



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

11th Session

9th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report
DAY 4

Friday, September 2, 1983

Pages 47 to 76

Speaker: The Honourable Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.

for his forthright determination to try to convince all the guys on the other side, when they were having a bit more passive position than now. I would like to indicate to them they have now changed that and I now welcome every support that we receive from the other side. Thank you.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Curley. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called.

AN HON. MEMBER: Recorded vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Recorded vote being requested, Mr. Clerk. All those in favour, please stand.

Motion 3-83(2), Carried

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Appagaq, Mr. Tologanak, Mr. Curley, Mr. Wray, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Braden, Mr. Butters, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. McLaughlin, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. McQuarrie.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: I will call the nays, but I am sure there were none. Let the records indicate that the vote was unanimous.

---Carried

Motions. Motion 4-83(2), Mr. McQuarrie.

Motion 4-83(2): Testing Of The Cruise Missile In Canada

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

WHEREAS the Government of Canada has decided to co-operate with the Government of the United States of America in the testing of the Cruise missile over Canadian territory;

AND WHEREAS Canada is not legally obligated to co-operate in the testing of the Cruise missile;

AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister of Canada has said: "All new weapons systems are potentially destabilizing", and that "instability is the fuel that feeds the nuclear arms race";

AND WHEREAS the deployment of the Cruise missile represents an escalation in the nuclear arms race;

AND WHEREAS there is a possibility that the proposed tests may result in the loss of a missile or missiles in the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS by its capability of surprise the Cruise missile might well be viewed as a first-strike weapon by the Soviet Union, thus giving likely impetus to even further escalation on its part;

AND WHEREAS there are now in place missiles of various types armed with nuclear warheads sufficient to provide a strategic deterrence to aggressive actions by the Soviet Union vis-a-vis the NATO countries;

AND WHEREAS Canada's commitment to co-operate in the testing of the Cruise missile makes further co-operative commitments such as the positioning of Cruise launch sites in northern Canada more likely;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has proposed to the United Nations a strategy for the suffocation of the nuclear arms race and part of that proposal includes a halt to the flight testing of all new strategic delivery systems;

AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister of Canada has invited the views of Canadians on the matter of testing the Cruise missile, indicating that the Government of Canada is open to a change in policy if it is clear that a majority of Canadians want such a change;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Frobisher Bay, that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories declare its opposition to the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada, and particularly over northern Canada;

AND FURTHER, that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories ask the Government of Canada to reconsider with a view to reversing, its decision to co-operate with the Government of the United States of America in the testing of the Cruise missile;

AND FURTHER, that the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories urge the Government of Canada to refuse to co-operate in any and all future activities that involve an escalation in the nuclear arms race;

AND FURTHER, that the Speaker convey this resolution to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the leaders of the opposition parties in the federal parliament.

MR. SPEAKER: Your motion is in order. To the motion, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I have never done anything more important, Mr. Speaker, that I consider to be more important than what I am going to attempt to do right now, and that is to persuade the honourable Members of this House to support the motion that I have put on the floor, namely, expressing opposition to the testing of the Cruise missile, asking our government to review its decision and reverse its decision and urging our government to refuse to co-operate in further escalation. I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that I were more adequate to the task. I am a middle-aged man. That much is obvious. I hope all Members support my position thus far. I am a middle-aged man. I have no particular hang-ups in life. I have no fear and anxiety about life, very little, and none whatsoever about my death, which must come some day. I say that because I want to demonstrate that this is not a motion put by someone who is hysterically fearful about the consequences of the nuclear arms race. Rather, it is put by someone who loves life. I like the sunshine, I like song, I like children and love, and although I am not fearful of death, given a choice between life and death, I choose life. And as a reasonably sane and stable man, when I look at what is happening in the world I believe that we are sliding to oblivion.

I remember well a statement that I heard on television many years ago by the eminent American engineer and philosopher, Buckminster Fuller, who said that we have reached a very critical stage in the history of mankind. A few among us have had the genius to develop complex technology and power and he wondered whether the rest of us have the moral and emotional maturity to handle what the intellect of some has been able to bring to us. And I deeply question that as well. It appears to me that we are sliding to oblivion. Let there be no mistake about the importance of the motion that has been brought to the floor of this House. It belongs in this House. It belongs in every forum where ordinary people have a chance to say what they feel about their future. It belongs. It is an issue that should be in this House without any question. And I think, because it involves the question of the nuclear arms race, that we are talking about the future of humanity, nothing more, nothing less, and I invite Members to take the motion very seriously. I invite Members to regard it as a question of conscience above every other consideration, economic or political or whatever.

I am someone who very much respects democracy and believes in it, but in reading through the history of democracy I see that it will not work successfully unless its leaders, from time to time on important issues exercise leadership, who do not turn to see what the fears and prejudices of the many might be, but rather themselves say this issue is so important to me and so important to all the people that I represent that I must in all conscience choose a decision and vote accordingly and I ask Members to do that here. In considering the debate today I would ask especially all Members who have not yet decided which way they stand on the motion, if you rise to speak later to express your concerns, your hopes or fears, that you do not commit yourself one way

or the other at that time but wait until the debate is ended, because I know that many, many people have deep concerns about this whole issue. They have fears and they say, "In order for me to overcome those fears there must be answers." Well, I deeply believe there are answers or I never would have put this motion in the first place. As the mover I will have the last chance to speak and it is my responsibility to try to answer the concerns that are raised. So if you have some doubt now, I would ask that you wait to hear the whole debate, that you speak, certainly, but perhaps not make that commitment until the whole debate is in.

I think that there is a danger, in matters like this, of many ordinary people supposing that someone else knows better than they do what is right and good for mankind, and that is an error that we fall into often. It is an error that my honourable colleague from Fort Simpson often admirably overcomes in committee. People start saying, "We cannot do this because of this and this." And Mr. Sibbeston says, "Look, what do we want? And if that is what the people want, we can do it," and it is done often. Please remember that in dealing with these technical issues, if you ask technical people for answers to the problems they will give you that kind of an answer, but the real question that faces each of us is what kind of world do we want? Is it a world without the continual threat of annihilation by nuclear weapons? If the answer to that is yes, then let us do what is necessary to bring it about.

A Long-Term Risk To Security

In order to be able to vote in favour of this motion, some of your fears must be answered. I would like to say that this move that unquestionably complicates the nuclear arms race -- that the testing of the Cruise missile -- is it necessary to our security? That is the very first question that has to be asked, and I would say that surely if it is not necessary then we should not be doing it, because it is an additional risk to our long-term security as a people. Related to that question, is there not adequate firepower right now to deter aggression by the Soviet Union? Well, every Member should know that the United States and Britain and France already have a vast array of nuclear weapons in place that are ready, that are pointed, aimed at the Soviet Union and ready to be released -- intercontinental ballistic missiles, missiles in submarines that are positioned at strategic locations all around the Soviet Union. That is, absolutely, an important question that Mr. Butters raises, "What about the Soviet Union?" I would say that anything that I am saying here applies to the Soviet Union equally, and the kind of appeal that I am making to conscience applies to those people as well. The fact is...

MRS. SORENSEN: They will not hear you, Bob.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Perhaps they will not, although it is not an argument against us doing something about it, if they are not in a position to do something about it. In order to break this kind of psychology, long ago the Great Buddha said: "Hatred does not cease by hatred at any time, hatred ceases by love. This is an eternal law." I believe it is not to be taken literally but simply an expression that where you have honourable people on either side, if they reach a disagreement where there is animosity that you will never alter the situation by continuing to escalate the animosity. Somebody must make an act of trust and if that act of trust can be made without great risk to yourself, then why not make it? President Reagan, for example, I believe regards the Soviet people as a monstrous people, but our own Prime Minister rejects that and has rejected it publicly. He would say that they are honourable people, but we have differences between us and we require this act of trust without jeopardy and that is important.

Deterrent Already In Place

I maintain that there is no great jeopardy in us refusing to assist in the testing of the Cruise, because we already have in place sufficient strength to deter any aggressive act by the Soviet Union. This does not add additional security, but it does additionally complicate the situation. It does additionally increase the risk of accidental war, because we come to rely too heavily on technology, on computer systems and so on. It does increase the risk that we will have a nuclear holocaust that is unplanned and unwanted by anyone, simply because there are high tensions and the weapons are in place and there are hair triggers ready to release them. That is what it does by testing this additional increment, but we do not get any additional security because the deterrent is already in place.

Do we suppose that if the Soviet Union for one moment had an edge in nuclear power that they would immediately use it in order to conquer and occupy western countries and compel them to become communists? I say no. Some people say, "Look at the lessons of history." I agree, learn the

lessons of history, but learn them properly. Do not misunderstand them. Learn them well, and I say if you have a good look at history, you would be forced to conclude that there is not that kind of threat at all. In fact, if there were, we are told that this is a response to an escalation of the Soviets when they put SS20 missiles into Europe in 1977. If that gave them an edge they have had it for five years, but they have not used it for that specific purpose.

And I say that if you will have a look at their ideology you will see that their ideology does not lead to their aggressively trying to annihilate other people or occupy them and conquer them. I agree that it does lead them to subversion and attempting to foment revolution here and there, but that is not met by a nuclear deterrent. That is met by freedom; that is met by the will of the people to continue to live the way they want to live. A nuclear threat does not change that at all. But their ideology does not lead to that kind of occupation and compulsion. Their interests as a nation-state do not lead to that kind of occupation and compulsion.

There are two major powers in the world: the Soviet Union and the United States of America. As nation-states, the most powerful nations want to keep the situation generally the way it is because they have only to lose and not to gain by instability. The realities of military logistics say that they will not invade and conquer and occupy and compel other countries to become communist. They could not possibly do it. They do not have the resources to do it. We have seen examples of where, when that sort of thing is tried, a people that has the will to resist will resist and can resist successfully.

