

Geneva negotiations when the President says, as he did yesterday after the Summit, and I quote:

Frankly, my own opinion is that the negotiations won't really get down to brass tacks until they—

The Soviets.

—see that we are going forward with the scheduled deployment.

“—going forward with the scheduled deployment”. Is it the Prime Minister's view that this is a constructive contribution to the success of the Geneva negotiations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, my view is reflected in the final communique which was accepted by all participants. I believe that the Hon. Member will see that in that communique two messages were contained. One was to the Soviet Union to indicate that it had to take seriously NATO's decision of December, 1979, to deploy Euro missiles unless there was a solution to the problem of the S.S. 20's. The message is in there and I feel it is important that the Soviet Union understands that message. At the same time there is another message which is written throughout—that the NATO countries' decision, as supported by some countries at Williamsburg which are not members of NATO, is to the effect that we also want serious negotiations in the hopes that we will find an alternative answer to the deployment of the S.S. 20's other than full deployment of the Euro missile, which NATO contemplates. That is the message therein.

I should not be asked by the Hon. Member if I support every comment, made by any participant, around that communique. It is certain that the communique was as a result of a compromise, and that is the way it should be interpreted.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

STATEMENT MADE BY UNITED STATES PRESIDENT

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, the quote which I just read to the Prime Minister was not in the Summit text. It was the comment of the President afterwards, in fact the next day afterwards. Again, President Reagan has said that, in his opinion, there should be deployment first, serious negotiations after, a one-track policy. Can the Prime Minister tell me, perhaps, whether he agrees with this or whether the other Summit leaders agreed with what is essentially now a one-track policy, as far as President Reagan is concerned? While he is standing, Madam Speaker, could he tell us whether the Summit leaders engaged at all in the discussion of merging the two talks, the INF and the START talks?

● (1425)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I would venture to say that President Reagan's statement as quoted by the Hon. Member is not an abandonment of the two-track policy. It is perhaps a view of the future that President Reagan and, I must say, some other participants at the Summit have, that the Soviets will not talk seriously

until we begin deployment. That is a view held by some members of NATO and no doubt by others. It is not the view that was held by the consensus at NATO, nor by myself representing Canada. But it does not mean that President Reagan has abandoned the two-track policy. It means that he thinks that no matter how hard we try the Soviets will not agree and that we will have to deploy before they take us seriously. That is his view and it is shared by other participants. It is not mine, but I repeat it is not a contradiction of the two-track policy; it is more in the area of speculation.

Miss Jewett: I guess it depends on one's interpretation of the words “contribute constructively” to the success of the negotiations.

MEASUREMENT OF SUCCESS OF NEGOTIATIONS

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, since the Prime Minister does not want to address the, I think, very important question of merging the intermediate and strategic talks and negotiations, then I will ask him concerning the success of the negotiations in Geneva. Since the Prime Minister and the Government now tie in the question of testing or not testing the Cruise very closely to the outcome of the Geneva negotiations, can the Prime Minister say what a successful outcome would be? What are the objective criteria for measuring the success of the Geneva negotiations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I would want to reassure the Hon. Member that I was not attempting to avoid the last part of the previous question relating to merging of the two talks. I would have to say that there was not a great deal of discussion about it. It came up incidentally in the discussion, and I think it is fair to say that some participants think that, sooner or later, both talks will have to be merged and that we will be dealing with the INF and the START talks in the same series of meetings. However, that is once again conjecture about the future. There is an historic difference in that the INF decision was a NATO decision taken in December, 1979. It was taken by the previous Government and it has been supported by our Government. Therefore, we are proceeding with these talks now.

As to what will happen in the future, I personally think we should be giving greater encouragement to a conference on disarmament in Europe, an idea which has been canvassed at Madrid. I think it would be a very good thing if negotiations could take place in Europe, so that those people like the Hon. Member who do not think that the Americans are negotiating to her taste would at least have the reassurance that many of the Europeans do share President Reagan's view on the subject of her previous question.

As to the—

Miss Jewett: Objective criteria.

Mr. Trudeau: As to the latter part, Madam Speaker, I cannot give any objective criteria. I think any negotiation