

*Supply*

**Mr. McKinnon:**—it states that Canada should press all nations to pledge never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Therefore, I cannot see that that should apply.

I think that at the present time the Warsaw Pact conventional forces outnumber those of NATO in the general order of three to one. That means that in the event of war, NATO could either surrender or risk total devastation of its territories and the loss of millions of lives. To avoid either of these unsavoury ends, the western allies would have to devote a great deal more of their resources to conventional defence. When one looks at the scale of the difference, it would frankly mean tripling the military defence budgets of those nations which form NATO to enable them to pay for and sustain, in conventional sizes, the equipment of the Russian forces opposing them.

I understand that the NDP wants us to get out of NATO and NORAD and sometimes points out that Sweden gets along well without being in NATO or NORAD, as does Switzerland. I would simply like to comment that whereas Canada contributes 1.7 per cent of our gross national product to defence, the contribution from Switzerland amounts to 20.2 per cent of government spending. I believe that Sweden's defence budget works out to 3.2 per cent in terms of its GNP.

Therefore, I see no way out other than through the continued surveillance of what is going on in the world in order to try and convince the opponents of NATO that there is a serious debate going on about how we are to reach this happy land in which there would be a verifiable reduction in arms. However, it must be verifiable. The real problem today is that the Russians are unwilling to have on-site inspection or any system of verification which is satisfactory to the western world.

I thank Your Honour very much for the extension of my allotted time.

**Mrs. Ursula Appoloni (York South-Weston):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to participate in this debate because it is indeed a momentous one, particularly in view of the current situation. We are not sure whether or not another war will break out tomorrow morning in the Falkland Islands and whether or not it will escalate. It is the atmosphere in which we are discussing disarmament today.

We are also discussing it at a time when Poland is still overrun. It is still under martial law. We think Mr. Walesa is still alive, but he is certainly not free. We are also discussing it at a time when Afghanistan is overrun and totally unfree. This is the situation today.

However, I am indeed grateful to the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) who opened this debate. I repeat what other hon. members have said in saying that I am grateful to him for making a speech which was not too emotional. I am particularly grateful to him for having been very careful, following my question, to point out that this is not an exercise of pointing a finger at one person or another, saying

that this one wears a black hat and the other one wears a white hat. It is not a question of who is moral and who is immoral.

I believe I speak for all hon. members of this House in saying that what we are discussing today involves a very serious difference of opinion and a difference in judgment. However, in all good conscience, I do not think that anyone in this House who holds different views from mine can be accused of insincerity. I think that is important to point out.

Unfortunately, this whole debate on disarmament has been obfuscated by dreadful tactics which I personally deplore. For example, let me read a cutting from the *London Free Press* dated March 30, 1982, in reference to a recent visit by our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) to Vancouver. We are told that the minister was lucky to have escaped relatively unscathed from a mob of militant nuclear protesters in Vancouver. The point I am trying to make is that it is counterproductive in this debate, to say the least, for one side or the other to be militant, all in the name of "brotherly love", or to resort to the kind of tactics that we should not if we are being sincere in our quest for disarmament. Unfortunately, this has already happened. We are not only told that in the news clipping, but we are also told that the minister was roughed up and spat upon. The whole situation was disgraceful. Worse still is the fact that the incident stemmed from a large meeting organized by the United Nations Association of Vancouver and the B.C. Coalition for Disarmament. Does disarmament mean that we stop arms build-up against the Soviets and knock up our own minister? To my way of thinking, that is not disarmament.

However, what I wanted to discuss is the real need for disarmament. I do not think we can even do that unless we also discuss the need for security. As I said earlier today in this House, I was a member of the committee and it was a very interesting experience. I am glad that we did agree to discuss security before tackling the subject of disarmament. It was amazing and almost ironical that Canadians should be speaking of either security or disarmament. The irony was that because of our historic and geographic situation it had never been necessary to worry about security. We have never been invaded since 1814 and even then we won the war, for goodness sake. We have not been threatened as other countries have been threatened and overrun every decade in their history. I very sincerely say that we, thank God, have not been threatened.

**Mr. Manly:** I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Manly:** Would the hon. member permit a question at this time?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Will the hon. member for York South-Weston accept a question?

**Mrs. Appoloni:** Mr. Speaker, I was good enough to wait until his leader had finished before I interrupted him. I would