

*Supply*

deployment. We accepted the two-track policy after the suffocation policy of Mr. Trudeau was not accepted. We realized that we had to let the Pershing and Cruise missiles be deployed in Europe. Now the deployment has taken place, the U.S.S.R. realizes that NATO countries can be together when it is important. We are in a new era as a result of what happened in the last month when the two major powers decided to return to the negotiating table.

This is why we offered in the amendment we proposed on behalf of Canadians an agenda for freezing acceleration in nuclear armament and an agenda which will lead not only to a freeze but to the eventual goal which we all have in mind—disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament which is so threatening to the world.

I should like to propose a new amendment to the House this afternoon in an attempt to obtain as much of a consensus as possible. As my Leader said this morning, we would like to propose an agenda for the peace talks which will start again in January. In our anxiety to put forward a new agenda, and not wanting to deny all that had been said, we proposed a motion, which unfortunately the Speaker ruled out of order. My new motion will guarantee that our intentions are all-inclusive. We subscribe to the intention of the motion of the NDP. We want disarmament. We want a bilateral freeze, not a unilateral one. We want the two superpowers to agree to a freeze. A freeze has to be verifiable, otherwise it does not exist. That was the intention of the United Nations resolution. However, if we express that ourselves, it has to take a realistic form. The realistic form has to be in the agenda which the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Turner) proposed this morning.

I should like to reintroduce in an acceptable fashion the motion which my Leader presented this morning. Hopefully it will be acceptable. I will explain it later if I have some time remaining, but now I will read it for the record. I propose, seconded by the Hon. Member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray):

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words following the words "on a nuclear arms freeze" in the second to last paragraph of the motion and by adding the following:

"and, noting that the resumption of arms talks by the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva in early 1985 announced by the superpowers on November 22, subsequent to the presentation of the above resolution at the United Nations significantly alters the political situation on which the resolution is based and constitutes an effective first-step in the achievement of the two objectives to be attained in the declaration of a nuclear freeze, calls upon the government to adopt as policy the intent of the whole resolution by urging that the meeting of the two nuclear superpowers have on its agenda the negotiation of limits on their nuclear arsenals, a mutually verifiable freeze and significant reduction; a strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty; a renewed emphasis on the mutual and balanced force reduction talks in Vienna; the encouragement of political emphasis on the Stockholm conference; a moving up of the date of the United Nations special session on disarmament now scheduled for 1986; an international agreement to ban the testing and deployment of high-altitude anti-satellite weapons; and the refining and improvement of nuclear weapons verification techniques."

● (1640)

*[Translation]*

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the amendment in French, which I would like to submit to the House.

I feel that the Official Opposition is actually proposing a new agenda that addresses the situation as it is today without concentrating on past problems. Personally, I think we now have a chance to review our positions in the light of this new development. Who would have thought six months ago that the superpowers would be meeting in January 1985 to make a fresh start? And why should we, in Parliament, not be willing to look at a new approach to disarmament? I think that is what Canadians want. As I said earlier, the Prime Minister has been very positive on that point in his speech at Antigonish. This is the only debate we have. In my opinion, the House missed a golden opportunity to say clearly to the Canadian people that we want, as soon as possible, to see an end to the proliferation of nuclear weapons in this stupid race which does not appear to end. It cannot be done without prior conditions. That is why we are proposing in the resolution that the first item on the agenda of the superpowers that are to meet in January be a freeze acceptable to both parties and verifiable as well by both parties.

That would be the starting point of negotiations in other fields of disarmament. But if the agenda of the two superpowers could be accepted in the words proposed by the Leader of the Opposition—it faithfully reflects the intent of the resolution introduced at the UN, but it also advocates something positive for the future—I think we now have before the House an agenda which is much more positive and much clearer, and which is consistent with the new situation which did not exist at the time of the UN resolution, when the wish expressed was that the superpowers meet and offer the world a new solution.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion I have just proposed will be accepted, for the issue is so complex that we want the same resolution to reflect the intent of the UN resolution, but we also want to add a concrete mechanism, in keeping with today's reality. I would suggest that, if the House were to adopt the proposition of my party, I mean the motion of the New Democratic Party as amended by the Leader of the Opposition, we would be making a worthwhile contribution.

During the last election campaign and the few months before, because of certain events you are familiar with, I met with hundreds of Canadians during my party's leadership race and during the election campaign in my capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs, and I have to say that the disarmament issue was raised all the time. More fascinating and more important still, the issue was invariably raised first by younger people in our society, students who were concerned about the future of both Canada and the whole world. We can spend hours and days in the House trying to find ways to reduce inflation by one or two points or lower the unemployment rate by five or six points, but all that will prove fruitless unless we find a way to eliminate the danger which is threatening all nations the world over.

As I pointed out earlier, both sides now have nuclear arsenals which are more destructive than thousands of times