic nuclear forces. Furthermore, a ceiling has already been set for the total number of missiles deployed under the START I and START II treaties. The cruise missile tests on Canadian soil are only to improve the guidance system. They cannot and must not be considered destabilizing under international arms control or disarmament agreements.

Finally, one question arises: should cruise missile tests be related to the issue of converting military industry and to the lower military spending advocated by the Bloc Québécois? I say no, they should not. First, very few military companies in Quebec and Canada are involved with this type of weapon. The economic, industrial and technological impact is minimal since a ceiling has been set for the number of units to be built. Therefore no increase in the budget of the Canadian Department of National Defence is involved.

Thus, it would be wrong for the Liberal government to make a connection with the lower military spending advocated by the Bloc Québécois.

It is important for Canada and Quebec to strengthen these strategic commitments; therefore the Bloc Québécois is in

*Government Orders*

favour of military agreements with its allies to ensure the security of Canadian and Quebec territory.

[*English*]

**Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo):** Madam Speaker, a number of members have referred to the cruise and they picked on the war in Iraq as an example of how advanced technology in weapons of destruction can save lives. We looked at the situation in the Middle East, we looked at star wars in Baghdad. Those were weapons, granted not of the most sophisticated kind, supplied basically by the superpowers.

How does producing more deadly weapons, with also the export that is involved in arms, help world peace? How does that make us as a nation more secure? We have to look at the weapons that were used in the Middle East. For the most part they were produced by advanced technologies, the United States, the Soviet Union, France. The list goes on and on.

What invariably happens is that the military says we have to have more advanced weapons than other countries have to deal with our own security. I guess this is a never-ending race.

When does the member see this vicious cycle stopping?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. First of all, I must remind the hon. member that what I suggested in my speech was to allow experiments relating to electro-optical guidance technology.

(2145)

I totally agree with the member on that. We are totally against any arms race or war. I did mention in my speech however that destabilisation is occurring in certain regions and, as we know, a country where democratic principles are completely disregarded is a country with a potential for and threat of aggression against which we must react. It is mainly in that perspective that we should look at the development of technological know-how.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Madam Speaker, I would like to pose a specific question to the member in light of what is the immediate challenge before us. He alluded to the agreement that exists for a 10-year period and in this agreement is stated a provision that it may be terminated upon 12 months' notice in writing by either party.

The question I would like to pose is this. Would the hon. member favour giving notice today, saying that yes, we will terminate it and in fact we would further request that any testing be held in abeyance until the Government of Canada has

completed its full defence policy review by the end of this year. This is an approach that I favour.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe):** Madam Speaker, I did say in my speech that we, in the Bloc Québécois, are committed to fundamental values. Clearly, the agreements passed with our allies and friends must be abided by. These considerations having to do with the value and observance of agreements must be maintained. Of course, as far as we are concerned, what really matters is to get to consider in its entirety the national defence policy, which has not been tabled yet. I call upon the hon. member to urge his government to table as soon as possible their White Paper on Defence that we have heard so much about.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services):** Madam Speaker, yesterday and today we have experienced a rather unique situation, a somewhat historic moment, as we had the opportunity to speak freely on two issues. Yesterday we talked of Canada's role as peacekeeper and today we are discussing cruise missile testing over Canadian territory.

[*English*]

Yesterday we talked of Canada's peace efforts abroad, our contributions to this particular process. Today we are discussing cruise missile testing. It seems to me that the two go hand in hand.

When people talk to me about Canada's armed forces they always talk about our soldiers with a great deal of pride. They also ask, increasingly so, very tough questions such as: What is peacekeeping? What is peacemaking? Is there a difference between peacemaking and war? Do our soldiers have different terms of engagement under different circumstances? Are they secure? Are we doing everything we can to make sure that they can do the job they are being asked to do?

As I understand the situation, what Canadians are telling me is that they want us to continue to make that contribution but they want us to continue to make the contribution within a different context. They want to make sure that our soldiers, our armed forces, are treated with the dignity and respect they deserve because they are putting their lives on the line to create a better society and very often it is in very troubled countries.