Position Of Government Of Canada

The question might arise, though, does the Government of Canada know something about all of this that we do not know? And is that why they feel compelled to do it? And my answer to that is no. Obviously they do not know something that we do not know, else the Prime Minister could never have made the statement that the Canadian government is amenable to change in its position. Rather, he would have told us, "Look, you may not understand, but I say this is necessary for our security and regardless of everything that is the path we will pursue." But he has not said that. He said if enough Canadians can demonstrate clearly that they want a change in all of this, he is open to change. Surely then he does not know something that we do not know.

Just to sum up that part of it I would say that there is already a deterrent in place. You must ask yourselves what are we gaining by doing this. Are we gaining additional security? The answer is that we are not. What are we risking by doing this? We are risking heightening tensions. We are risking the possibility in those tensions of an unplanned and unwanted war taking place and we are risking increased possibility of accidental war because of the hair-triggered systems we have. To turn just briefly to the "whereases" -- how much time do I still have, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Four minutes.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Four minutes, okay, thank you. With respect to each of the whereases, I will not go into them in great depths since I do not have the time, but Canada is not legally obligated to co-operate in the testing of the Cruise missile. We have signed an umbrella testing agreement, but in each case Canada specifically can refuse. Indeed, Norway, for example, a member of NATO, has refused. Denmark and Holland both refused to have nuclear weapons on their soil, Iceland will neither allow testing nor nuclear weapons on their soil, and yet they are members of NATO. We could refuse and still be good members of NATO. The Prime Minister of Canada in speaking to the United Nations a year ago said that all new weapons systems are potentially destabilizing. They will heighten concerns about a disarming first-strike capability. They will blur the difference between nuclear and conventional war and they will increase the problems of verification. And instability, says he, is the fuel that feeds the nuclear arms race. We would be contributing to instability by contributing in any way to the development of this weapon.

I think I will just turn to a wrap-up rather than dealing specifically with each of the whereases. If there are particular questions on them I hope they will be raised during the course of the debate and I will attempt to answer them later. We really do not need this weapon for our security, and indeed I submit that we and all mankind will be more secure without it. In asking Members to support this motion, I am not asking you at all to do something for me. I am asking you to do something for yourselves, for your children and for all mankind, because it can be done without any

additional risk to yourselves, and if that is the case -- and to myself as well -- why not do it? In the last little remaining time, once again I would just urge Members that if they have not yet decided which way to vote, please do not make an early commitment. Raise the concerns and in the last portion I will try to address any concerns that are raised within the time limit available. Thank you very much.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Patterson, as seconder, do you wish to speak at this time?

An Issue Of Conscience

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It always is very difficult to second a motion from the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre because he speaks with an eloquence I am sure I will never attain, but I would like to say that I, without hesitation, can endorse fully everything said just now by Mr. MacQuarrie. I would like to say that I feel very much that this issue, although it might be seen to affect particularly the people of the Mackenzie Valley over whom this missile will be tested, certainly affects all the people of the Northwest Territories and indeed the people of Canada and the people of the world. This issue must be seen as an issue of conscience ultimately, and as an issue that crosses, should cross all political and party lines. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I too am deeply concerned about the issue of testing of a carrier for a nuclear weapon over the Northwest Territories. It troubles me greatly. I think it should be dealt with seriously by every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that arms escalation will lead to peace. In my career as a lawyer I have had the sad experience of dealing and analysing the anatomy of a murder case, where human failings result in the death of a human being or human beings. This is a sad experience for all concerned because life is precious, life is sacred, humanity is sacred, and I ask all Members of this House, recognizing that this issue is part of the accelerated arming of the eastern and western blocks with holocaust weapons, if we care about human life, how can we encourage what would result in the murder of the human race if there should be a war through human failing or otherwise?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the arms race is now perpetuating itself, that the military-industrial complexes, the technocrats, are feeding off the weapons game in each block, reinforcing each other. And this issue of Canada's involvement tests us as a nation. Are we in the back pockets of the US? Some people in this House believe, I know, that the issue here is the threat of communism, that there are communists ready to invade the Northwest Territories and that we must support the arms race to protect ourselves. Now I think Mr. MacQuarrie has clearly stated why this is not a question of self-defence. The people of Russia, the men, women and children of Russia are innocent people no different from us. They are just as anxious for peace as we are, Mr. Speaker. They are just as outraged, they are just as outraged about the shooting, the alleged shooting of the jumbo jet the other day.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: They are human beings no different than us. They are not the enemy. The enemy is the war machine and I say why should we be part of it? I do not believe the testing of this missile or the deployment of this missile is necessary to balance Russian strength either. All I have heard leads me to believe that France, Britain and the US are already way ahead.

Opportunity To Be First Jurisdiction To Take A Stand

Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to be the first jurisdiction in Canada to take a stand on this issue, although there is a motion before the legislature of Manitoba, proposed to the House by the premier, which urges that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Government of Canada not to promote the testing or the development of the Cruise missile or any other military hardware intended to be used in the development of nuclear weapons. We have a chance, in the very jurisdiction which produced the fuel which led to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to state that we believe that this madness has to stop.

I believe that the United States government is very anxious to test the Cruise missile over northern Canada. They tested 50 missiles in the US and two of those missiles have been lost. One, I understand, was never recovered. It was never known where it ended up. The northern terrain will be even more challenging for the guidance systems. While I accept, from the information I have received in my capacity as an Executive Member, that there is such a tiny danger of injury to persons or the communities near the test site or indeed the environment, while I accept that, I do think that the testing in this environment is very important to the successful development of this missile in view of the apparent uncertainty of its navigation system as illustrated by the four per cent loss rate in the US tests. So I think our position on this in the jurisdiction over which the main testing is to take place could be very important for that reason.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of an opportunity to test the Cruise missile in the Northwest Territories is not going to cripple the US military giant. I am confident that the people of the Northwest Territories do not want to see this testing take place. The Inuit Circumpolar Conference held in Frobisher Bay voted unanimously against testing or location of nuclear weapons in the circumpolar countries and I would urge the Members of this Assembly who represent Inuit constituencies to bear this resolution in mind when they vote.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a little phrase that is on the door of my assistant's office here in Yellowknife that I am always seeing, especially in my capacity as Minister of Education, that I think I will leave with you, in this debate. The little note says, "It will be a great day when our schools get all the money they need and the air force has to hold a bake sale to buy a bomber."

MRS. SORENSEN: Hear, hear!.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: We have got our priorities wrong in this world and I think it is time that the people of the Northwest Territories, through us, expressed their profound concerns about the future of the human race. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. We will adjourn for 15 minutes. I will recognize Mrs. Sorensen immediately after coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

I call the House back to order. Mrs. Sorensen, to the motion.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in any debate, you must have two sides and I would like to present the other side to this very important issue. May I first say that the issue of the Cruise missile has not been an easy one for me to deal with. I, too, love life and I certainly love freedom and neither am I an hysterical person, nor do I see communists under every bed, nor do I see them coming across the North Pole. Up until this morning, I have had one position one day and the very next day have changed my position, only to return again to my previous thoughts. So it has been an issue I have wrestled with, and, after a great deal of soul-searching, Mr. Speaker, I still do not feel that I am ready to accept the fact that the Cruise missile represents any more of an escalation in the arms race than the Soviet deployment of the SS20 missile aimed at Europe and carrying a triple warhead. There is no doubt that this deployment, which began in 1977, as Mr. MacQuarrie has pointed out, was a destabilizing move which posed a direct threat to the security of the NATO countries of which we are a part, and that threat resulted in the decision by the NATO members in December of 1979 -- not just recently, but in 1979 -- to counter the Soviet threat with the decision to deploy in 1983, later on this year, the Pershing 2 missile and the ground-launched Cruise missiles in Europe. This request, Mr. Speaker, came from NATO countries in western Europe, such as West Germany, not from the United States.

Effect Of Deterrents

Mr. Speaker, the move and the counter-move is the essence of the arms race, and I agree with those who say that it is senseless, that it is senseless particularly since both the communists and the western world already have enough nuclear capability to destroy our world many times over. The only

thing that makes this insane policy of terror bearable to me, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Soviet Union and the Americans are actually negotiating to limit land-based intermediate range missile systems. Whether the negotiating being done is in good faith or not remains to be seen -- but they are talking. Recently, as late as Friday of last week, we have reports that the Soviets said Moscow would be willing to liquidate any medium range missile, including the triple-warhead SS20, that would be pulled out of eastern Europe under an arms agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MRS. SORENSEN: It was the first such offer made publicly by the Soviets and, I believe, directly related to their efforts to stop the NATO planned deployment of the Pershing 2 and the Cruise missiles later this year. The question, Mr. Speaker, has got to be, would the Russians have made that offer if NATO had not countered with a threat of its own -- the threat of the Pershing 2 and the Cruise missile? Mr. Speaker, this threat and subsequent actions by the Soviets raise doubts in my mind about the criticism levied by some that a policy of deterrence, a policy of terror -- and I agree that it is terror -- does not work. Perhaps it is crazy, perhaps it makes no sense, but does the western world have a choice? I am trying to wrestle with that and I am trying to determine whether we do or do not have a choice.

