

Supply

Ms. Jewett: We had to issue it to show that we were not in entire agreement with the majority statement. Our motion calls upon the Government to adopt the United Nations resolution as policy—

Mr. Chrétien: Stop there.

Ms. Jewett: —thereby rejecting the position of the previous administration.

Mr. Chrétien: That has nothing to do with the resolution.

Ms. Jewett: It has. It makes it very clear that the Canadian House would be taking a position for the first time that is contrary to the position taken—because these resolutions have come to the UN every year—by both the previous Government and this Government.

Ms. Copps: You are playing politics and you know it.

Mr. Deans: That is what you do.

Ms. Jewett: Maybe it is politics, but I think it is very important for all of us in this House to make a fresh start on this issue. The best way to do it is to vote for the UN resolution that we have presented.

Mr. Deans: Why do you not move to amend it?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Tremblay) for a question or a comment.

Mr. Tremblay (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I had a brief comment to make. The NDP does exactly what I said it did a while ago, namely criticizing for the sake of it. With this resolution, the NDP wants to prove once more that it is on the side of virtue. Most often, this virtue remains undefined, but when we look at something like this resolution, it becomes quite clear that the NDP motion is already outdated. In other words, far from leading the way, the New Democratic Party is lagging behind. In addition, the Official Opposition plays its official role quite well and shows itself as it really is because, while agreeing on the balanced position taken by the Government, it criticizes the form rather than the substance of this position in the absence of certain people. It does so through the subtle remarks made by Members of Parliament and former Members. This really shows the Opposition as it really is, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, if I may, I would like to tell the Minister for External Relations (Mrs. Vézina) that her balanced position could not have been better explained, expressed and defended than it was by the Hon. Minister herself, and I am quite proud of it.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The period for questions and comments is now over. We shall now resume debate. The Hon. Member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins).

Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, first with all due respect to the junior Minister, I think she is to be congratulated for being here and for doing her best under very difficult circumstances. I think it is a tragedy that the Government elected with the largest majority in Canadian history is sitting here today with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) absent when we are debating a motion that affects the very lives of the people of this world. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Coates) is away at meetings and has been away at meetings, so I do not criticize him in the same way in this regard.

I have known the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) for a number of years. I have great respect for her, but I would like to say to her that no person and no political party in this world has a monopoly on all the answers. I do not think that the subject should be projected in that manner.

The Hon. Member also talked about nit-picking. Any political party or any leader in the world today who works sincerely for peace is not nit-picking. They are seriously discussing all the parameters of the issue and searching for a solution. I think it is unfair to say just because people are discussing a subject that they are nit-picking. This is far too serious for that type of language. This is a complicated and tough issue and is one that will not be settled tomorrow.

I would like to say to the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam that if she learned more about the military community of Canada she would have a better appreciation for the work it does not only in Canada but around the world. The actions of the military have saved a great many conflicts in this world.

Mr. Blackburn (Brant): What has that got to do with the motion?

Mr. Hopkins: In the motion today the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam said that Russia is already moving toward a freeze. Why not? The Russians have all their SS-20s in place in Europe and the NATO powers are only in the process of installing their Pershing IIs to upgrade our missiles. It is very easy when fully armed to the teeth to say: "Boy, I am all for the freeze, I am all for peace, and I want the world to know it". If a freeze came about today, the fact of life is that the free world would be in danger of being walked over right through Europe. Then we could imagine what would happen to North America.

● (1250)

This issue is a very complex one. There is no simple answer. However, there must be a solution toward which we must all work together. Einstein said something years ago which is very applicable to this motion and to the debate today. He predicted that the day would come when the human race would focus its attention on mankind rather than on arms. Virtually this is what is happening in the world today. Naturally there are different viewpoints as to how to arrive at a safe society for the