When we talk about cruise missile testing it seems to me that we need to ask ourselves very fundamental insightful questions as well. I do not pretend that I know all of them but I am going to raise a few. What was the original rationale for this particular agreement and is it still valid? Some people will argue, and I can appreciate that.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

We must honour our commitments. I totally agree but, clearly, when the situation changes, it is important that we review our commitment.

(2150)

[English]

All I ask is, is the original rationale still valid, or is it equally responsible to sit down and ask whether the reasons that motivated that particular agreement are such that they necessitate that kind of response?

I want to ask another question. This is one that is troubling me as well. Can we ask other countries of the world to reduce armaments, perhaps not to manufacture certain kinds of armaments, and undertake such an initiative that is cruise missile testing? Is there not a potential contradiction if we were to do that? People will ask.

It is important as well before we reach a final decision to consider seriously not only what parliamentarians are saying in this House but what other elected people are saying to us, particularly those who are affected. I am talking about the provincial and territorial governments. I am talking about other governments where we have elected representatives. We need to consider very seriously what the people are saying, because this has an impact on them and we have a responsibility to at least listen to what they are saying.

I appreciate so much that we were given the opportunity yesterday to talk about our contribution to peacekeeping and peacemaking and that we are talking today about cruise missile testing, components of our defence policy. We have been promised a thorough review of where we are at and where we might go. I see this as the beginning of that particular process.

I am going to make one final comment because I know I have other colleagues who want to address this issue. We are being called upon to exercise leadership. Perhaps some people would characterize leadership as to lead, to build, perhaps to refine armaments—and I am not suggesting that there is not a role for that—but we need to consider it very seriously and with great sensitivity. We also need to lead to disarm, to promote peace. Clearly I prefer the latter.

**Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore):** Madam Speaker, it was very interesting listening to the debate today and I stand to participate. I would like to suggest that Canadians want peace and non-violence, as evidenced by the peacekeeping activities. We have some 4,700 Canadian men and women involved in peacekeeping. Should we not then encourage those values in our international affairs? Should we not encourage other countries to seek peaceful and non-violent solutions to problems?

While this may sound idealistic, and I have heard that said earlier, it is up to us to set an example for the international community in which we belong. It is up to us to teach by doing. We cannot preach to other countries that they should not develop their nuclear arsenals while we allow cruise missile testing on our northern lands. We cannot preach to other countries that they should solve their problems by peaceful and non-violent means, when we in effect justify using weapons.

To allow cruise missile testing is to say there is still a need for nuclear weapons and that North America has a nuclear ability to resolve any dispute.

We should remember that by our actions not only do we set an example for the rest of the world, we set an example for our children.

(2155)

Crime among Canadian youth is ever increasing. If we hope to change this reality, we must show that we are a society that values peaceful solutions. We must show our youth that violence is not the way to solve problems but that they should seek non-violent solutions. I do not believe we would be setting that example if we continue to allow cruise missile testing in Canada.

Times change. Today our needs have changed. We heard earlier about the different uses for the cruise missile. However, I want to say to this House that the world around us has changed and it is time for us to recognize those changes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Langlois:** Madam Speaker, I thought that the period following the speech by the hon. member for St. Boniface was reserved for questions and comments. I think that the hon. member has joined the debate itself.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I think the hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore may have misunderstood after the debate from the hon. member for St. Boniface. The hon. member was actually to make comments and/or ask questions.

**Mrs. Catterall:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I understand that the debate, by agreement among the parties, is to end at ten o'clock. There are a number of us on this side of the House who are therefore not going to get the opportunity to speak on this most important issue.

Given that only one woman from the government benches has spoken on this issue—the three remaining speakers who will not get an opportunity are also women—I wonder if all members in the House might agree to allow the member to continue her remarks and to use the remaining five minutes.

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Do we have agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Ms. Augustine:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the generosity of the members across the way.

I am sure that the people of Etobicoke—Lakeshore are presently following this because I have had faxes and notations from individuals who have been watching this debate all afternoon and all evening.