Look at the facts. The facts are that the Soviets deployed the SS20, aimed it at western Europe in 1977. Western concern was raised and western Europe asked NATO to help. NATO countered in 1979 by saying that by 1983 Pershing 2 and the Cruise missiles would be deployed to counter the SS20. But they gave them four years warning on it and Soviet concern was obviously raised. Then the Soviets, last Friday, have made a tentative offer to reduce the number of weapons aimed at western Europe. Negotiations on that offer will resume on September 6 in Geneva. The question is, would the Soviets have considered backing off if NATO had not made the counter-threat? Cynics on both sides of this issue would say that such talks and negotiations are doomed to failure. Well, that is where I believe Canada should come in.

Role Of Canada

I believe we have a strong role to play in breaking this one-upmanship war game, this giant leapfrogging that we seem to be involved in. I believe that Canada must be the voice of reason in this, through its Prime Minister and through our External Affairs Minister. We must be the buffer between the superpowers. We can perform, Mr. Speaker, an important service to the people of the world if we make a strong commitment to world disarmament and develop a strategy to work toward this. That is what we should be demanding our government do. But, Mr. Speaker, at the same time I do not believe that we should shirk our responsibility. As long as we are a part of NATO, we must be supportive of its two-tracked strategy on the arms race. The first part of that strategy to try to get the Soviets to reduce their SS20s, which are deployed and ready for mass destruction of western Europe and which were not necessary because the Soviets already had SS4s and SS5s and nobody was complaining about those nuclear arms, but because nobody complained, it is my opinion that they said, "No one is complaining; maybe we should go a step further", and they developed the SS20.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MRS. SORENSEN: The second part of that two-part strategy is to begin negotiations between the Soviets and the US to limit land-based intermediate range missile systems on both sides. And we are seeing that happen. We will see a meeting in September of the superpowers on this issue.

Canada's Position In NATO

If we wish to withdraw, Mr. Speaker, from NATO, then obviously we are not going to be bound to the two-track strategy. But in 1969, this country reaffirmed, after review, its commitments to NATO and to NORAD. While it is true NATO has no legal requirements for Canada to test the system that is being suggested now, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Canada has a moral requirement as a member of NATO to do its part or to withdraw from NATO. Testing this guidance system is our acceptance of our NATO responsibility. To me, nothing is clearer than that. I believe Mr. MacQuarrie's motion should have been directed toward that issue. Should we be in NATO or should we not? That is the essence of the question, and I think that is what this motion should have directed. That is a whole different type of debate.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else which I would like to raise at this time. I think it should be understood that under present government policy, Canada is a denuclearized zone in NATO. With the F-18s, the government has taken away any need for nuclear weapons to be stationed in Canada. I

do not believe that there is a threat that the Cruise missile will be stationed in Canada's North. At least we have to make pretty clear that we do not want it to be stationed here, and that perhaps should be the essence of another motion. I think that we should continue that policy, that this House should pass a resolution to call for the government to continue to keep Canada nuclear free, as the Inuit did at the ICC Conference this summer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, let us debate whether we should stay in NATO or not and let us give clear direction to our government on that issue and on the issue of a nuclear-free zone. I think we should be careful too, Mr. Speaker, of being too self-righteous, and we must be careful of being too hypocritical. No matter how pacifist, neutralist and non-aligned we become in the future, if we leave NATO we will continue to live under the protection of the US nuclear umbrella. If we did not have the US as neighbours, would we be spending far more on our military personnel and our military equipment, money that would be redirected from medicare and education and infrastructure? I suspect we would spend more if we did not have that US protection since no Canadian would want its government to leave its citizens undefended. Part of being in NATO is a sharing of defence costs and responsibilities.

Single Issue Politics

Mr. Speaker, I have another issue which I wish to raise, that of single issue politics. I have been a great one to encourage people who wish change to use process to do it, to lobby, to write letters and to support candidates for election who are sympathetic to the concerns of whatever the lobby group is concerned about. At my constituency meeting the other night, it was made quite clear to me that if I vote the wrong way on this motion, I will not be supported in my re-election campaign by certain individuals. Mr. Speaker, I accept that. I certainly feel that it is the right of my constituents to work and vote for whom they please. But I also believe that single issue politics is wrong, that what we require in government are thoughtful, well-prepared, well-rounded individuals capable of making decisions which are in the best interest of the community, the province or territory, or indeed the country, depending on what level of government one is. Because a candidate rejects the Cruise testing does not make that person a capable politician. Likewise, those who support the Cruise testing are not necessarily the best politicians either. It is dependent on what they do in their daily lives and how they conduct themselves on all issues that is important. My point again is that single issue politics could destroy our political system. This concerns me and I refuse to make a decision to support or not support this issue based on who will or who will not work for me in the next election.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Poll Revealing Support For Government Decision

MRS. SORENSON: Something else, however, has helped me to make up my mind, Mr. Speaker, although it was not the total deciding factor. I did a poll in Yellowknife South. A series of eight questions were asked by nine well-respected Yellowknife community surveyors. A total of 420 names were chosen at random from the last municipal voters list, and each was called sometimes two and three times if they were not home the very first time. Of those on the original list of 420, 42 per cent responded; five per cent refused to participate; and 53 three per cent were out of service numbers, on holidays or not at home.

To the question, "Do you think the Canadian government made the right decision in allowing the testing of the unarmed missile in the Northwest Territories?", 50 per cent of the respondents in Yellowknife South responded yes; 31 per cent responded no, and 19 per cent responded undecided. Mr. Speaker, to the question, "Do you think the Cruise missile is necessary?", 49 per cent responded yes, 28 per cent responded no; and 23 per cent were undecided. To the question, "Should Canada belong to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or NATO?", 80 per cent responded yes, two per cent responded no, 12 per cent did not know enough to comment on it, and six per cent were undecided.

Mr. Speaker, my poll was professionally administered. I had assistance from a political scientist on the questions and on the methodology. I chose individuals that I respect and admire and who are not directly linked with a strong pro or anti movement on the issue, to do the surveying. I had circulated the questionnaire to key individuals in the community for critique on bias and so on, including members of the Peace Movement. I will be releasing a more detailed analysis of the poll.

Initial results do reveal, Mr. Speaker, that my constituency supports the government decision to test the Cruise missile. They do not like it; that was made evident to the surveyors time and time again. It does not mean that they are consenting to carte blanche on all decisions of this nature but, for now, the majority in my constituency feel that the government has proceeded with the right decision on this issue. The 80 per cent support for belonging to NATO, in my opinion, gives tacit support to Canada to do its part to maintain the integrity of that organization.

Issue More Complex Than Cruise Missile

Mr. Speaker, for all those reasons, I find I must vote against this resolution. I believe it zeroes in on a single issue, that of the Cruise testing, when the real issue is whether we belong to NATO or whether we do not, whether deterrent policy is a good policy or whether it is not, whether we should have nuclear arms or whether we should not. Right now, the accepted policy of the nuclear arms race is the balance of power and NATO's two-track strategy. Unless and until Russia is prepared to meet the western world at the negotiating table to stop the escalation of the arms, until citizens of Russia are allowed to demonstrate freely and to tell their government in a free and open way how they feel about the arms race -- because I too believe that they are genuine and sincere people, as Mr. Patterson has revealed, but so were the Germans in the second World War -- until those things happen, I fear the balance of power strategy will remain. I do not like it, but I feel it will remain.

Mr. Speaker, until we create something in lieu of the military game, such as searching in outer space for minerals, such as educating and feeding the world's illiterate and hungry; until we convince the economic elite of the world that their greed will be met with new goals rather than those involving military weapons and nuclear arms; until war does not serve to raise countries and politicians from the ashes, such as what has happened to Margaret Thatcher in Britain with the Falkland Islands crisis; until we have good will and a sense of being citizens of the world rather than our own insular communities, then I fear man is doomed. The issue is so much more complex than the Cruise or no Cruise. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion. Mr. Braden.

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be very brief. Mrs. Sorensen has raised a number of the points that I intended to cover, so I am not going to belabour the issue. However, I would like to say at the outset that I respect that there are Members of this House and many Canadians who have a very legitimate and sincere concern about the expansion of the nuclear arms race. I think that while it might be naive, all Canadians are looking to the day when the threat of a nuclear holocaust is behind us. However, I think, and I said this the last time we had a discussion of this nature in our Legislature, I think what our leaders have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to continue to work at the negotiating table and to force the Soviet Union and the United States to dismantle the immense arms arsenal that they have developed. And this I see is the only productive course for the future.

Balance Of Power

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons why we are in the mess that we are in now, in 1983, is because we had a weak Democratic president of the United States in the 1970s. The United States, in my opinion, definitely lost ground in the balance of power during the reign of Mr. Carter and now what we have down there is the right-wing backlash. And I do not purport to support or reject everything that Mr. Reagan does, but I think because of the situation in the 1970s when we had the Russians invading Afghanistan and we had the horrible incident in Teheran where a number of American citizens were held hostage, we have a situation where the United States is trying to make up for lost ground. Now, while threats are thrown back and forth by the Soviets and the Americans, and these are threats that are legitimate cause for concern, I think Mrs. Sorensen in her remarks has demonstrated how a tough stand of NATO and the United States is starting to bring about a hint of positive results in negotiations.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: And it is about time that that positive attitude has come about. Now, in respect of Canada I believe that we have a responsibility to NATO. I believe that our pitiful military record during the past 14 years is perhaps a function of the party in power, the attitude of the Prime Minister and other Liberals toward the military. I think that what is happening now is a recognition that Canada has to play a much greater role in the defence of the western world than it has in the past, and I say that with all due respect to the present federal Government of Canada.

