

Supply

Commons" on this cover of the so-called report. This other one is in a better form and should have been a press release. As a press release, that can be done. It was a very happy thought that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) had in describing it as a press release.

With respect to the actual status of minority reports, it is worth recalling Beausnes's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fifth edition. I would like to put this on the record, Mr. Speaker, because it is important that the status of this report be recognized across this land for what it is: it is a press release.

Section 641 of the fifth edition of Beausnes's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, page 202, reads:

(1) If a member disagrees with certain paragraphs in the report—

And we were preparing a report, Mr. Speaker, in the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

—or with the entire report, he can record his disapproval by dividing the committee against those paragraphs to which he objects, or against the entire report, as the circumstances of the case require; and he can put on record his observations and conclusions, as opposed to those of the majority, by proposing an alternative draft report.

The second paragraph of this particular section reads as follows:

(2) While the opinions of dissenting members may be included in a committee report, no separate minority report may be tabled in the House.

None has. There is no such thing as a minority report. Yet we hear the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) describing it as "the minority report", which it is not.

Mr. Blaikie: It is, whether you like it or not. You just held it in your hand.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Or as the "minority committee's report", which it is not either, Mr. Speaker. Beausnes describes very clearly that when a report is being prepared, those who object to paragraphs or to the whole report may have their views expressed in that report before it is tabled.

● (1700)

A very wide spectrum of views was expressed in that committee. As has been mentioned, there was a wide spectrum of views ranging from those of Arbatov on the left through to views from the right. In order to accommodate that spectrum we compromised throughout, until the last two or three days. Then those who dissented and did not feel they had received enough concessions no longer showed up. They went off to prepare their press release and had the audacity to present it to the Canadian public as a minority report.

Mr. Sargeant: That is a lie.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): They used House of Commons stationery, and I think that is absolutely inexcusable. I will therefore continue to call it the "press release by the dissenting rump".

There is one other aspect of the report which I find regrettable. Three weeks ago the chairman of the committee

tabled—in both official languages, as is the practice—the full report in this House. I have a copy of it. It is on legal-size typewritten paper. There is not yet a bound report. Today, three weeks later, there is no bound report for distribution to those concerned. However, meanwhile this press release has been distributed far and wide. Even with the Post Office conditions we have in this country, there has been time for it to come back from the extremities of the land to Ottawa with the request that we subscribe to it. There is no regular report ready for distribution, and I find that rather regrettable.

The reports of the special committee on the disabled, the special committee on reserves and the special committee on alternate energy sources and a number of other committee reports were bound. I think it was done in the case of the special committee on federal programs financing. That was done quickly. Why we should have had to wait three weeks for the final edition of this full report I do not know. In fact, during question period I tried to ask the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) if he could explain why we have had to wait three weeks for that full report. Perhaps when he makes his contribution to this debate he will be able to tell us why there has been no final version of that report so that we might send it to those who contributed to the hearings and are interested in the outcome of our report.

I also find it curious that six members out of the 30 should consider themselves anything more than just 20 per cent of the committee. They have elevated themselves to a prestigious position and circulated misleading advertising.

I want to refer briefly to this press release since it is actually before us. I think one might even say the motion before us could be ruled out of order because the words used are improper. The words should be: "That this House supports the press release on security and disarmament signed by six members of the standing committee." Nonetheless, it has been widely circulated and there are some interesting observations in it, one of which I would like to examine a little more closely. It has to do with a nuclear freeze.

There is a notion today that rough parity exists between the superpowers. That is referred to somewhere in this press release, and I think it is worth while to ask ourselves just how the conclusion that there is a rough parity was reached. At page four of this particular version, the press release says:

Because the Soviet Union has a significant advantage in intermediate-range missiles currently aimed at western Europe, NATO feels it necessary to deploy new single-warhead missiles in European sites.

Then the next paragraph states:

There is, in short, rough parity today between the superpowers.

I do not know where these hon. members were when Dr. Lindsey was speaking to us. "Rough parity" is a strange way to describe the missile situation in Europe at this particular time. Not many people were privileged to receive copies of the report of the hearings of this committee, and I therefore feel it very important that one, or perhaps two, paragraphs from one particular day's testimony be put on the record of *Hansard* so