

Supply

McKinnon) mentioned Mr. Arbatov. Mr. Arbatov is a Soviet citizen. He is an interesting person, in fact extremely interesting. He was more interesting to people like me who have not had too much experience with the Soviets. We have read about them and seen them on television, but we have not met them face to face. On that occasion in committee, we were able to talk to Mr. Arbatov, who, by the way, is cited as being one of the top people of the Soviet Union. He is somebody to whom we should listen. It was fascinating to hear his testimony. If anyone is following this debate, he should ask for the minutes of that particular meeting at which Mr. Arbatov was present.

● (1650)

Mr. Arbatov, for instance, had no answers to my colleagues who specifically asked him: "If the Soviet Union is so interested in peace and disarmament and brotherly love, what are you doing in Afghanistan?" Mr. Arbatov told us: "Oh well, the Soviet authorities had to fight the bandits." The bandits—in Afghanistan! Since when does Mother Russia have to send in tanks and a lot of people just to fight a few bandits, ill-paid, ill-clad, ill-equipped? Is that the Soviet idea of security?

We talked about Poland. Some of my colleagues were very intimately concerned with Poland, they themselves being of Polish ancestry. What did Mr. Arbatov have to say about that? Why are the Russians in Poland? Is this security? If so, whose security? Russia's security? Do they really need to invade an innocent country just to keep some bandits in check? Do they really need to invade Poland? I do not think the Polish army was a big threat to Soviet security. I do not think the Polish people are, who, if we understand them and agree with the reports we have, are not very well paid at the moment. So what do they want in Poland?

That is what is happening today. People who cannot defend themselves, like the Poles and Afghans, are being put under the bloody boot of Russia. What are we going to do? We will freeze our nuclear armaments? It is almost funny to think of this in Canada. We do not have nuclear weapons. But now, even if we do not have them, there are those among us who will say that we should not even let the Americans, our best allies and perhaps ultimately our only defence against the big boot of Russia, even attempt to test the mechanism of one of their weapons. I wonder how irresponsible we can afford to be—unless, of course, we do believe in the good will of the Soviet Union.

Having listened carefully to Mr. Arbatov's testimony, having read many, many papers on the whole situation, having served for two years—perhaps the finest two years of my life—with the Department of National Defence, I am not convinced, Mr. Speaker, that peace is uppermost in the minds of the Soviet Union. No one can convince me to that effect.

The hon. member for Victoria mentioned Sweden. Sweden does not belong to NATO, nor to NORAD. Sweden spends much more of its GNP on defence than we do, very much more. Do hon. members know what happened in Sweden not so long ago? A Soviet submarine got into one of the bays in

Sweden. It was not just an ordinary submarine, it was a nuclear one. I did not hear any protest. I did not see any protest marches in Toronto or in Vancouver or in Winnipeg or anywhere else in Canada. I did not see any marches of protest against the invasion, which it was, by a Soviet nuclear submarine into Swedish waters. No, no, we were very quiet. I did not see any demonstrators going to Litton Systems in Toronto because a Soviet submarine had been in Swedish waters. No, no, we did not do that.

I think we have to be extremely consistent, Mr. Speaker, in our approach to what is happening. No one, especially those of us who are interested in defence in this Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, wants war. Many of us know what war is. We do not have to read textbooks, we do not have to watch war movies, whether from the American point of view, the British point of view, the Japanese or the German point of view. We do not need that sort of propaganda because we ourselves know what war is and we do not want to repeat it for ourselves or much less for coming generations.

However, it is because we know what war means—

Mr. Blaikie: You don't know what nuclear war means.

Mrs. Appolloni:—that we are more concerned than ever to make sure war does not happen again.

Mr. Blaikie: Do you know what nuclear war is?

Mrs. Appolloni: If war can be stopped, it is by deterrent. If the hon. member across the floor can give me a proper deterrent which will not be just idle words, I will accept that deterrent.

Mr. Blaikie: Have you ever been in a nuclear war?

Mrs. Appolloni: Other than nuclear. In the absence of a deterrent, I will take the nuclear any time. We have to stop war. That is what we are talking about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wenman: That is the point. She has not been through a nuclear war.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): This is a very important debate, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad we are having this opportunity to examine a matter which has been altogether neglected here for too long. I regret it is being brought forward under the misapprehension that we are discussing a minority report. There is no such thing, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, in Canadian parliamentary practice as a minority report.

I regret and deplore that a document such as this, bearing the Coat of Arms of Canada and the heading "House of Commons of Canada", should be circulated throughout Canada in this form, or in this other form, also carrying the Coat of Arms of Canada, suggesting that the House of Commons has approved this particular package of words.

I do not know whose paper was used for this particular operation, or who authorized the use of the words "House of