

*Supply*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Order, please. Before entertaining discussion on this document, I understand the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) is seeking unanimous consent to have the resolution appended to today's *Hansard*.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, we would be in agreement on the condition that the hon. member agrees that the entire minority report, which he has argued very persuasively should have been included, be attached to today's *Hansard* as well.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** For the benefit of the hon. member, I think we are talking about two different subjects.

**Mr. Broadbent:** We are debating the minority report.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** I see that I will not obtain unanimous consent. It is unfortunate that the House will be deprived of a motion which parliamentarians unanimously accepted in Lagos. I see my reverend friend the hon. member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) nodding his head in agreement. If hon. members of the NDP want to be partisan—

**Mr. Broadbent:** Who is being partisan?

**Mr. Crosbie:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps the hon. member could explain to the leader of the New Democratic Party what he is talking about. It is not the majority report or the minority report of the subcommittee; it is a resolution from Nigeria. We would like to have it attached to *Hansard*; surely he does not object to that.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Wonderful, John.

**Mr. Crosbie:** The hon. member is so shocked by what happened in Saskatchewan that he does not have all his marbles tonight.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

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

**Mr. Broadbent:** Go ahead, go ahead.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Therefore, the Chair understands that there is no unanimous consent to attach the resolution as an appendix to *Hansard*.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** I will try to resist the wonderful and peaceful appeal of my good friend, the official critic of the NDP, who said that we should use our knowledge and conscience to vote tonight and that we should not consider it a non-confidence vote. This is what she said.

**Mr. Ogle:** Would you be good enough to ask the House to table the subcommittee report?

**Mr. Prud'homme:** It is too bad the hon. member did not ask. I am always willing to agree. It is too bad, it is too bad. I read the minority report and I should like to deal with it now. I would prefer to talk about the views expressed by the committee, but unfortunately not enough was said about the report itself. A considerable amount of work was done by my hon. colleagues to which the official opposition referred this afternoon. They referred to some of the resolutions but not to all of

them. In fact, 21 resolutions were put forward. I see some members of the New Democratic Party agreeing because they themselves said in their minority report that they agree with much that was said. Unfortunately, they could not agree with the majority report, and consequently added their minority views to the report.

• (2100)

I can find most of what is contained in the 11 pages of the first issue of the minority report in the full report, except for the four points which were made as well as some other points.

I will start with the last point. Hon. members may be surprised, and I hope the official opposition will not be shocked, when I say that we should provide more resources for the study of disarmament. I, personally, am quite sympathetic to this view. I know the committee will forgive me for saying so, and I suggest that it is a small bonus I get for having abided by their wishes so well when I shared in that concession by not putting my views forward. I am disappointed that the committee did not accept the proposal that we create five or six chairs of peace in universities similar to the strategic studies which have been taking place across Canada and which are paid for by the Department of National Defence. I urge hon. members to allow the three parties to work together in order to reassess our views on this proposal because I am confident that we can come to an agreement on this particular point.

I must say that I do not doubt the credibility or the sincerity of the New Democratic Party. However, I would ask them, in return, to give us credit for the same credibility and sincerity. I was going to argue with what the leader of the New Democratic Party had said, but my colleague, the hon. member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appolloni) already asked him to correct his statement about the high degree of morality of the members who signed the report. I find his answers totally acceptable and I now know that he does not doubt the sincerity of government members.

I would like to comment on a proposition which is often raised, that of non-first-use of nuclear weapons. All members should realize that those who advocate a pledge by NATO countries of non-first use of nuclear weapons are suggesting two things: first, the United States should withdraw its nuclear umbrella which presently aids in deterring a conventional attack on our NATO allies in Europe; and second, that our European allies should agree to the withdrawal of that protective nuclear umbrella. I would tell members of the New Democratic Party, and any others who advocate such a policy, that it is not looked upon as being favourable or acceptable to the governments of Europe. I discovered, when I spoke to some members of the social democratic party in Lagos, Nigeria when asking their assessment of NATO, that they were very strongly in favour of NATO. I expected that they would have had the same view as my friend, the hon. members for New