I will have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was moved by the statements of Mr. MacQuarrie and Mr. Patterson. I think that no citizen of the world or citizen of the Northwest Territories or whatever wants to see his home, family and environment destroyed in a war, and those statements, Mr. Speaker, had an effect on me. However, I cannot support Mr. MacQuarrie's motion. I believe that what we have to do is encourage our leaders to get the United States and Russia at the negotiating table and to use whatever means they can, whether it is through the United Nations or whether it is through having some of our senior statesmen work with other world leaders to convince the two major superpowers that continuing on with the expansion of the arms race is ridiculous and dangerous to us all. I see that as the only course they can take and if we encourage our leaders to reconsider the decision that they have made on this particular issue, and on others, I think what we are doing is falling into the trap that Mr. Carter fell into in the United States in the 1970s. I do not see that disarmament is just a one-way street. It is a two-way street and negotiations will be tough and they will take a long time, but I think with that kind of approach we hopefully will see some light in the future to save the world. Thank you very much.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Braden. To the motion. Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in my remarks regarding the particular motion. I cannot profess to take the same position as Mr. MacQuarrie. Perhaps that is because I am older. I am not really reconciled to death yet, although I do know it is coming. Perhaps as one grows older one gets a little more hesitant about it and I want to say with apologies that regardless of how this goes I would much prefer to be called Duke, not Nuke. So I want to get it straight.

Evaluation Of Tracking System

I would just like to make a comment on some of the "whereas" clauses that Mr. MacQuarrie has in his motion. First, I want to take issue with the opening "whereas" clause in which it is stated that Canada has decided to co-operate with the government of the United States in the testing of the Cruise missile over Canadian territory. When people think of a Cruise missile, those of you who are the same age as I am, will recall the V-2 rockets of World War II, and they think of that kind of a missile, but this has a nuclear warhead on it and it is going to come into the Northwest Territories and it is going to blow great holes in our particular terrain. That is the impression, I think, that people have when we say we are going to test the Cruise missile, and I suggest to you that in this particular "whereas", that is not so. Canada is not testing a Cruise missile. It is evaluating the tracking of the particular pilotless aircraft approximately 20 feet long. It is not armed because, as Mrs. Sorensen correctly put it, Canada since the 1970s has been a non-nuclear nation. Its forces do not have nuclear weapons of any kind. In fact, from the early 1970s and even in our NATO commitments, we have got away from nuclear weapons. We do not develop them, we do not produce them. So when we are looking at the motion itself where it says that there is a testing of the Cruise missile over Canadian territory, it is not a testing of the missile itself. It is an evaluation of a tracking system. And so I have to take issue with that.

I think as well that in some of the other "whereas" clauses where Mr. MacQuarrie's motion states that the tests may result in the loss of a missile or missiles in the North, well yes, they may and they may not because the track record of the testing that has gone on in the past certainly does not suggest or lend any great fear that this missile or a number of missiles are going to be lost. And if it were lost, and it is not nuclear armed, what harm is it going to do, being 20 feet long? A third issue that I would like to raise is in the very next "whereas" clause where the Cruise missile might be viewed as a first-strike weapon by the Soviet Union. If we are going to be sitting here and thinking that the Soviet Union do not know as much about that Cruise missile as ourselves or even more, they know it is not going to be a first-strike weapon. It does not fly that fast; at 500 miles an hour, 800 kilometres an hour, if you like, it is going to take a while to get there, and a first-strike weapon it is not.

Regarding the clause that suggests that there are enough missiles in place now that we do not need any more, that is questionable, given the kinds of things that Mrs. Sorensen replied to, and it is certainly questionable in the eyes and view of the people that we have looking at our particular defence system, our military people. I do not agree as well that the positioning of Cruise launch sites in the Northwest Territories or northern Canada is likely to come about because of an evaluation being made on a path which this particular pilotless airplane, if you like, will fly down. I do not think that necessarily follows.

Raising Unnecessary Alarm

Finally, the comments that Mrs. Sorensen raised, the pertinent point of the deployment of missiles in Europe and of budgeting moneys in our federal government are the kinds of comments that I would have made as well. I agree with what she is saying and I do not intend to reiterate them. I believe that this country's position of being a non-nuclear country and of this country's strategy of a negotiated solution that will make deployment of new missile systems in Europe unnecessary -- I agree with that and that we should not be supporting a unilateral disarmament. The government believes that negotiations will not succeed if we show signs of weaknesses and I would associate myself with that particular policy of the government, and as such, I cannot support the motion because I think that the motion is raising even more of a spectre of unwarranted difficulties and raising of alarm because it is not, again not, the testing of a Cruise missile. It is an evaluation of a flight plan. That Cruise missile is not armed. Canada has declared itself, it will not have nuclear arms in the country, and for that reason I think that we are indicating more of an alarm amongst the people than the particular test or evaluation of that flight pattern, if you like, will in fact do.

I have been satisfied with the briefing that I had, that Mr. Patterson had, in terms of the harm that it will do in environmental, social, anything at all in the Territories, and I do not believe it. I think there are enough failsafe mechanisms within it that there will not be a particular difficulty in evaluating this test pattern flight path from off the Beaufort down into Cold Lake. So for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against it.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion, Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too, like my friends Mr. Patterson and Mr. MacQuarrie, fear the balance of terror which is being used to keep a so-called stable peace in the world right now, and I have seen the movies and read the books which most of us have, in the 60s and 70s, which portrayed trigger-happy colonels who are the defence in one of the major nations of the world, either the United States or the Soviet Union, overreacting and causing a situation which have led or did lead to global conflict. It is timely that yesterdays incident with the Korean commercial airliner being shot down over Soviet airspace is a good example of how these things can get out of hand.

Mr. MacQuarrie talked about history lessons we should all have. My father had a history lesson and my uncle had a history lesson he died from, and that was the lesson of the western democracies being unprepared and not believing that the Germans would invade, expecting they would never do something like that; being unprepared, having the British army with actual carved wooden cannons on their coastline just to make the Germans think that they had weapons when they did not. So that is a good history lesson of what happens if you let the other side know you are down, especially when the other nation you are dealing with is a cold-hearted, totalitarian state, where no freedom of speech or democracy is allowed -- that is the type of people we have on the other side of the so-called line. There are no people marching in the streets of Moscow. There is no assembly anywhere in the Soviet Union where its citizens -- as Mr. Patterson said, the citizens, the ordinary people in the Soviet Union, do not want to have global war, a nuclear fight, but probably neither did the ordinary German people before World War II.

There is no doubt in my mind that this type of nation we are dealing with would possibly take advantage of us being down. There is a paranoia. Both countries probably do have, although they maybe do not want to announce them publicly, first-strike scenarios, and that is the thing we have to worry about. We have to have the other side think that if they make the first strike, they are going to suffer, and there is no assembly like this in the Soviet Union, where people can get up and criticize their government and embarrass ministers without having to take a short trip to Siberia.

Responsibility For Defence

It is not easy. Sure I do not want to have Cruise missiles flying over our heads here, but we have a responsibility. It has to be tested somewhere, and maybe somewhere in our country. I think maybe a clearer statement by our government would have helped a little bit. Maybe we should be looking at the idea of using these Cruise missiles by launching them in the Arctic and having them head south over the Northwest Territories, we should be making sure our DEWline stations are upgraded in order to defend against such a missile. Maybe that is part of what they are doing but it has not really been put out that way.

So there are bigger questions here and they are, do we stay in NATO or do we get out? Then do we hope the United States will defend us, because we hardly have a navy anymore? So how are we supposed to protect our coastline and our own air? Or do we spend the dollars ourselves to take care of all this defence? I put it to you that by being united with our neighbours and our allies in these democratic western nations, we are sharing this defence of our continent with the United States and we are sharing the defence of freedom and democracy in the West.

So this is not, as Mrs. Sorensen said, a one-issue question. I am against the balance of terror, but we are in it, and the other side is in it and we cannot get out of it if the other side does not get out of it. So though I am very sympathetic with Mr. MacQuarrie's statements and Mr. Patterson's statements and I understand their feelings and fears, and I have those same fears, the reality of the situation is there is another side -- and it is a cold-hearted, totalitarian state, which is paranoid just as, maybe, the US government is paranoid about what the other side might do. We do not dare let down, or let them think we have let down, because both sides do have first-strike capabilities and we are in a situation where it is going to take both sides at once doing something and, maybe through the United Nations, when the Soviet Union agrees to have a United Nations group inspect all their sites and disarm at the same time a similar group disarms in the United States, fine. Then we can talk like this, but you cannot do it on a one-way street. So I will not be supporting the motion, I will be voting against it.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. To the motion. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion either. I regret that I did not have the opportunity to do the research that was carried out by the Member for Yellowknife South and in so speaking today I can only say that I speak for myself personally, because I have heard from none of my constituents with regard to their concern on this matter. I represent a constituency in which a large percentage of our population are military personnel and the dependants of military personnel. They have been in that community for as long as I remember and their presence in northern Canada is directly related to the fact of the cold war which began immediately after the hot war ended in 1945. Also, a few miles away from my constituency is the DEWline settlement of Tuktoyaktuk, and one of a series of DEWline sites that stretch across the North as an early warning system on aggressive acts that might be taken by our neighbours to the North. I expect that the mover of the motion and the seconder find the timing of their motion a little awkward in view of the death of 265 innocent victims over the north Japan Sea...

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Not at all.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: ... of which 11 are Canadian. Obviously, the detecting abilities of that nation would be such that they could determine that they were zeroing in and taking out a commercial airliner. In fact, I would say, sir, that if this motion passes today, we, this group, in the whole western world would probably be the only agency or group that is giving comfort and encouragement to the USSR.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. TOM BUTTERS: When the mover of the motion asked me yesterday how I would be voting, I was discussing the requirement that if we do not learn from the lessons of history then we are bound to repeat those lessons, and, as Mr. McLaughlin pointed out, one of the lessons that was learned in 1939 by a gentleman who came back from Munich with an umbrella and told his people that there is

peace in our time, found that there was death and destruction for six years ahead, and he was a living example of the type of philosophy that is being put forward by Mr. MacQuarrie and Mr. Patterson today.

