

*Supply*

**Mr. Broadbent:** Yes.

**Mrs. Appolloni:** Mr. Speaker, I was a member of this committee that studied the disarmament question and I can say in all truthfulness—

**An hon. Member:** What is your question?

**Mrs. Appolloni:** If the hon. member would keep his colleagues in check, at least a minimum of courtesy and free speech will be allowed us.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Yes.

**Mrs. Appolloni:** Thank you. The committee did work, I am very happy to say this, in a situation of non-partisanship and sincerity. It is along those lines that I ask this question very sincerely, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has just spoken. I fully respect his views, even though I do not share them. In his opening remarks, he paid particular reference to the members of the minority, who signed the minority report. That, too, is permissible; partisan bouquets may be given from one side or the other.

What I am referring to now is the specific reference the hon. member made to the moral stance of those who signed the minority report. This is my question, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the member for Oshawa is not implying that those who did not sign the minority report, or rather those who concurred in the majority report, are less than moral. My contention is that there are many of us who feel that the protection of our own and other Canadians' sons and daughters is also a very sincere moral imperative.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question very much. It gives me a chance to clarify that point. I agree entirely with what the hon. member has just said, that the majority as well as the minority are to be seen to be in fully equivalent moral terms. I would never suggest the contrary, nor did I suggest it. But it was a possible implication. I agree that one might have inferred something I did not intend, because I did not elaborate on the point. I welcome the opportunity now.

This issue in this country, as well as in the United States and in other countries, is something that does not divide people in terms of moral commitment. Most importantly, it divides us in judgment about the ways of achieving those goals.

**Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, in the last year we have seen a growing worldwide concern over the arms race. More and more people are alarmed at the prospect of an increasing escalation of armaments which they believe may well result in a nuclear holocaust. I agree with the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) that the reality of a nuclear holocaust would be such that the description which he gave is certainly not excessive. Here in Canada there is also rising impatience with the failure of governments throughout the world to negotiate some of the most effective elements of effective disarmament.

Mr. Speaker, the government shares these concerns of the people of Canada, concerns which people all over the world have expressed. There is, alas, no magic formula to bring about the result we all wish. I believe that as a government we have been and continue to be able to put forward a responsible, coherent and effective policy to help achieve the ideal of disarmament and arms control to which we are all dedicated.

Canada's position is not identical with that of the superpowers. Both the United States and the Soviet Union are nuclear weapons powers. We are not. Both are engaged in the development of new nuclear weapons systems. We are not. Both have large expansions in defence expenditure underway. We have not. Both are involved in large-scale trade in armaments. We are not. Canada's position is that of a western middle power.

● (1540)

To say that we do not share the perspective of the two superpowers is not to say that we are either a neutralist or a non-aligned nation. We are a western middle power which supports western values and advocates the western alliance. In fact, we participated in the founding of that North Atlantic alliance.

I would like to quote, as applicable to our situation as well, the words last week of that great German socialist, Chancellor Schmidt, at the annual meeting of his party. He said:

German policy may not and can never be made from a position equidistant between Washington and Moscow. We stand on this side, on the side of free and equal peoples.

It seems to many of us that it is because the Canadian socialists do not share this position morally, politically or militarily that they can come to a different conclusion.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Back to the trivial and petty again, Mark.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** I would be very pleased to entertain questions when I have finished. The New Democratic Party obviously does not like to hear the truth. Members of the New Democratic Party do not like to hear what they could easily conclude if it were not for the fact that they do not favour belonging to the North Atlantic Alliance. Obviously for them a solution can be found on the basis of only one kind of approach.

**Mr. Broadbent:** What about Senators Hatfield and Kennedy?

**Mr. MacGuigan:** We are talking about the NDP; we are not talking about American senators.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Just deal with the issue.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** The American senators to whom the leader of the New Democratic Party is referring are supporters of the North Atlantic Alliance. His party is not. I sympathize with him because I believe he is a closet supporter of NATO but cannot come out of the closet because of his party. I sympathize with him.

**Miss Jewett:** That is pretty sick, Mark.