

*Nuclear Armaments*

• (1730)

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young) for his presentation of this motion because it is efforts such as this by public figures that make it possible for organizations throughout the world to take action.

I also want to congratulate the organizations on disarmament and other anti-nuclear organizations whose persistence in many of these nations has made this a cause of the public rather than a cause of the few.

I sometimes wonder what kind of world we would have today without those small groups of anti-nuclear activists, who march in the streets and demonstrate in front of the City Hall in Toronto or Vancouver. If they were not there to pressure the Government to put the reins on the development of nuclear weapons, what kind of world would we have? What kind of world would we have if the public did not take an interest in limiting nuclear arms?

I can only imagine the horror of what might have happened if there had not been organizations that dared to stand up and oppose the war machines of the world. I think, for instance, of the group holding hands around the nuclear base in England. This is the type of action that brings the concern of people to the attention of Governments throughout the world. If these groups were not persistent in making their views known throughout the world, there would probably be a much greater prevalence of nuclear development and armaments throughout the world.

We must give all our support to this kind of public intervention. I join an anti-nuclear march whenever I see one because I think it is that type of support that allows people in nations of the world to speak out against the development of arms that can destroy the world.

This debate has taken place on several occasions, and we hear the same arguments which attempt to negate the support we wish to give disarmament groups. However, I believe that the passage of such a motion for a nuclear weapons free zone would send a message that we not only support peace, we are willing to send a political message throughout the world that Canada is ready to take a decision on disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. As long as nuclear weapons exist, there is always a chance they will be used.

The U.S.S.R. and the United States will retain those nuclear weapons for as long as they believe a nuclear deterrent is required. Presently, discussions are taking place in an attempt to reduce the number of weapons in the East and the West. However, if the U.S.S.R. and the United States believe they require a nuclear deterrent, why is it necessary for other countries to be part of the nuclear armament structure?

If Parliament is unable to pass a motion such as this, we will not be encouraging the development of the peace movement, or even giving the current disarmament discussions the support that is necessary in order to succeed. While this motion will

have no effect on the deterrent force of our allies, it would send a message to the rest of the world that there should be no further development of arms that can eventually destroy the world. Once the button is pushed, it makes no difference whether these weapons are designed for first use or for defence.

If the number of nuclear weapons free zones throughout the world increased to the point where the majority of countries declared limits as suggested in this motion, nuclear armed countries like the U.S.S.R. and the United States will perhaps listen to what we say.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part briefly in the debate on the motion moved by our friends to the left on August 31. First, I want to say that this issue is quite serious. On the one hand, we have heard some of our colleagues in this House support a motion to have Canada withdraw from the nuclear club. On the other hand, others say that agreeing with this motion would displease our allies since we could no longer take part in some aspects of our agreements with them.

• (1740)

[*English*]

The issue before us is indeed one that is of unimaginable proportion. In 1945, the first atomic bomb was exploded in the desert of New Mexico. From that point on life itself changed. Man and humanity had created the power to destroy itself. We cannot change that. It has happened. It is here and here to stay. Some people will argue that since the Hiroshima disaster, the so-called theory of mutually assured destruction has worked. Mutually assured destruction is abbreviated as "MAD" and there is something to be said for that abbreviation.

Of course, not only do we have mutually assured destruction in the event of a war but at the present rate of building up nuclear armaments, we have in fact mutually assured destruction whether we press the button or not at some point in the future. The point I am making is that in everyone and every thing there is a margin of error. The people who work in nuclear silos, the people who operate that machinery, and even the decision makers are not beyond the potential situation of making an error. Sooner or later—hopefully, much, much later, or not at all until we have totally dismantled nuclear warheads—we will have an error of some sort. Obviously, given that there is no room for any error, that day could be quite sad, not only for the people who started the confrontation, not only for the other side, but potentially for everyone.

The Secretary General of the United Nations gave a speech to the UN General Assembly on December 12, 1984. He described the situation I have just outlined with the following words:

No ideological confrontation can be allowed to jeopardize the future of humanity. Nothing less is at stake: Today's decisions affect not only the