I appreciate the few minutes left to me to express what we heard from the member from the Northwest Territories about the wildlife situation and the environment, keeping the territories safe for the individuals who are presently there, for ourselves and for our children.

As I said earlier, the important point is the example that we as Canadians give to the rest of the world.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Langlois:** Madam Speaker, may I direct my question to the hon. member for St. Boniface as I refrained from making more interventions in order not to disrupt the hon. member's speech?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Agreed.

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse):** In his speech, the hon. member for St. Boniface asked questions and suggested alterna-

tives. Was it to give a different spin to his presentation in this House? Did he say that his answer to the question the government is asking us would be no and that he is not favourable to continued cruise missile testing?

**Mr. Duhamel:** Madam Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his question. Yes, I asked a number of questions. I think that they are important questions that should be discussed here in the House of Commons and elsewhere. I would like to see such discussions held across Canada as part of the defence policy review.

I think I closed my speech by saying: We can exercise leadership by promoting, building, refining armaments and so on. That is an avenue that is open to us. It may be something to consider but I am saying that there is an alternative: to promote peace and exercise leadership in this area. I thought I had made clear that I preferred the latter option but I thank the hon. member for having asked me that question. It is very nice of him.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** It being ten o'clock, pursuant to the order made Tuesday, January 25, 1994, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 10 p.m.)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Wednesday, January 26, 1994

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### **The late G. Campbell Eaton**

Mr. Rompkey ..... 379

### **Serial Killer Board Game**

Mr. Godin ..... 379

### **Interprovincial Trade Barriers**

Mr. Hanrahan ..... 379

### **Social Security**

Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton) ..... 379

### **Nobel Peace Prize Committee**

Mr. Assadourian ..... 380

### **International Customs Day**

Ms. Whelan ..... 380

### **Curling**

Mr. McKinnon ..... 380

### **Multimedia Transaction Network**

Mr. Ménard ..... 380

### **Group of Seven Summit**

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge) ..... 381

### **Research and Development**

Mrs. Barnes ..... 381

## **Cigarette Smuggling**

Mr. Caron .....	381
-----------------	-----

## **Rod Hay**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) .....	381
-----------------------------------	-----

## **Administration of Justice**

Mr. Lavigne (Verdun—Saint—Paul) .....	381
---------------------------------------	-----

## **Victorian Order of Nurses Week**

Ms. Fry .....	382
---------------	-----

## **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

## **Cigarette Smuggling**

Mr. Bouchard .....	382
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) .....	382
Mr. Bouchard .....	382
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) .....	382
Mr. Bouchard .....	382
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) .....	383

## **National Defence**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	383
Mr. Collenette .....	383
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	383
Mr. Collenette .....	383

## **Infrastructure Program**

Mr. Manning .....	383
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) .....	383
Mr. Manning .....	383
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) .....	383
Mr. Manning .....	384
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) .....	384

## **Tax Shelters**

Mr. Loubier .....	384
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	384
Mr. Loubier .....	384
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	384

## **Income Tax**

Mr. White (North Vancouver) .....	384
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	384
Mr. White (North Vancouver) .....	384
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	384

## **Indian Affairs**

Mr. Bachand .....	385
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) .....	385
Mr. Bachand .....	385
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) .....	385

## **Job Training**

Mr. Epp .....	385
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	385
Mr. Epp .....	385
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	385

## **MIL Davie**

Mr. Guimond .....	385
Mr. Young .....	386
Mr. Dubé .....	386
Mr. Young .....	386

## **Investment Canada**

Mr. Gallaway .....	386
Mr. Manley .....	386

## **The Deficit**

Mr. Benoit .....	386
------------------	-----

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	387
Mr. Benoit .....	387
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	387

### **Canadian Embassy in China**

Mr. Bergeron .....	387
Mr. Ouellet .....	387
Mr. Bergeron .....	387
Mr. Ouellet .....	387

### **Auditor General's Report**

Mr. Thompson .....	387
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	387
Mr. Thompson .....	387
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	388

