

the Hiroshima striking power. If ever there should come a day when, through error, indifference or inadvertence, a nuclear war breaks out, we will have failed in our responsibilities. That is why I think this debate was very important, and I would urge both the NDP and the government to endorse our motion which does take full consideration of the intent of the UN resolution, but in a concrete, positive and challenging agenda for the meeting of the two superpowers next January 7 and 8. I hope the House will accept the amendment I have just moved.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Having had the opportunity to consider the amendment introduced by the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice (Mr. Chrétien), I rule that it is in order. I submit it, therefore, to the House in the following fashion:

Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Gray (Windsor West), moved:

[English]

Shall I disperse?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Are there any questions or comments?

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice (Mr. Chrétien) a question. He will know, of course, that the nuclear freeze resolution at the United Nations has come up each year. Indeed, in the last several years it has come up while talks were going on, either INF or START talks. I therefore wonder why he feels that somehow the whole idea of a nuclear freeze should not be pursued simply because talks are once again to go on. I just do not understand. We have had debates at the UN on the nuclear freeze every year. Indeed, the UN is debating the matter again. As the Hon. Member knows, it will be coming up this week or next week. I just wonder why he feels there is something so vastly different with talks beginning in January when we have had talks every year that we have been debating the nuclear freeze. We want a nuclear freeze.

[Translation]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my remarks that we are in favour of a nuclear freeze. If you read our amendment carefully, you will note that we mention a nuclear freeze, but only as a first step towards disarmament. And that is the problem we have been faced with whenever we have had to deal with the position of the NDP who feel that a nuclear freeze is the solution. It is not the solution, because we would end up with the same situation as we have just now. There are now too many nuclear weapons and we would give to the public a false sense of security if we insisted only on a strict nuclear freeze. There are just too many. With the existing weapons, we could all get killed a hundred times over.

And we refuse to give people a false sense of security. We mean to say . . . I fully support the notion that we must begin somewhere. We now have a motion dealing with a resolution aimed at convincing the superpowers to use a nuclear freeze as

Supply

a first step toward disarmament, but we should not be satisfied with the idea, which I have too often met in my discussions with people concerned with this problem, that a nuclear freeze is the whole solution. The whole solution it is not, for it is only the first step toward the solution which is nuclear disarmament and not nuclear freeze.

[English]

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, the former Minister, because of his preamble to an amendment which has not yet been ruled on, argues that the announcement of talks possibly getting under way again significantly alters the political situation. I am saying to the former Minister that there is no significant alteration in the situation. The talks have gone on before. Let us face it, they were mostly deadly gambits. So why can the former Minister not accept the present United Nations resolution as he has already agreed it is the first step? Then, if we can get support for the intent, which he speaks of in his amendment, why can we not have the Government do what we have suggested, which is to support the resolution itself, not just the intent, but the resolution itself? Then, we can move on to all the other matters, many of which would be covered by a freeze. Why can we not have a straightforward support of the UN resolution, not just its intent, but the resolution itself?

● (1650)

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the problem with which we must cope is the politicking of the NDP on the resolution, rather than having a clearcut resolution. The NDP introduced a political element in stating that it condemned everything which had been done in the past by the previous administration. It is very easy for the Hon. Member to get up and appeal to my best instincts, which are so numerous, but, she is just playing politics with terrible problems such as nuclear disarmament.

We have to cope with the problem which has been given to the House by the NDP which is playing politics with disarmament. My amendment has tried to cope with that political problem. The House unanimously approved the peace mission of former Prime Minister Trudeau. It was a denial of that end other initiatives which were taken, such as the suffocation policies, which were supported by the House. But, the NDP again wants to play politics with war and peace. So we proposed a resolution, which was within the intent of the UN resolution, to establish a positive agenda for future development in disarmament talks around the world.

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, as a new Member I am having great difficulty in understanding the argument of the Hon. Member for Saint-Maurice (Mr. Chrétien). He says the New Democratic Party was playing politics by the insertion—

Ms. Copps: The Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Ms. Jewett) said that this morning.