

The Address—Mr. Gourd

My colleague the Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) who is the official Public Works critic could also tell you about the struggle in which he was involved at one time. I am convinced that all problems would finally be solved if highway 13 was built. But no, they would rather institute legal proceedings and reduce the aid to farmers by withdrawing farm credit.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy to co-operate with a separatist government in Quebec. However, I can see the day when the Liberals hold office and I am convinced that with Robert Bourassa as a leader we will see changes in the Quebec economy. I am pleased to see that the constituency of Argenteuil-Papineau has always proudly elected Liberals who knew how to defend their interests.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this outline I have just given should not be overlooked. Before concluding, I want to say how proud I am of the Throne Speech, a speech which gives new impetus to the economy and I am convinced that the next budget soon to be tabled if the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) decides to curtail his trips abroad will be an excellent one and that my constituents in Argenteuil-Papineau will benefit from the economic recovery and a lower unemployment rate.

● (1700)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. In French this time, I should like to call the attention of the House to a breach of decorum. A little while ago, as the Hon. Member for Argenteuil-Papineau (Mr. Gourd) was speaking, one of our colleagues crossed between the Chair and that Member. This is simply not allowed, first under our Standing Orders, and second under a long tradition. And to support what I am saying, I should like to refer Hon. Members to Citation 298 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, which states, and I quote:

Members may sit in their respective places with their heads covered, but when they desire to speak, they must rise and remove their hats.

This, of course, is outdated.

They are not to cross between the Chair and a Member who is speaking or between the Chair and the Table, or between the Chair and the Mace when the Mace is taken off the Table by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

That is clear and simple. Yet, from past experience, I can say that this rule of decorum has been broken very often, perhaps on a daily basis.

Therefore I urge Hon. Members to act more in accordance with this rule of decorum, not necessarily out of consideration for the occupant of the Chair, but out of consideration for the Hon. Member who has the floor and who certainly deserves the House's full attention.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there questions or remarks?

[English]

Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, last week I attended the Stockholm Conference. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) kindly invited a member of the Official Opposition as well as a member of this Party to join him at that conference. I know that I speak also for the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), who has not spoken in this debate, in assuring the Minister of our appreciation for this invitation. The full title of the conference is, Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

One of the reasons it was and continues to be such an important conference is that it is the only "game in town". At present there are no other fora where members of the Western Nato Alliance, members of the Warsaw Pact and neutral and non-aligned countries are meeting.

The INF talks, the START talks and the MBFR negotiations have broken off. As well, the United Nations itself is not in session. Therefore, the very fact that the Stockholm conference is taking place and was attended during its first week by the foreign ministers of all 35 participating countries gives it an even greater significance than it would otherwise have had.

Although the Minister mentioned only two of the participating groups yesterday—the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact countries—there was also a very important third group, in some ways the most important, which is the group of neutral and non-aligned countries. I suggest that that group was led by Sweden not only because of the conference taking place there but because of the tremendous weight and influence of the Prime Minister of Sweden, Olof Palme.

The title of the conference is somewhat deceptive because there was not, in fact, very much talk about disarmament. Those talks will come later on since the conference will continue for almost three years. At this particular meeting the primary purpose was to develop what are called confidence and security building measures and generally to discuss the state of the world and the nuclear peril. No ministers who spoke addressed the overwhelming subject of what we will do about the nuclear peril and whether we will ever really seriously look not simply at controlling nuclear and other arms but abolishing them.

There is a very interesting two-part series in the *New Yorker* magazine written by Jonathan Schell, the author of *The Fate of the Earth*, in the issues of January 2 and January 9. I urge all Hon. Members, particularly those in the Government, to read those articles because Schell was not talking simply about the reduction of arms but their abolition. He evolves a fascinating new theory of deterrence once nuclear arms are abolished.

When delegates were talking both publicly and privately about such very important matters as giving advance information of troop movements in Europe, having smaller numbers of troop movements covered in that advance information and having neutral military observers of such activities and so on, I occasionally had the feeling that, as important as all these