I would like to do as Mr. McCallum did and look at the "whereas" clauses, because I think that many of them are misleading, and they should be examined in that light because, theoretically, the basis of the motion stands on the validity of the "whereas" clauses. The first clause notes that "whereas the Government of Canada has decided to co-operate with the Government of the United States of America in the testing of the Cruise missile over Canadian territory". Mr. MacQuarrie did not mention in his remarks that the decision to co-operate with the United States was made in debate in the House of Commons when my representative who sat in this House a few moments ago had an opportunity to speak in that debate and did speak in that debate and supported the position, as I remember, of the Government of Canada. But a debate did occur and that decision was based on the support of the Members of the House of Commons.

Moral Obligation To Participate In Program

The second "whereas" clause mentions that Canada is not legally obligated to co-operate in the testing of the Cruise missile and that is true, but we are morally obligated to co-operate in the testing of the Cruise missile. As both Mrs. Sorensen and Mr. Braden pointed out, Canada has been remiss in its contributions to NATO in past years. We have been looked at by our allies as somebody who is not pulling their weight and we have an obligation to our NATO allies to take part in this testing. If we do not accept and fulfil that obligation, then we should do, as Mrs. Sorensen suggested, discuss removing ourselves from that organization. That is the question, whether we are part of the NATO brotherhood or we are not. So we have at the present time a strong moral obligation to participate in this program.

The mover quotes the Prime Minister, but the Prime Minister also indicated his support for the testing of the Cruise missile, as I remember. Mrs. Sorensen argued the point of the escalation of the nuclear arms race very well and I will not cover that ground, but it is not an escalation, it is a balance that is being achieved.

"And whereas there is a possibility that the proposed tests may result in the loss of a missile or missiles in the Northwest Territories". That, as Mr. McCallum pointed out, is a very minor possibility. It is a small craft that is unarmed and it will be guarded and guided, as I understand, by overflying aircraft. The chances of loss, as I say, are negligible.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Four per cent.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: A lot has occurred since the tests that took place in the southwestern United States, Mr. Patterson, in terms of technical controls. And then the "whereas" clause which says "And whereas by its capability of surprise, the Cruise missile might well be viewed as a first-strike weapon by the Soviet Union, thus giving likely impetus to even further escalation on its part". That is totally false, totally false. The Cruise missile is a weapon of retaliation. It travels at 500 miles per hour.

"And whereas there are now in place missiles of various types armed with nuclear warheads sufficient to provide a strategic deterrence to aggressive actions by the Soviet Union vis-a-vis the NATO countries". Mrs. Sorensen's argument, I think, quite clearly demolished that "whereas" clause.

Canada's Position On Nuclear Weapons Unchanged

"Canada's commitment to co-operate in the testing of the Cruise missile makes further co-operative commitments, such as the positioning of Cruise launch sites in northern Canada more likely." That is most unlikely with the Canadian position that is being accepted. We are a nation which could probably develop a nuclear bomb but we have not done that. We have stayed away from being involved in the nuclear arms race. We have never developed our own nuclear weapons. With the addition of the new CF-18 aircraft being deployed, the last nuclear weapons capability that this nation might have will also be removed. Then Canadian Armed Forces will neither possess or have the capability

to use nuclear weapons of any kind. We have not allowed the assembly, transportation or storage of nuclear weapons on a Canadian territory in peacetime, with the exception of the limited air defence capability mentioned above. Canada's non-proliferation safeguards policy is being developed to ensure that our exports of nuclear material, uranium, do not contribute to nuclear proliferation. So that everything that this nation has done in the nuclear age has been to render that "whereas" clause not only redundant but false. We have not moved in that direction. There is no indication we have moved in that direction and I have not heard any political leaders of any political party saying we will.

"Whereas the Government of Canada has proposed to the United Nations a strategy for the suffocation of the nuclear arms race, and part of that proposal includes a halt to the flight testing of all new strategic delivery systems". Certainly Canada has been in the forefront of attempting to bring the major powers to their senses; but this motion will not in any way contribute to that initiative. The motion itself suggests almost that if you voted against it, in some way you favour nuclear war, that by not supporting this motion, in some way you are supporting the concept of a holocaust, which is not at all true.

Motion Suggests Position Of Weakness

The concern I have, as with yourself, is a personal concern. I served in a war that was brought on by a weak leader. I do not wish to be part of that situation again. The proposal that Mr. MacQuarrie is making can only encourage the USSR to look upon Canada as a weakling in the unity of NATO countries. The concept that I see him putting forward, somehow, is that weaker is stronger, and I have never found that to be the case. The Ukrainian people in the USSR probably have had the most difficult dealing with the Russian nation of any group of people in the world. There is a maxim that the Ukrainian people have, and that is that if you want to get a Russian's undivided attention, you hit him with a two-by-four on the head. This is exactly the way I understand that you would deal with the USSR. You deal from strength and not from weakness, and if we approve this motion, what we are signaling to the USSR is that we are a nation who deals from weakness.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. To the motion. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: (Translation) Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am going to speak in Inuktitut regarding Motion 4-83(2). It is probably well known by the Inuit; we are told that the Inuit were supposed to support this motion. I just want to talk in Inuktitut reading this information. It seems that I am appealing to you to support this motion; if you are afraid that I want you to support this motion regarding the Cruise missiles -- because they want to test the Cruise missiles in the NWT, because the Inuit people have been listening to this. I do not want them to be afraid of what they are listening to. What is also in my mind is if we are going to be afraid of this, let us just stand back and let them do the work themselves.

Those of us who are the Members of the Legislative Assembly, have to be aware that this was started back in 1979, and the number of the Cruise missiles that was put out was the number 333, including others -- pardon me, 233, plus 999. If we want to stop this, if you want to stop the Americans from testing the Cruise missiles, we would have to inform the others that are involved in this testing, if there are 333 missiles -- if we say it is okay, go ahead, if we say it is all right with us, then there would be more people that would be afraid of this. For example, when we negotiate with the Government of the Northwest Territories, the Inuit themselves look at them as if they are very small. Sometimes when we approach the government, we get help from the government regarding the Cruise missiles. We are not too well informed about the Cruise missile testing. I would like to get more information on this. If I had more information on it, I would be able to make more comments. (Translation ends)

Support Urged For NATO Allies

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go into the reasons why I am not in favour of supporting a nation like United States or Canada in the belief that it can unilaterally disarm itself and expect the opponent to likewise, that it can let down its arms and say, "Let us agree, and sign an agreement." I believe that if we are proposing that we have unilateral disarmament, that we would

be undermining our friends in Europe who have asked for particular assistance in this regard, because they are the ones that are better informed, most likely, with all the details that we have not got here. I would have wanted to be able to have more information in order to make a much more constructive decision with respect to this proposed Cruise missile test in this part of the land. Regrettably, we are faced with having to vote on this motion without asking for a briefing from the military experts or from our friends who are more familiar with this issue.

I want to state, though, that although the motion is very convincing in terms of the possible threat of nuclear arms development, including this part of an area, I wanted to indicate to my constituents that I do not think that we will be in the best or strongest position by having to react or respond to fear. The motion as it is creates quite a fear to those opposing this particular missile test in the NWT. I have not known in dealing with the complex government issues or whatnot, that you are ever able to strongly achieve what you want in weakness and in fear, an inferior position. It is not possible. You cannot negotiate and expect the other side to have a comparable possible agreement, at a disadvantage. You will always be given a disadvantage or inferior deal if you are starting from the weaker position. I believe the people, the NATO experts, are saying to us "We know what we are talking about. We are at the area where there is a possibility of the most activities in terms of possible nuclear war. But we believe in order to reduce nuclear arms build-up in that area, that we have to negotiate from the position of strength." I believe that is what they are asking their Canadian friends to do. I as a person who fears this very subtle threat of the communist influence, believe that this threat, in my view, of communism should not be taken lightly. I believe we have not enough information to make a unilateral decision today. You have to let our friends in Europe, particularly the members of NATO to let go, and not give this possibility of establishing our strength for a negotiating strategy, and if we let that opportunity go, I am not sure how we are going to achieve the possibility of a balanced arms build-up. I, too, am not in favour of any possible war. I certainly do not believe that we ought to carry out any development in terms of that, but in order to negotiate with Russia, experience I think has shown that you cannot negotiate with them equally and fairly, unless you are able to deal with them at equal level.

So from this point of view, because I believe that at the present time our friends in Europe, the members of NATO, are possibly in the best position to advise us on that, I therefore am going to have to vote against the motion, not because I am supporting the possible arms build-up or anything, because my conscience tells me that in order to negotiate the reduction of arms build-up with Russia, you are going to have to have a negotiating position. To make unilateral decisions, I think, is not going to help them or help us. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to register my remarks that they in no way undermine the honourable Member's strong case to ban the tests in this part of the area. I would like to let them know that I too am concerned about possible war, but I am not convinced that the testing of the Cruise will likely result in it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Curley. To the motion. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, this matter is of special concern to people in my constituency because they are right in the flight path of the proposed testing of the Cruise missile. The initial reaction of the people to the idea of this test is actually negative, maybe out of ignorance or otherwise, but I must say that the people in my constituency see the idea of testing the missile negatively. They do not want to see it happen. People in my area in Simpson have already seen an Armed Forces plane. One has been seen flying over the Simpson area obviously looking over the terrain and geography in advance likely of the missile testing and people are beginning to be conscious of this possibility, and I would have to say generally there is going to be increasingly more concern.

