

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): There could be no more of a destabilizing element in those negotiations or in the escalation of the threat than that particular initiative by the United States.

I want to point out that members of the Liberal Party in this House have been the only ones who have consistently argued for an active interventionist, international Canadian role. That is why during the motion on arms control in this House before Christmas, we proposed an amendment to a motion from the NDP which motion rejected the Liberal tradition of realism in the arms race. We voted unanimously on that amendment, despite some of the comments afterward. In fact, when we talk about shading a view, I notice the statements over the past weekend of the Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) to the effect that her party, the NDP, should review the opposition to the NATO Treaty. I am very interested to see the comments on the monolithic unity of that Party on this issue in subsequent weeks.

We seized the opportunity to put before this House sensible propositions which would have sent a clear message to both superpowers to put on their agenda for these negotiations the negotiation of a mutually verifiable nuclear freeze with reductions, strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, renewed emphasis on mutual and balanced force reduction talks in Vienna, those talks having broken off, the moving up in the United Nations of the special session on disarmament which is now scheduled only for 1986, an agreement to ban the testing of high altitude anti-satellite weapons, star wars, about which I have been talking, and to refine and improve nuclear weapons verification techniques. In short, our idea was that the Parliament of Canada could send a clear, unanimous message to the two superpowers to find agreement on these issues.

That amendment was rejected by both of the other Parties, too locked in to the left and the right ideologies to support constructive dialogue between the superpowers. The point is that the possibility of nuclear confrontation is not just an issue for the superpowers. It affects every man, woman and child on this planet.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): Every Government speaking on behalf of Canada has the duty to speak out for constructive dialogue on this issue and to put pressure on both superpowers to find a solution. I see the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) in the House. I am glad he is here because the issue is important. In response to a question before Christmas from my colleague from Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), he accused that Member and indirectly the Members of this Party of being anti-American in taking this point of view. I say to him that it is not anti-American—and I do not stand in his shadow in wanting a better enhancement of our relationship with the United States—to insist on an independent foreign policy and to look at this most crucial issue in the eyes of humanity and in the eyes of most Canadian citizens. He said in New York that Canada is open for business again. I always

Disarmament Talks

thought that this country was open for business. Whatever point he was making in New York, I say to him that we may be open for business, but we are not up for sale.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): This means sometimes having the courage to tell our friends the truth. My caucus and I are deeply disappointed that the Government has rejected the opportunity to follow that tradition and to accept that duty. I urge the Minister and the Prime Minister to move the active quest for peace up somewhat higher on the Government's agenda.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) for renewing the practice of making a statement on motions and enabling the two other Parties in the House to respond to it. Like the Minister and my colleagues, and I am sure his colleagues—I really do not know where the Liberals stand—I am pleased to say to the Minister on behalf of my colleagues that the foreign ministers of the two superpowers did in fact agree to at least start talks. We have no idea whether any positions have changed, softened or anything, but it is in the interests of world peace, if we ever reach it, that negotiations do proceed.

I was a little disturbed to see them broken into three baskets in the way they were. Many of us would have preferred to have seen negotiations on intermediate and strategic weapons joined. I would have liked to have the view of the Minister on that matter.

I would also have liked a further explanation from the Minister as to what the U.S. and the Soviets mean in the communique by saying that the negotiations will address "a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms with all these questions considered and resolved in their inter-relationship". I wonder if the Minister's envoy to Ottawa succeeded in explaining that to the Minister because I know that the Minister takes a rather dim view of bureaucratise. I take it to mean that the three sets of talks will be linked and there will not be a simple dealing with only one set of negotiations and then going to another and then to another. Since they are not merged in a single basket, it is absolutely essential that there be very close links among the three sets of talks.

The rest of the Minister's statement addresses in an extraordinarily convoluted way the strategic defence initiative of President Reagan. I find that the Minister has basically taken his advice on this from the United States Department of Defence rather than taking any independent advice. For example, he said that it would be premature to draw definitive conclusions about the SDI. He says that given the extraordinarily complex technical questions that it raises, it is obvious that it is a highly hypothetical concept. That is what the United States Defence Department is saying but that is not what most of the ablest scholars in the United States are saying. In fact, they are saying quite the opposite, that we do