

### Supply

In this context it is important to note that agreement would entail as an early consequence the cessation of the development of the Cruise missile, which is clearly a first-strike nuclear weapon. In terms of the existing balance of nuclear power, this weapon is simply not needed. Although the Soviet Union has a clear advantage in intermediate-range missiles, the United States and its allies have an advantage in long-range missiles. As the subcommittee notes, there is now overall parity between the two sides, a parity which many existing military experts in the United States in particular are in agreement with.

To attempt to obtain nuclear superiority on the part of the United States is faulty, first because the Soviets have said that such American action will simply cause them to expand on their nuclear programs. Hence the cycle will once again move into motion. Second, as Admiral Noel Gayler, former chief of the United States forces in the Pacific, pointed out in last Sunday's *New York Times*, in the real world such so-called superiority has no meaning. I quote this former director:

We and Russia are like two riverboat gamblers sitting across a green table, each with a gun pointed at the other's belly and each gun on hair trigger. The size of the guns doesn't make much difference; if either weapon is used, both gamblers are dead. In the same way, the size of the nuclear forces makes little difference.

It is more than redundant, therefore, to proceed with the Cruise missile. It will set in motion even more spending on armaments on both sides. It will simply increase the already excessive balance of terror in the world.

The proposal for a nuclear freeze is practical. It gives no advantage to either side. The Canadian government should use its influence in the world community at the United Nations special session to get a freeze and effective international mechanisms for enforcement accepted. It is clear from recent talks that the United States will have to be prepared to change its views on the Cruise missile. On the other hand, the Soviet Union will have to change its views on the important question of inspection. The message for Canada is clear as to what our role should be. We must be working to convince both of the superpowers to show this kind of flexibility.

● (1530)

The second recommendation in the committee's report is that there should be no Cruise testing. Mr. Speaker, it must be very clear that this follows the first point. As the subcommittee points out, we should not be party to tests aimed at improving the technological capacity for nuclear war. It is only by denying the use of space in Alberta or Saskatchewan or anywhere else in our country that we will be clearly seen to be taking a step against the arms race. To participate in such testing would be to make a mockery of any claim to favour a halt in the nuclear arms race. The Cruise test question is, then, a specific test for Canada. We must now take a stand against the irrational and inhumane nuclear weapons race and we must begin by not permitting the testing of the Cruise missile here on our soil.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** The third recommendation, Mr. Speaker, is one which in my view does not have the same rigorous and

verifiable force in the real world as the first two. It is, nonetheless, very important. It simply is that Canada pledge itself never to be the first to use nuclear weapons. To me it is a profoundly important moral commitment which should be the first step to urge other nations with a nuclear capacity to join in. Surely, I say to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan), on this point as well as on the others, the Government of Canada should not hesitate to make such a commitment and to follow through with such appropriate subsequent action.

The fourth and final recommendation in the minority report is that we spend in Canada one tenth of 1 per cent, which is \$7 million, of our defence budget on disarmament efforts. That amount could go to strengthen disarmament education, provide information and develop research activities in this field. Surely this proposal is precisely in line with the thinking of the vast majority of Canadians. Canadians, no matter where they reside, no matter what political party they support, are interested in peace. Canadians wherever they reside, whatever political party they support, would be more than willing to see this kind of allocation of government funds devoted to the development of peace and the means of achieving that, rather than put all of our emphasis on spending in the armaments field. The more than 30,000 people who assembled in Vancouver, in a demonstration that was clearly spontaneous, I am sure in this regard were speaking for Canadians from coast to coast.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Broadbent:** The unspeakable horrors of a nuclear war cannot be exaggerated. Only madmen contend that they can be. I describe as madmen those who are in the armed services, whether of the Soviet Union or of the United States or of their respective allies, who talk glibly about being able to survive a nuclear strike, being able to have a so-called limited nuclear war.

However, Mr. Speaker, if I take it as fundamental that men and women of good will and reasonable intelligence in all parties would agree that any form of nuclear war will constitute a nuclear holocaust, in the real world of politics it is not enough to point out these consequences, no matter how horrific. It is the fundamental responsibility of the politician to present a workable solution and then to work for its implementation.

It is rare in political life that the ideal and the possible perfectly coincide. In my view, we now have precisely that situation. The goal is to begin mankind's march back from the nuclear precipice. The practical means are the proposals, supported by many people in many lands, that I have just described. All that we now need is the political will to carry them forward. Let us get on with this important human job.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Appolloni:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) allow me a question?

**An hon. Member:** No.