Mr. Speaker, I am conscious of the nuclear arms race situation in the world and it is essentially a struggle, as it were, between two superpowers, the United States and Russia. Canada, as I understand it to date, is really not greatly involved in the nuclear arms race. The extent of Canada's Armed Forces is very limited. I guess we have a few planes flying surveillance flights around Canada checking the waters and lands and we have the Armed Forces here in Yellowknife and Inuvik. I do not know precisely what they do but we see some presence of the Armed Forces but obviously not on a scale that other countries have. We also have the DEWline in the North and that is a joint effort between Canada and the United States as I understand it.

It seems to me thus far anyway in the world, Canada has a special ability to make moral statements and provide a certain consciousness to the superpowers. It is, of course, a non-nuclear country and is in a good position to do that. In the last few years throughout the world there have been demonstrations, people generally showing concern about the nuclear arms race and really the very real possibility of the superpowers destroying the world if they really began to war against each other. One must say that this demonstration has been good in that it has provided a consciousness to everybody in the world about all these terrible possibilities. I think too it probably puts pressure on the major countries, certainly making them aware that there are many people that are aware of the possibility or the atrocity of having war again.

Canada Should Not Be Involved

One has to take seriously, I guess, the real possibility of there eventually being a war between the superpowers and you have to take seriously the possibility of one gaining great advantage over the other. But I would say, maybe out of ignorance or naiveness, let that race be between the United States and Russia. I say, let us not get dragged into it. I do believe that if we permit the testing of the missiles here in Canada and in the North here that we may be getting ourselves involved. Obviously they are not testing for their health or they are not testing for no reason at all. They are testing with the hope that if it comes down to it they would eventually use that route and who knows what the next stage may be. Perhaps the United States will want to station missiles and have Canada become more involved in the whole warfare and at the moment we, in Canada, are probably in a good situation in the sense that we are not an antagonist in the war, in the nuclear arms race, and we are not a great threat to Russia. I suppose if there was really a war, I suspect that Canada would not be one of the countries that the Russians would want to destroy. Not being involved in the arms race we are in a situation where we are not antagonists and certainly not one of the countries that Russia would likely want to knock off. So better to be alive, I would say. Indeed, if there was a war between United States and Russia, and let us say the likelihood of both of those countries being annihilated, at least in Canada there is a chance of surviving and being alive.

I guess the question that I ask is, is it really necessary to have the testing of the Cruise missile here in our part of the North? Is it the start of establishing more strategic weapons here in Canada and in the North, because we obviously would be seen by the United States as being in a good strategic location to have missiles and other weapons placed because we are relatively close to Russia? So I just say that if, in a small way, by passing this motion that we provide more consciousness to Canadians and to other people in the world, we will have helped the de-escalation of the nuclear arms race. And on that basis I guess I support the motion in the hope that it will really do that, it will provide more consciousness to people in Canada that people of the North anyway are concerned and are opposed to the missile testing. In this way it may provide an incentive or it may be the start of other parts of the country doing similarly. So I will be supporting the motion and hope that a sufficient number of Members do, so that this motion can pass.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. To the motion. Mr. Wray.

Limits To Achieving Position Of Strength

MR. WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened this morning to the honourable Members' comments with great interest because I must admit that personally I have very mixed emotions about this whole issue. Coming from a country that knows the ravages of war and knows what it is to deal from strength, you tend to develop an attitude that strength is right, that that is the only way to work. But there comes a point in time that you have to question how far we are willing to go to achieve this strength. How many times can you kill one person? We already have enough nuclear weapons in the world to kill us all many times over. The Soviet Union is as powerful if not more powerful than the United States, and do not think for a moment that with the development of the Cruise missile, they are going to back off and say, "Oh, well, I think we will maybe reduce our weapons." All they are going to do is pour more money and more time into the development of a weapon which is superior to the Cruise missile and then the Americans will react the same way. This is what has caused the arms race, this fear of both sides that one side must be stronger than the other. But eventually there comes a point in time where technology will run out or our patience will run out, and no new weapons will be developed and somebody will decide, "Well, let us go for it," and that is the end of us all.

I think what we should remember particularly in the Northwest Territories is that we are not going to be immune from any nuclear war. One of the first targets that the Soviet Union is going to go for is the DEWline stations. The scenario, and it is fairly accurate, is that the shortest way to North America is over the Northwest Territories and Alaska and the shortest way to the Soviet Union is over the Northwest Territories and Alaska. Given that most Canadians and most North Americans consider this part of the world to be an Arctic waste, they would have no hesitation at any time of meeting each other right above our heads. I think the people of the North much more than other Canadians should be worried about nuclear war basically because most of the people up here have had to live with the DEWline sites from the very early 1950s. It is a constant reminder of the threat.

I listened with interest to some of the comments that were made by some of the honourable Members and I would like to perhaps correct some of them. There was a comment made that our friends in Europe are the ones who want these missiles because they are the most threatened. But anything I have ever seen from Europe suggests to me that that is not accurate, that in fact the vast majority of Europeans do not want these missiles anywhere. The fact that Norway, Sweden and Denmark, which are European countries and a hell of a lot closer to the Soviet Union than we are, have rejected those weapons says to me that they have no problems in their morality when it comes to nuclear weapons.

We have been told to remember the lessons of history, particularly with regard to my own country. Well, I really do not need anybody telling me about the lessons of history. I had a father who was killed in the war and I had a mother who was machine-gunned several times and those history lessons live with me every day of my life. I have seen what war can do and it is not a very pleasant sight and it is not a very pleasant thing to live with. You know Mrs. Thatcher was elected. Why was she elected? Because she got 800 British troops killed to save an island that means nothing? Is that something we should be proud of, the fact that she sent people down there and spent billions of dollars and is driving a country that is already in debt deeper into debt? Is that something that we should all be proud of? I agree that we cannot show weakness, but there comes a time when particularly we in the western world have to show that we are the most sensible of the peoples in the world, and say, "Hold it." We are already dealing from a position of strength. Not to have the Cruise missile is not going to weaken us any. We are already stronger than they are as it is. So this idea of dealing from strength is I think a red herring in terms of the issue. We can get stronger than we already are, but why should we? Because all we are going to do is put more fear into the minds of the Soviets and you will get a reaction from them and then you will get another reaction from the Americans. So I have no hesitation in supporting Mr. MacQuarrie's motion. I mean, after all, when I spend my last two minutes on the face of this earth, at least I will know that I did something to try and stop it.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wray. To the motion. Last call, anybody that has not spoken to the motion, do they wish to do so? Mr. MacQuarrie, you have the closing remarks.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It appears that not only in this House, but, I know, in many parts of the world, there is still much work to be done in order to help people to have enough knowledge to assess the entire situation accurately and enough trust to do the right thing with that knowledge. It appears to me that if many of the comments we have heard here today are typical of the thoughts and fears of many people in the world, that in the end the worst fears of Buckminster Fuller might indeed be realized. It seems that many cannot rise above a conventional and stereotyped approach to deal with what is an extraordinary and urgent matter. I would like to respond to as many of the points as I can. When I say "as I can", I only mean in view of the time. I found no statement made by any Member in opposition to this motion that cannot be adequately answered, and it is a question of having sufficient background knowledge and sufficient time in order to do it.

Compelled by Circumstances

I find that the general feeling is that Members really do not want to see advances in nuclear weaponry, escalations, but they feel compelled by circumstances to go along with it and I understand that, because in reading the many remarks of our Prime Minister on this matter, I find that is precisely the situation in which he finds himself. Again and again, he makes statements

and judgments and assessments that would indicate we should not proceed any further with this madness, and yet in the end he says, "Let us proceed." It is because he feels compelled, but I deeply believe that the arguments that he finds compelling are not compelling, because they are based on two assumptions. The first is that the Soviet Union is indeed a real and significant and imminent threat to the security and the way of life of people in NATO countries. The second is that whatever threat they pose is best answered by an escalation in nuclear weaponry.

I say that both of those assumptions are very questionable and very vulnerable to challenge. I wonder whether our defence policy, and the defence policy of countries all around the world, is being made as a result of sharp and thoughtful risk analysis and assessment or whether it is being made as a result of paranoia and a shadowy perception of bogey men and, appallingly, I believe it is the latter.

Further Escalation

Mrs. Sorensen indicated that the Cruise is not more of an escalation than the SS20. Mr. Butters said, in fact, it is not an escalation at all. Well, I think a thoughtful reading of what the Prime Minister has said would indicate that he would agree it is an escalation. Mrs. Sorensen said it is not more of an escalation. I agree, it is not more of an escalation, but it is an escalation. I say that the Soviet Union, which is paranoid -- and I will come to that matter later -- will respond with further escalation.

Next, the reason I said in the "whereas" that this missile can be viewed as a first-strike weapon -- and it is not totally false, as Mr. Butters would like to suggest -- we already have huge missiles that are in place to deter any Soviet aggression. If we see their missiles coming these will be released and they know it, and that is what, perhaps, deters them from aggressive action. They will see us building a missile that can be easily hidden in barns, in the backs of trucks, that can be released at low altitudes and sneak into a territory underneath the existing radar. When they see that being built, they would have to say, "Why would they want to build something like that? Is it perhaps because they would like to sneak up on us quickly and knock us out before we know what is happening?" If that is the case and if that is their assessment, their next step will be to develop what is called a launch-on-warning system, which will be a highly computerized system that as soon as it sees the first sign of any Cruise missile stealing across its borders will automatically launch weapons in response. That is the kind of escalation that we have to be worried about, relying more and more on technology rather than on the judgment and the feelings of human beings. That is a tremendous risk.

