

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Irwin:** Members of the NDP can harp. It is the truth, and the truth makes anyone harp. Canada has the most stringent safeguards on the export of armaments and the safest nuclear plants in the world. The NDP wants us to spend less on armaments. I think it was the hon. member for Victoria who mentioned that we spend 1.7 per cent of our gross national product on armament, which puts us in the second lowest place to Luxembourg in the NATO alliance. We have gone a long way toward peace.

I support the five or six recommendations of the majority report and I sympathize with the minority report. In many ways they fit together. They are looking for strategic arms reduction talks, decisions on anti-ballistic missile treaties, comprehensive multilateral test bans, nuclear weapons free zones, non-proliferation and, an end to chemical and biological weapons. We all want this. On the whole the minority report has been a genuine effort of concerned members of the committee to ease world tensions. It has stimulated debate on the points of view which vary in the majority report. I think we can live with them, I think they are important. But how can we vote for them when it is a vote of non-confidence?

**Miss Jewett:** What do you mean?

**Mr. Irwin:** If I vote for the minority report today, the Government of Canada falls. I do not think it would serve any useful purpose or contribute to controlling world armament if I voted for the minority report. To accept it for discussion is one thing; to bring down the government is another. Therefore, it is unlikely that the minority report will be supported by this side of the House.

**Mr. Lalonde:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Consultations have taken place with representatives of the opposition parties. We have agreed to seek unanimous consent of the House to revert to tabling of documents for the purpose of tabling the offer made by the government of Alberta and the Government of Canada to the Alsands consortium.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

### ENERGY

TABLING OF JOINT PROPOSAL OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT  
AND ALBERTA TO ALSANDS CONSORTIUM

**Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2), I wish to table, in both official languages, copies of the joint proposal by the Government of Canada and the

### Supply

Government of Alberta to the partners in the Alsands consortium.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—REPORT  
ON SECURITY AND DISARMAMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Broadbent:

That this House supports the minority report on security and disarmament signed by six members of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence in April, 1982, calling for, *inter alia*, a worldwide nuclear freeze, no Cruise missile testing in Canada and a world-wide pledge against first use of nuclear weapons.

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today deals with an issue which through the years has grown in importance and, by consequence, has become visibly and vocally controversial. Because people throughout the world rightfully seek to live in peace, concern over the change in nature and weapons of death and destruction of war is more than justified.

As a member of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, which conducted an exhaustive in-depth review of the issues of security and disarmament, I along with my colleagues had the opportunity to examine these concerns and the reasons behind them.

Prior to the presentation of our reports the committee spent long hours over many days listening to and reading comments from a great many individuals and groups from diverse areas of the Canadian and international community. One of the reports represents the views of a majority of committee members; the other, as has been pointed out very well, was a press release. I will address this split later. Each group, each individual and each report, while varying in approach to the problem at hand, revealed quite clearly an abhorrence of war and a deep-rooted horror that the consequences of another major war would be the destruction of mankind. The immediate and obvious focus of concern is the possibility of and the escalation toward a nuclear war.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age some 37 years ago, mankind has had to live with what has been described as the terrible burden of nuclear weapons and the havoc they may wreak. In a recent address, the United States Secretary of State Alexander Haig, commenting on the issue, said:

No one has ever advocated nuclear war. No responsible voice has ever sought to minimize its horrors.

If there is any comfort or slight encouragement to be derived from the current situation, it is that this view is being expressed by a representative of the administration of one of