

Supply

The Government makes many arguments to excuse not voting for the nuclear freeze. Let me point out another "picky" argument that it uses. It is that the negotiations to secure a freeze would be as lengthy as the negotiations on reductions. It says that this would hinder the negotiations on reductions.

No one has ever suggested that negotiations on a mutually verifiable freeze would not be lengthy, but that is no reason for not proceeding with such negotiations. All those who have advocated a freeze have said that these negotiations should be followed by massive reductions. That is what this resolution says. I cannot emphasize too strongly that while negotiations must take place for both, a freeze must come first. The massive reductions come later.

I believe that until Canada follows its friends in NATO, its friends in the United Nations and the ANZUS Pact, all of whom have seen the logic and reason for voting in the United Nations for a freeze, this country will not really be facing the nuclear peril.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, while the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) concentrated particularly on the Cruise missile in her remarks about nuclear weapons systems, I am sure she would agree that the same would be true of nuclear battlefield weapons such as artillery shells and mines. I believe she stated that the location and numbers cannot be verified with respect to those weapons. She has indicated that many nuclear weapons cannot be verified and I agree with her.

I think she will agree that she could amend that statement to include "without on site inspection". In other words, if both sides would permit on site inspection, we could verify all nuclear weapons. However, the Soviet Union will not permit on site inspections, which confirms her statement that the location and numbers of these weapons cannot be verified. If that is true, how can she and her Party advocate the logic of calling for a mutually verifiable freeze? How can she call for a verifiable freeze when she also stated explicitly that verification is impossible? Would she not agree that it is better to call for progress where progress is possible rather than advocating what is clearly impossible, according to her own arguments? Would we not be better off to advocate progress and strategic arms reduction, to start talks where verification is possible?

Would it not be more wise to advocate, as Mr. Trudeau and members of our Party have advocated in the past, that we try to make progress where progress is possible? A verifiable situation is idealistic and she stated accurately that verification is impossible under the current policy of the Soviet Union. Why advocate the impossible when we can perhaps achieve progress by advocating the possible?

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Hon. Member was present during all of our hearings on verification. Therefore, he did not hear some of the arguments made by people such as Harriet Critchley. The difficulty is that even if all nations agreed to on site verification, it still would not be possible to make that verification. That verification would be difficult, particularly with the submarine-launched Cruise mis-

sile. Even if there was agreement, there are no technical or other means to verify the numbers and the locations. It is too easy for either side to cheat and that is my point.

As far as ground-launched missiles are concerned, which are easier to verify, we are moving toward an agreement with respect to on site verification. My point is that even if both sides agreed in principle to on site verification, according to most expert opinions I have read we would be unable to verify in practice something like the submarine-launched Cruise missile. Neither side would be able to know the numbers or locations for sure. That was my point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I recognize the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) for a question or comment.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, it would be for a comment—

● (1240)

[*English*]

I have a comment and then a question, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt that I regret very sincerely that the resolution of the New Democratic Party was couched in a way which extremely embarrassed many people. The New Democratic Party knew that by blaming the past administration the Official Opposition would not support an amendment like that when a good percentage of the people here, including myself, were part of the administration, and supporters of the administration in the case of back-benchers. They cannot blame themselves for what they did yesterday. My colleague has a different vocabulary; he calls it cheap politics. But I would rather say that I regret sincerely this resolution.

I know my esteemed colleague the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) worked very hard in the Standing Committee of External Affairs and National Defence. She said earlier on: "On the committee of security and disarmament we put forward a minority report". I would like her to attest to the fact that she did support the report as her colleagues did. We all supported a diluted report, I admit, but she supported it because in order to be "more liberal" in our approach, for the first time we allowed a minority report to be part of the majority report. I want to be clear and I want the record to be clear, for future reference by students and readers, that the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam did sign and accept the report on security and disarmament. The Hon. Member only added a minority view. I want to be clear even for myself.

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, taking the Hon. Member's points in reverse order, the practice is that when a majority does agree to a matter in a standing committee the whole committee is listed. It is as if it were a unanimous report: all committee members are listed. That is the practice. Therefore, I was listed along with five others. The only route we had to go was to issue a separate statement which we called a minority report.

Mr. Prud'homme: It was in addition.