Mrs. Sorensen says that she is sure the reason that Andropov has decided that he will dismantle some of the SS20's is because we countered with a greater threat. Well, she may be right; I cannot say for sure whether that is it or whether it is not. But I do note that there was a recent change in Russian leadership as well and a change in policy could be coincidental with that. But whatever the reason, is this not then the auspicious moment for us to respond positively and say we recognize that and therefore we will not proceed with this further escalation, as a sign of good faith to respond to what he is suggesting?

Obligations To NATO

Two or three Members raised the matter that so long as we are a part of NATO we have an obligation to NATO. I think I demonstrated very clearly that it is not a legal obligation. William Epstein, who is the Canadian head of the Pugwash movement, was the head of a disarmament committee at the UN from 1950 to 1973, and now an adviser to our own Department of External Affairs, says we have no legal obligation to help the American tests. Canada can reverse its decision without violating its commitment to NATO or to NORAD. So the question remains, do we have a moral obligation? I will be the first to say that every human being has a moral obligation to help those who help him in a difficult situation. So what I am conceding is yes, we have certain friends, we have certain moral obligations to them; but I would say that even in our personal relations, in trying to fulfil that moral obligation to our friends, we never suspend our own judgment as to whether there is a real and genuine threat to our friends. If he is paranoid or drunk or something else, and believes there is a threat and wants us to do some drastic action, though we are friends and would like to honour that, we will still say, "I must judge whether there is the threat that you say there is." I am saying that there is not that kind of threat, though the United States of America claims that

there is. We can fulfil our obligations to our allies in other ways and not have to get into co-operation with this kind of escalation. There is another point. Some Members say we must help with the Cruise, but a little later they say, but we will keep Canada a nuclear-free zone. I say bullshit...

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Oh, here, here, that is terrible.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I will withdraw that remark and apologize, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. MacQUARRIE: If you are saying that we believe nuclear weaponry is necessary and we believe that our country should help in its development, then I do not see how you can take a moral or logical stand, but say we do not want any of them in our country. There is a danger that as soon as we begin to co-operate we will be drawn further and further into co-operation, to the point that we become a nuclear power. With respect to Mr. Braden's comments, I can only say that it is a sad day for me to think that there are people who see a thoughtful approach to a difficult problem, sensitivity, a willingness to accept and extend some kind of trust, as weakness, because if that is the case, the world is doomed.

Mr. McCallum went on about the Cruise missile -- I misled people. Mr. McCallum and I are both teachers and I hate to have to remind him, but I will, that a "missile" is a pilotless projectile. That it is indeed the missile that is being tested, though not the nuclear warhead, and I admit there will be no nuclear warhead on board. It is also a fact that there will be, or there is now, a four per cent loss factor. So that is not trying to scare anybody; that is the way things are at the moment.

Mr. McLaughlin raised a couple of points. He did mention that the USSR is paranoid and I believe the leadership is, in many ways. I try to understand why and I try to understand how to deal with it. I do know that in 1918, when many of those people had fought to overturn a feudal regime, that American and British and some Canadian troops occupied Russian ports to try to turn that around. I do know that the Soviet Union was attacked in 1914 and again in 1940, and that in those two wars, they lost far more than any other country, about two million dead -- dead, not wounded and displaced and everything else -- in World War I; about 10 million dead in World War II. They have a little reason to be paranoid. Perhaps we do too, viewing some of the things they have done. But are we going to make the rest of human history depend on that kind of paranoia? Surely it has to be broken somehow. If Mr. McLaughlin can resign himself to a balance of terror, I do not wish to because I do not think I have to.

I think I have the chance to do something about it and I am trying to. I encourage the rest of you to try to as well. I was never sure, when he talked about the cold-hearted, totalitarian state, whether he merely meant the government or the people; but I have read Russian literature and listened to Russian music and read Marx and Engels and I can assure you that it is not cold-hearted at all. There are people who have the same kinds of hopes and fears that we do and we should handle the situation taking recognition of that.

Lessons Of History

I would have to save my strongest remarks for Mr. Butters because I believe that he was attempting to use scare tactics. He says that my motion suggests if you do not support it, then you favour a holocaust or something. I see nothing of that in the motion at all. I am not suggesting such a thing and did not intend to. I say that people of conscience can differ on an issue like this. But I will say to Mr. Butters who raised, as Mr. McLaughlin did, the question of lessons of history, that I will not stand here and have him tell me that he has learned a lesson from history that I have not. I have read Mein Kampf. I did not learn about it in an afternoon lesson in some schoolteacher's class or on the page of a story in Time magazine. I have read Das Kapital and many other essays of Marx and Engels. I have read the background involved in World War II which he and Mr. McLaughlin referred to. They say the lesson of history is if you are weak somebody will take advantage of you.

This is a very simplistic reading of what happened in 1938 and 1939. Neville Chamberlain, the Prime Minister of Britain, was a prime minister who was an honourable and good man and wished to be moral. I say he made the mistake of trying to use a moral approach in world affairs to the exclusion of any influence of power, and that was naive and that was wrong, and that is why he got into that problem. Is this situation the same? If we decide not to test the Cruise missile are we leaving ourselves weak and vulnerable? And the answer is no. Count them; 30,000 nuclear warheads that the United States has under its control ready to go right now. We are not being left weak and vulnerable by not co-operating with this decision. The second thing is that the parallel with Chamberlain and Hitler is not the same at all, either. Read Mein Kampf and you will see that there was a fascist who believed in a policy of national aggrandizement. He wanted the German state to become strong and powerful and to actively conquer other areas. And so that is the kind of person you were dealing with.

If you read communist ideology, it is not the same at all. Their concern, they say, is that there are, whether you believe it or not, subjected poor people all over the world who should rise up and overturn their capitalist masters. They will not advance their cause by annihilating those poor people everywhere. Surely you know that the song that is the anthem of Russia is the Internationale. Their ideology simply does not lend itself to that kind of aggression and conquest, though, as I admitted earlier, it does to subversion and fomenting revolution and so on; but that is not met by a nuclear deterrent.

Adequate Strength For Act Of Trust

I can only say if you are going to base your decision on the arguments of history, please learn it well before you do so. By not going along with the Cruise missile I say, absolutely, we do not leave ourselves weak and vulnerable. We still have adequate strength and that is why right at this crucial time there is a chance for us to make this act of trust because we can do it without great jeopardy to ourselves. In the Globe and Mail in the few days after the Canadian government made its decision, I read an article that reported on a speech by Admiral Gene Larocque, formerly retired admiral of the United States Navy, who belongs to the Centre for Defence Information. I had not heard of this organization before. It is a group of retired American generals and admirals who, having been through their military career and seen what is happening have afterwards said, "We are alarmed about the nuclear arms race and the possibility of the destruction of the world." In that article Admiral Larocque said that the United States has 30,000 nuclear missiles; that in his opinion it is a Frankenstein that is already nearly beyond control, and that in his estimation the United States is at this time three to four years ahead of the Soviet Union in the development of nuclear weapons. So this is the ideal time for a little sane act of trust.

Mr. Curley said that we ought to get more information from military experts. I respect the military and as long as arms are necessary I respect the profession of arms. I said that in this House once before. But I also recognize that when people are trying to decide issues that are broad and sweeping and issues of conscience, you do not just ask a particular expert what is the answer. Must we take the advice of a dentist as to whether or not we want fluoride in our water? He would probably say yes because his greatest concern is preventing cavities. I say that in this matter we do not have to wait to be told what to do by military experts. Again I say what do we as people want, and set out to do it, and tell the people who are working for us to make sure that it is done.

Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I feel, and I ask Members to think of this seriously, that there is attention on what we are doing here. What will we say, that we are apathetic? That we are just willing to go along with whatever is happening because it is hard to know what the real facts are? That we are sort of acquiescent or that we do not care? I hope that will not be the message. Every one of us is going to have to go away from here today and because it is a question of conscience, say, did I do the right thing? I had the chance and did I do it? Now, I recognize that two people who vote opposite could both go away and feel that; but I would only like to say, having read and thought and discussed this matter for many months, that I know I can go away and believe that I have done the right thing. The question...

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: That makes two of us.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Very good. I am glad of that, Mr. McCallum. Will we break the psychology of escalation when we have the chance to do so without significant risk to ourselves or will we refuse to take advantage of that opportunity? Another question: Will we survive as a race on this earth

or will we not? I say, Mr. Speaker, that they are one and the same question, and that in the small way in which each of us has some impact on the affairs of the world, that question is now in our hands, and I trust that each Member will handle it with the thoughtfulness and the courage that it deserves. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: A recorded vote, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. A recorded vote is being requested. Mr. Clerk, will you handle the recorded vote? All those in favour of the motion, please stand.

Motion 4-83(2), Carried

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Evaluarjuk, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Wray, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. SPEAKER: Will all those opposed to the motion please stand?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Curley, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Braden, Mr. Butters, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. McLaughlin, Mrs. Sorensen.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any abstentions?

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Tologanak.

MR. SPEAKER: One moment, until I get the count. The count, nine in favour, eight opposed, one abstention.

---Carried

---Applause

I believe that completes motions for today.

Item 13, first reading of bills. Are there any bills for first reading? Item 14, second reading of bills. Mr. Braden.

ITEM NO. 14: SECOND READING OF BILLS

Second Reading Of Bill 5-83(2): Judicature Ordinance

HON. GEORGE BRADEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Inuvik, that Bill 5-83(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Judicature Ordinance, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to amend the Judicature Ordinance to provide that the court of appeal for the Northwest Territories sit only in the Northwest Territories and that it sit at least twice a year.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the principle of the bill.

HON. KANE TULOGANAK: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Bill 5-83(2) has had second reading.

---Carried

Second reading of bills. Mr. Wah-Shee.