### **Fisheries**

Mr. Wells .....	388
Mr. Tobin .....	388

### **Research and Development**

Mr. Ménard .....	388
Mr. Manley .....	388
Mr. Ménard .....	388
Mr. Manley .....	388

### **Department of National Defence**

Mr. Penson .....	389
Mr. Collenette .....	389
Mr. Penson .....	389
Mr. Collenette .....	389

### **Human Rights**

Mr. Nunez .....	389
Mr. Marchi .....	389
Mr. Nunez .....	389

Mr. Marchi .....	389
------------------	-----

**Canada Customs**

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	390
Mr. Marchi .....	390

**Housing**

Mr. Zed .....	390
Mr. Dingwall .....	390

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Interparliamentary Delegations**

Mr. Fontana .....	390
Mr. Rompkey .....	390

**Crown Liability and Proceedings Act**

Bill C-4. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	391
Mr. Rock .....	391

**Petitions**

**Senior Citizen Pensions**

Mr. Duhamel .....	391
-------------------	-----

**The Senate**

Mr. Althouse .....	391
--------------------	-----

**Social Housing**

Mr. Godin .....	391
-----------------	-----

**The Criminal Code**

Mr. Nunziata .....	391
--------------------	-----

**Prescription Drugs**

Mr. Solomon .....	391
-------------------	-----

**Rights of Grandparents**

Mr. Lastewka . . . . . 391

**Serial Killer Cards**

Mr. Hanger . . . . . 391

**Social Housing Rent Increases**

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) . . . . . 392

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken . . . . . 392

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Cruise Missile Testing**

Mr. Collenette . . . . . 392  
Motion . . . . . 392  
Mr. Bouchard . . . . . 394  
Mr. Frazer . . . . . 397  
Mr. Robinson . . . . . 398  
Mr. Duhamel . . . . . 398  
Mr. Bodnar . . . . . 398  
Miss Grey . . . . . 399  
Mr. Szabo . . . . . 400  
Mr. Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry) . . . . . 401  
Mr. McWhinney . . . . . 401  
Mr. McClelland . . . . . 403  
Mr. Bellehumeur . . . . . 403  
Mr. Robinson . . . . . 403  
Mr. Graham . . . . . 404  
Mr. Bachand . . . . . 405  
Mr. Taylor . . . . . 406  
Mr. Bergeron . . . . . 406  
Mr. MacDonald . . . . . 408  
Mr. McClelland . . . . . 409  
Mr. Robinson . . . . . 410  
Mr. MacDonald . . . . . 410

Mr. de Savoye .....	412
Mr. Silye .....	412
Mrs. Parrish .....	413
Mr. Asselin .....	414
Mrs. Parrish .....	414
Mr. Chatters .....	415
Mr. Szabo .....	416
Mr. de Savoye .....	417
Mr. Penson .....	417
Mr. Langlois .....	418
Mr. Caccia .....	418
Mr. Solberg .....	419
Mr. Proud .....	420
Mr. de Savoye .....	421
Mr. Gouk .....	422
Mr. Plamondon .....	422
Mr. Ramsay .....	425
Mr. Allmand .....	426
Mr. Caron .....	427
Mr. Gallaway .....	428
Mr. Brien .....	430
Mr. Robinson .....	431
Mr. Anawak .....	433
Mr. Solberg .....	433
Mrs. Wayne .....	433
Mr. de Savoye .....	435
Mr. Silye .....	435
Mr. Rompkey .....	436
Mr. de Savoye .....	437
Mr. Anawak .....	437
Mr. O'Brien .....	439
Mr. Deshaies .....	439
Mr. McClelland .....	439
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	441
Mr. Bachand .....	441
Mr. Ringma .....	442
Mrs. Kraft Sloan .....	443

Mr. de Savoye .....	443
Mr. Lee .....	443
Mr. Telegdi .....	444
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe) .....	445
Mr. Telegdi .....	447
Mr. Leroux .....	447
Mr. Pagtakhan .....	447
Mr. Duhamel .....	447
Ms. Augustine .....	448
Mr. Langlois .....	449