

United States and western Europe of the responses by young people to the ever present threat posed by nuclear weapons. The pattern that emerges from these surveys is a chronicle of confused hopelessness, unrelieved anxiety and sometimes suicidal despair. On occasion that despair has resulted in people completely losing hope and choosing the path of suicide. Pathetic messages left behind by these young people are a searing indictment to those who would brusquely dismiss—as the Member across the House is doing—this phenomenon as irrelevant or perhaps even humorous to the issue we are debating today.

It is extremely difficult to join in this debate without becoming emotional. Surely it is a sign of some serious disorder for anyone to speak or even to be here today without becoming emotional. Members who have seen the film *If You Love This Planet*—and I hope everyone has—surely will recall the response of peace activist Helen Caldicott to charges that her crusade against the threat of nuclear weapons was, to quote, “overly emotional.” I applaud Dr. Caldicott’s response:

Anyone who can contemplate the prospect of the world-wide race to thermonuclear Armageddon without becoming emotional cannot be classified as a sane human being.

I hope that all Members who are here in this House today will consider this issue with considerable emotion.

All New Democrats support this motion. The people of Canada, I must say, know where New Democrats stand on the desirability of making Canada a nuclear weapons free zone. It is perhaps one of our most important policies. Over the years a number of my New Democrat colleagues have sponsored Bills and motions with the goal of prohibiting the deployment, testing, construction and transportation of nuclear weapons and associated equipment through and within Canada and the export of goods and materials for use in the construction and deployment of nuclear arms as reflected in this motion today.

To look back in history, on March 5, 1986, and again on October 8, 1986, the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) introduced such Bills. I am sorry to say these Bills received only first reading. On December 13, 1984, my colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), who I hope is listening to this debate from his hospital bed today, introduced a nuclear weapons free zone Bill. This Bill proceeded to second reading on March 18, 1985. The Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young) has presented the House with another opportunity to demonstrate some real leadership to the people of Canada. I very much hope that Hon. Members from all Parties will lend their support to this motion.

• (1750)

Unfortunately, the Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) said on behalf of the Liberals in 1984 that they may wish to make it absolutely clear at this time that they are neither for nor against the concept of a nuclear weapons free zone in Canada. That is a typical Liberal response. I am pleased that the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) spoke positively in support of this motion today. I only hope

that he was speaking on behalf of his Party and not as an individual.

Hon. Members opposite have supported what I would call some nonsensical arguments about the international repercussions of Canada’s becoming a nuclear weapons free zone. I would like to quote Project Ploughshares in this regard. In *Making Canada a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone*, Project Ploughshares has said:

It is both technically and politically incorrect to argue that refusal to participate in or support the nuclear forces of other NATO members is incompatible with membership in the Alliance... Currently Denmark, Iceland and Norway are actively examining the prospects of creating a regional, Nordic Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone... Greece is attempting to negotiate a similar, Balkan zone. These countries intend and expect to remain members of NATO even if they should become full nuclear weapon-free zones.

As well, we are concerned by the statements made, I presume reflecting the Government’s position, by the Hon. Member for Leeds—Grenville (Mrs. Cossitt). I hope very sincerely that she will review this information and reconsider the statement she made today.

I know how keen supporters across the country are for us to pass this motion in the House. I would hope that there would be debate in the communities across Canada and that people will talk to their Members of Parliament, particularly those who are members of the Official Opposition and those in the government Party, about this matter.

Finally, I would like to end by quoting a poem by Tommy Douglas, who was a tireless fighter for peace. He wrote:

You say the little efforts that I make
Will do no good; they never will prevail
To tip the hovering scale
Where justice hangs in balance.
I don't think
I ever thought they would.
But I am prejudiced beyond debate
In favour of my right to choose which side
Shall feel the stubborn ounces of my weight.

I know all of us in this Party would urge all Hon. Members to take a very tangible step in support of this motion as a positive step toward peace, a world where our children can sleep at night with less fear of a nuclear holocaust.

* * *

[Translation]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate does not insist upon its amendments 1(a) and (b), 2(a) and (b), 3, 4(a), 5(a) and (b), 6, 7(a) and (b), 9, 10 (b) and (c) with which the House of Commons did not concur; that the Senate concurs with the amendments