Second Reading Of Bill 8-83(2): Regional And Tribal Councils Ordinance

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Yellowknife North, that Bill 8-83(2), An Ordinance Respecting Regional and Tribal Councils, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to establish regional and tribal councils.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the principle of the bill. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Member Speaks Against Bill In Principle

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak against this bill in principle. We are on Bill 8-83(2), I understand. Is that right? I am against the introduction of this bill by the government in this session of the Assembly. I think that this represents a very significant step in the sense that we are, by doing it, beginning the formal establishment of what could well become a fourth level of government in the Northwest Territories. That is why it is significant, because there are differences about this legislation in that some of the suggested councils will be formed along tribal lines, and include band council membership. For these reasons, and not because I am necessarily opposed to that, but because these are very significant matters, I believe that this legislation has been introduced too hastily.

I am supported in that at least by letters that were received by the standing committee from the towns of Inuvik and Hay River, who also agree that it is too hasty. We are moving ahead too quickly with this, particularly when it is actually unnecessary.

Some of the reasons that I say it is too hasty are because of some very thoughtful research that that has become available on this matter, and it is one of these books that has been tabled by Mr. Sibbeston, on regional government. In that research there are some very thoughtful questions about the establishment of a regional government. I would like it understood that I do understand the limited nature of the type of government that is being advised.

We would be establishing advisory councils. They would not have legislative power. Thankfully, there is an amendment going to be proposed, I believe, which would allow various communities an opportunity to opt out if they felt not satisfied by the way the regional council served them. So I understand the limitation. I would also say that like most Members here I do want a government that is democratic and responds as much to the people as it reasonably can, but I am not sure that establishing regional councils will establish that. I say that this is hasty, because it is clear that these are some of the questions raised in that research.

Power To Be Effective Is Necessary

But at the moment there is no additional power coming to the Northwest Territories from the federal government. So if these regional councils are to be effective, they must have power; if they have power, it must come from either the municipal governments or from the territorial government. I am not sure that, first, the people of the Northwest Territories generally understand that, and secondly, if they do understand it, whether that is what they would really want.

There is a danger raised in this research that suggests that if powers were to go first to regional governments that this may in fact weaken communities, and yet this government has no official policy of devolution of power to the communities, and that this is a very real concern. I can say that I saw evidence of it in committee discussions. There are certainly some Members who want these regional councils to have power, even to the detriment of communities. So that is a thrust that will be beginning to be more and more evident as time goes by.

In the research, it also suggests that when you establish regional governments there becomes a competition for available resources and that this competition can become quite bitter if you have "have" and "have-not" regions. It suggests that it could even become much more serious if there are divisions along racial or tribal lines, because if one of these areas happens to be the have-not group and is left out, they are concerned that this will entrench divisions between people.

The research suggests that when you implement regional government, there can be increased confusion among people about who is responsible for what. Ordinary people then start turning here or there and everywhere they turn, they say somebody else has the responsibility. The research also

suggests that there could be a great danger. They note that this present Assembly and this present government have become responsive to communities, but it is time-consuming and it is costly. So the question arises, will this government start to find it more convenient just to consult with one regional council and not with the communities at all? Is that something that the people want?

Legislation Introduced Too Hastily

I say that this is too hasty because there have been, on this very significant step, no public hearings or general discussions aided by this research. There have been no specific resolutions from various band councils and communities saying, "We have discussed this matter, and we make the conscious decision that we would like to belong to that regional council." There are no such resolutions. That at least would force discussion on the issue, as to whether people really wanted this kind of government or not, but there have been no such resolutions. There may have been in the odd place but what I am saying is it is not part of the legislation to call for that. The legislation simply says these communities are in this regional council, and for me, I have to say I do not even know if they want to be. I was assured by some Members in some cases that that was so, but I do not really know.

I say that this is too hasty because we now have pending municipal legislation. A paper has been put out designed for devolution. I would like to see this government proceed with that first, clearly establish the municipal structure, clearly devolve whatever powers are going to be devolved, and then allow the communities to come together in regional groups and say, "We feel we can handle this item best by joining together with other communities." Great, this may not happen here.

I say that this is too hasty, because this is the last session of the Ninth Assembly. We should not rush to impose this legislation on the next Assembly, and we should not rush to impose it right at a time when the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum are discussing fundamental political change, and yet this is going to pre-empt an initiative there. The reason I have this concern is because once implemented, it would be hard to withdraw from that position if it later appears to be necessary. The established regional councils will become one more lobbying body that will be pressing to make sure that regional government absolutely is a feature of the constitutions of the eastern and western territories.

Legislation Unnecessary

I have said that it is too hasty, and I also said I particularly do not like to see it because it is unnecessary. We now have operating on an informal basis -- well, Baffin region is on a formal basis, but other regional councils are presently operating on an informal basis, and being funded by this government. I say there is no harm in leaving that situation as it is. Continue that informal practice until some of these other matters are dealt with adequately and we see from experience whether what we are doing is right or not.

So I just say finally, this should not be passed until there is the research discussed, there is public discussion, there are resolutions from communities, devolution to communities and the passage of the design for devolution and a chance for WCF and NCF to look at it.

I am not necessarily opposed in the long term to regional government. It may well be evident, eventually, that that is the way we have to go in order to handle our problems adequately in the North. But I say it is something we should approach with more caution than is being demonstrated by the government here.

Motion That Second Reading Of Bill 8-83(2) Take Place Six Months Hence

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I will move that Bill 8-83(2), An Ordinance Respecting Regional and Tribal Councils, be read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day, six months hence.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to the motion? Mrs. Sorensen. To the motion.

MRS. SURENSEN: Mr. Chairman, Mr. MacQuarrie asked me earlier if I would second his motion. After discussing with him the information that he has received as the chairman of the legislation committee, and after he had discussed the book that we have just recently had tabled in the House

called "Regional Government" as prepared by the Western Constitutional Forum, I find that I have not had enough information available to me to be able to accept this proposed legislation at this time. I think the points that Mr. MacQuarrie have made are very good points and points that this Legislature should consider very, very carefully before moving into this new legislation. Therefore I would ask Members to seriously consider the motion to delay for six months this important legislation until we have had time to review the documents that we have just had placed before us in the recent couple of days.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

MR. WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. MacQuarrie cannot win them all the time. I cannot support his motion. We in the regions have been looking at this matter now for close to a year, a year and a half, and I would suggest to the Members that if they had wanted more information it was readily available. This legislation is the result of many, many meetings in the communities, of many, many meetings at the regional level, and it is our opinion that a fourth level of government is needed just because of the largeness of this area and the diversity of the regions. I am sorry, but we cannot support Mr. MacQuarrie's motion on this. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion. Mr. McCallum.

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, may I just ascertain from Mr. MacQuarrie through you, sir, if that was the report of the standing committee on legislation or was that Mr. MacQuarrie's own personal -- that he has stepped aside from it?

MR. SPEAKER: I understand from the manner in which it was brought in, he spoke against, on second reading, against the principle of the bill. I accepted it as his own opinion, not that of his committee. Now, if that is in error, Mr. MacQuarrie, you can correct me.

MR. MacQUARRIE: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: I have heard question being called. Mr. Wah-Shee.

HON. JAMES WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to disagree with the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre, is it? I would have to indicate to the Members of the House that this is not a piece of legislation that is coming before this House that has taken us only a month to put together and without consulting the people in the communities and the regions. I would have to say that the whole discussion in regard to regional councils has been ongoing long before Bob and I were elected to this House. So obviously it is a request that is coming from the people in the communities and from the people in the regions. My feeling is that a lot of work has been done by my staff in the Department of Local Government, a lot of work through the various regional offices, elected people in the communities, particularly the municipalities, and in the Mackenzie area the chiefs were involved because they were at the regional meetings. Certainly the matter was discussed in the individual communities as well so the legislation that is coming before you for your consideration has had a lot of input from the people. I do not agree that it should be delayed. I feel that this legislation should be considered by the people and we should do it now.

Motion That Second Reading Of Bill 8-83(2) Take Place Six Months Hence, Defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie, do you wish to close the debate? Are you ready for the question? All those in favour? One. Opposed? It would appear that the motion has been defeated.

---Defeated

In view of the hour, Mr. Clerk, have you announcements and orders of the day, please?

HON. ARNOLD McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, Mr. Wah-Shee moved a motion for second reading. I am not sure it was voted on.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry; you are absolutely correct. We are beyond our time but with the indulgence of the House I will proceed with the vote. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Bill 8-83(2) has had second reading. Thank you.

---Carried

Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Announcements, Mr. Speaker. There will be a meeting of the standing committee on legislation 9:30 a.m. Tuesday, September 6, in the caucus room.

ITEM NO. 18: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day, Tuesday, September 6th.

1. Prayer
2. Members' Replies
3. Oral Questions
4. Written Questions
5. Returns
6. Ministers' Statements
7. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
9. Tabling of Documents
10. Notices of Motion
11. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
12. Motions
13. First Reading of Bills
14. Second Reading of Bills
15. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills, Recommendations to the Legislature and Other Matters; Bills 11-83(2), 3-83(2), 12-83(2), 13-83(2), 1-83(2), 8-83(2), 2-83(2), 5-83(2), 6-83(2), 10-83(2)
16. Third Reading of Bills
17. Assent to Bills
18. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. This House stands adjourned until 1:00 p.m. Tuesday, September 6, 1983.

---ADJOURNMENT

Available from the
Publications Clerk, Department of Information,
Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, N.W.T.
\$1.00 per day; \$30.00 for 1st session, \$20.00 for 2nd and 3rd session; or \$50.00 per year
Published under the Authority of the Commissioner
of the Northwest Territories