

Supply

Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) and that socialists would share the same view internationally. But since they were so much in favour of NATO, I had to reassess my own understanding. If my hon. friend from New Westminster-Coquitlam said that her views were in my best interests, I would suggest to her and members of her party to reassess their thinking about NATO. I realize that there is division in their party about NORAD and NATO. Obviously, if it is good enough for socialists in Europe to be strongly devoted to NORAD and NATO since it demonstrates an air of solidarity in the western world, it should be good enough for the NDP and for all Members of Parliament. As well, the foreign minister for the Republic of Germany has rejected the nuclear no-first-use proposal and has reiterated his country's support for NATO's doctrine of flexible response as the only plausible deterrent against aggression and political pressure at any level.

It is interesting to note that those who propose the no-first-use of nuclear weapons to counter a conventional attack, in my opinion, ignore the fact that such a renunciation would require the NATO countries to increase their conventional forces considerably. I wonder if the supporters of that resolution are advocating that kind of build up. If they are not, I suggest that their view is full of inconsistencies and would weaken the security of our European allies.

An hon. Member: What is security?

Mr. Prud'homme: I am asked what security is. In my opinion, security does not mean naiveté. I believe that it is absolute madness to be spending over \$5 billion for armaments in the world when that money could be used for development in other areas. Security also means being sure about your sincerity about disarming and using that vast amount of money to combat ignorance and poverty and to help people throughout the world. Security means to be able to believe that the other side is equally sincere and that it is not trying to take advantage of my sincerity to build up better armaments and force me into a position where I have no choice but to give in to their demands and conquests. To me, this would be security.

I will say in the House that I have absolute understanding for the views expressed in the minority report by those six members. My difficulty is reconciliation and finding a way to harmonize the views of those groups who are well intentioned. I predict that the question of nuclear armament will be the question of the 1980s. It will be the issue which will animate the students and all concerned people. It is my hope that the other side will be equally concerned. I do not like to say "the other side" but it is those groups who do not share the same sincerity. I hope the hon. member who is about to interrupt me will be quiet. I will not say who he is, but he was very rude this afternoon to the hon. member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appoloni) when he called her speech stupid. I call that intolerance, when we all agreed this afternoon to extend the time allocated to any member and he refused to give that courtesy to the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro). I ask, in all sincerity, why there are so many people, when we begin to debate the question of disarmament, who

fight each other in the name of disarmament. It is similar to people killing each other in the name of God, be it in Iran or in Northern Ireland. I saw the same intolerance when a colleague of mine went to speak at a university. He was violently attacked by ministers or members of the clergy. They were discussing disarmament with as much sincerity and as much desire to arrive at a conclusion. I do not understand that. I always try to see not what divides people, but what could happen there. Accordingly, I will conclude by saying—

• (2110)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, following the speech of the chairman of the committee on external affairs, I think it would be appropriate for me to say on behalf of members of the committee that we did appreciate the chairing job that he did. He did it with appropriateness and competence, and for that I commend and thank him.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wenman: I would like to preface my remarks tonight with a theme which I think should be kept constantly in mind throughout my presentation. There is a consensus in the House. The Progressive Conservative Party agrees, the security and disarmament committee agrees and I agree that there are no winners in a nuclear war, or any other kind of war for that matter. Therefore, the maintenance of peace is the highest priority for all rational thinking men and women in this country and of this world. That consensus is, in fact, the consensus which created this debate, which created this committee, which created this report and which propels this debate forward in the House today.

In the next 20 minutes before I end this speech, it could begin and it could be all over at the same time. If a one megaton bomb were dropped 20 minutes from now on the centre of downtown Toronto or downtown Vancouver, within a two-mile epicircle of blast there would be instantaneous incineration into millions of pieces of what were 200,000 or 300,000 Canadians. In a two mile to six-mile circle from the centre, there would be instant blindness for those who turned to look at a fireball many times brighter than the sun. There would be instant deafness as eardrums shattered. Lungs would collapse and there would be fatal third-degree burns which medics could not treat, even if they had the capacity and competence to do so. Within that circle, everything combustible would instantly burst into flames. Even beyond that six-mile distance from the centre, flying objects would blast through windows and walls. Within a 12-mile circle there would be continuing damage and, above all, a mass of charred, irradiated bodies fleeing, dying, struggling their way from the epicentre of the blast. Conditions would be intolerable as a result for those beyond the 12-mile centre of the blast. Some people would survive.