

● (1700)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** I regret having to interrupt the Hon. Member. He has two minutes more remaining at the next sitting of the House.

[Translation]

Order, please! It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS— MOTIONS

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Shall all orders and items preceding item 106 stand by unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Stand.

\* \* \*

[English]

## NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

### ADVISABILITY OF DECLARING CANADA A NUCLEAR ARMS FREE ZONE

**Mr. Baker:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In listening to motion No. 106 on the Order Paper, "that, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of declaring Canada a nuclear arms free zone", to my recollection a similar motion was dealt with last week in the House by general agreement of Members. The motion as I read it is similar in substance and intent to that dealt with last week. Perhaps the Speaker cannot rule on this immediately, but I am pretty sure, Sir, that you were in the chair at the time. Does it meet with the rules of the Chamber that we can deal with the motion again?

**Mr. Young:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I think if the Hon. Member reads *Hansard* for the day in question last week, he will find the question debated was a private member's bill and not a private member's motion.

**Mr. Baker:** The reason I pointed this out and regardless of what the hon. gentleman says, Mr. Speaker, both are motions and the rule applies to motions. A bill is a motion, a resolution is a motion. This is dealt with in Erskine May and in Beauchesne under motions. The point of order I raised deals with the sections on motions. Could Your Honour, who was in the chair at the time, rule on the question now?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** The Chair has been looking into this matter in the last while. Our records indicate

## Nuclear Disarmament

that the motion referred to by the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker) could be one of two Bills that have been debated in the House, namely Bill C-204, which was defeated, and Bill C-203 which is essentially the same as the Bill which was debated.

The Chair at this point is in some difficulty inasmuch as one can now express some reserve as to whether Bill C-203 should have been debated in view of the fact that Bill C-204 had already been defeated. However, that brings up the problem we have at the start of a session when Bills are put on the Order Paper and by our system it is possible for Members to be putting similar bills on the Order Paper at the same time.

The motion which is before the House today is essentially of the same substance as the Bill. The Chair would like a little more time to look into this matter, just a few more minutes, and it proposes to allow the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young) to complete his remarks on the motion before the House. We will then render a decision on the point of order that has been raised.

**Mr. Neil Young (Beaches)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of declaring Canada a nuclear arms free zone and that it should consider the advisability of prohibiting the deployment, testing, construction and transportation of nuclear weapons and associated equipment through and within Canada and that it should consider the advisability of prohibiting the export of goods and materials for use in the construction and deployment of nuclear arms; and

That, the Government should consider the advisability of encouraging cities, provinces and states throughout the world to undertake similar action.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is indeed similar to the measures proposed in the private members bills introduced by my colleagues, the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) and the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant). All three measures would prohibit the deployment of nuclear weapons in Canada. They would also prevent the transit of nuclear weapons through Canadian territory and waters. They would make it unlawful to develop, test, or produce nuclear weapons or components of nuclear weapon systems in Canada or the export of same.

My motion is somewhat different from the other two measures proposed by my colleagues, but nonetheless equally important. My motion calls upon the Government of Canada to take a leadership role in encouraging others throughout the world to follow the example set by this House of Commons if this motion is adopted.

I do not think I overstate the case when I say that the arms race has brought us face to face with our own annihilation. There are now some 50,000 warheads in the arsenals of the two superpowers alone. Some may think it trite to make reference to the maxim that you do not put a smoking gun on stage unless you intend it to be used, but I think that maxim sums up for us the dilemma we have forced upon ourselves in the rush to augment national security by threatening the security of another nation with nuclear weapons.

Until recently the theory that governed the strategic thinking of the superpowers has been that of deterrence, that it