

### Supply

3. Hopes that the other major nuclear-weapon State will find it possible to comply also with the request of the General Assembly before the closure of its thirty-ninth session;

4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its fortieth session an item entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 39/... on a nuclear-arms freeze".

and calls upon the Government to adopt it as policy, thereby rejecting the position of the previous administration.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my comments on this important debate in the House of Commons today by quoting an old Chinese proverb: "If we do not change our direction, we are likely to end up where we are headed". Nothing could be more relevant in terms of evidence supporting this quote than the direction which we in the world will inevitably take if we do not put an end to the nuclear armaments buildup. If we do not stop, Mr. Speaker, the odds are—and they are strong odds—that one day a nuclear weapon once again will go off. If that happens, the odds are depressingly real that mankind itself, and not just a part of mankind, will be threatened. It is time we in this world, we in this Parliament, took leadership to put an end to this nuclear madness.

On November 20, Mr. Speaker, there was a vote in the committee of the United Nations on the question of a nuclear freeze. Canada was among a small minority of nations, I regret to say, which voted against that freeze. To put into perspective what is going on in the world I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that since that vote took place there has been added to the nuclear arsenal of the world the equivalent in nuclear strength of 2,800 times greater than the bomb which went off at Hiroshima. I repeat, just since November 20 we have added to the nuclear arsenal of the world enough destructive power to exceed by 2,800 times the strength of the bomb which devastated the people in Hiroshima.

We have before us a resolution, Mr. Speaker, which calls upon the nuclear superpowers to implement a nuclear freeze. It is one which I submit is grounded equally on hope and on realism. The essence of this resolution, as I see it, is twofold; first, it is applied to both of the superpowers. If one does not act upon it, then the other is in no way obligated. That is a crucial and realistic aspect of any initiative which is to be taken in the real world. The second point which is imbedded in this resolution, and imbedded in the thinking of almost anyone associated with the resolution, is that it calls for verifiability. What this means is that if both of the superpowers come to their senses, accept the first point and obligate themselves now to stop the nuclear armaments race, then if down the road one of the superpowers hesitates in some way to provide access for verification and puts up roadblocks of any kind to discourage the examination of nuclear developments in the armaments field in any way, the other nuclear power is no longer obligated to act under the terms.

What we have, I repeat, is a resolution which is not only optimistic in the sense it would begin, if acted upon, to provide hope for those who are living and for those who will come after us, but it is also one which is grounded in realism. It is not pie in the sky. It is something which ought to be able to obtain the support of the most militaristically-oriented sectors of both the

Soviet Union and the United States, if they are doing what they claim, that is, acting in terms of self-defence of their own societies. And it is inextricably linked with the notion of verifiability.

In my comments this morning, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell on all the horrors of the allocation of resources because of this terrible nuclear madness at a time when so many millions of people in the world are starving. Nor do I want to talk about the potential consequences of a nuclear war. That has been done before in this House and other speakers in this debate will no doubt discuss those profoundly important aspects of this question as well. What I want to dwell upon in my comments this morning is this new Government, which promised us change, new directions, particularly in this field, its attitude on this matter, and I want to indicate why it seems to me to be totally lacking in substance.

• (1110)

Last February the man who is now Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), then Leader of the Opposition, said: "We need to restore this Chamber as an instrument for seeking national consensus on the challenge we face in foreign affairs". I thought it was a fine speech at the time and a fine sentiment that all of us could support. However, I say to the Government House Leader (Mr. Hnatyshyn), who is here for the debate today, that if there was ever a national and international consensus on anything in the world, surely it is the consensus on the need for the United States and the Soviet Union to stop developing, producing and deploying nuclear weapons. The consensus is there.

I say to the Government House Leader that if he looks to his own country, church leaders of virtually every faith, union members, women's groups, peace groups—hundreds of them—veterans' associations, the young, the old, western Canadians, eastern Canadians, indeed 85 per cent of the population of this country indicated in the most recent Gallup poll on this question that they are in favour of a verifiable nuclear freeze. If we go outside of Canada and consider the world, every part of the planet, east, south, north, west, countries of every ideological stripe, are united on this important issue. They believe we ought to have a mutual, verifiable nuclear freeze applied to the superpowers. Indeed, more than one-third of the membership of NATO refused to vote against a nuclear freeze. The UN vote was 111 for a nuclear freeze and 12 against. As a Canadian I am ashamed to say that the Government of Canada was among the 12 against a nuclear freeze.

If we go outside of the international community as such, outside our own community as such, and go to the United States of America, so much the concern of the new Government, what do we find? We find that the U.S. House of Representatives has voted in favour of a freeze. Former NATO generals are in favour, as is the former head of the CIA. Business people of all kinds have recently come out in favour of the freeze. I refer the Government to a notable article in the November 19 issue of *Newsweek* in which a leading group of American businessmen go further in their