

initiative than does the resolution before this House. Walter Mondale, former candidate for the presidency of the U.S., Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate, all are for the freeze. Public opinion in the U.S. is overwhelmingly for a verifiable nuclear freeze. The reality is that in the United States almost everyone except Ronald Reagan is for a verifiable nuclear freeze. That is the reality.

This new Government, then, Mr. Speaker, if it had sought to act upon the commitment it made in the debate last February on the question of a consensus, did not even have to lead on the issue. All the new Conservative Government had to do was to follow the opinion of Canadians and Americans, indeed world opinion. Surely a Conservative, if he cannot lead, ought to be able to follow what the rest of mankind wants.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1115)

Mr. Broadbent: The new Government which promised the people of Canada change and innovation should not have voted against a verifiable nuclear freeze at the United Nations. Rather, having said it would help arrive at a consensus in the House of Commons, in the first week in the new session of Parliament, knowing that this matter was going to come before the United Nations, the Government ought to have brought this motion before the House of Commons. It ought to have obtained a positive vote for it and taken that attitude and spirit back to the United Nations and voted for a freeze. That is what it should have done.

In 1945 Albert Einstein said: "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our way of thinking". If I were to apply the reasoning of Albert Einstein to the new Government, I am sure if he were here he would agree with the following sentiment: The unleashed power of evidence, reason and public opinion has changed everything but the Conservative Party's incapacity to think. I think that is the reality. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the Government is now not only ignoring Canadian opinion, it is, in its great determination to indulge in a permanent waltz with Ronald Reagan, ignoring American public opinion as well.

In that regard I would like to turn to some of the arguments which the Government has offered in defence of this lamentable vote at the committee stage at the U.N. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) admitted recently that public divisions among our allies have existed in the past on the important question of the freeze. He might have indicated in the same statement, as I did just a minute ago, that more than a third of the membership of NATO is in disagreement with President Reagan on this issue. Our new Secretary of State for External Affairs, who promised initiatives and change, said that Canada should not add to tensions with our major ally to the south. On the weekend he was quoted as saying the following: "We have to define ourselves and not let ourselves be defined by notions that others might have of us". I think that is a wonderful sentiment. There was a no better way

Supply

to define ourselves than by taking an independent stand on this issue rather than letting ourselves be defined at this point in our history by the man who happens to be the President of the United States. That is precisely what he ought not to have done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: This kind of so-called reasoning, which I regret to say is so characteristic of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, is not thought at all. It is simply the refusal to think. It is not the course of an independent ally. It is really the easy acquiescence of the timid.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Don't blame me. I am not the vice-president of Socialists International.

Mr. Broadbent: You will have your chance, I hope, to apply more cogent arguments.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: What about President Mitterrand?

Mr. Broadbent: The Government House Leader is obviously a little defensive. He ought to be, having heard the ridiculous arguments offered by his Secretary of State for External Affairs.

The second point I want to deal with, Mr. Speaker, concerns another argument provided in such a cogent and brilliant way by our Secretary of State for External Affairs on the weekend. He said that the Secretary of State for the United States, Mr. Shultz, and the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Gromyko, have agreed to meet next month. I am glad that he picked that up. It is true that they are going to meet next month. He went on to say: "We have to be careful that we do not do anything to throw it", meaning the meeting, "off course". He said; "We ought not to throw it off course by voting in favour of a nuclear freeze". How silly can one get?

● (1120)

His own disarmament ambassador to the United Nations revealed for me a more cogent line of reasoning as an explanation for what is now taking place among the superpowers than that demonstrated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On Friday in Vancouver, Mr. Roche pointed out that the United States and the Soviet Union are now responding to mounting world opinion against the arms race. He said that discontent will eventually pressure the superpowers into reaching an agreement.

I want to say to the Secretary of State for External Affairs that Mr. Roche has it right. The superpowers are beginning to respond to pressure that is being exercised by other nations and by other groups within their own society. I also want to suggest to the new Secretary of State for External Affairs, whose Government has promised change, that we don't create pressure on one of the superpowers by always agreeing with that power, we don't lead by following and we don't bring about nuclear disarmament by voting against a verifiable nuclear freeze at the United Nations.