

*Supply*

In that connection I was very happy to see a ray of hope this afternoon, one to which the Minister of National Defence has not seen fit to adhere tonight. It came principally from the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan), although I should add that the parliamentary secretary perhaps gave us even a greater reason to hope that the minority report on security and disarmament, the report we are asking the House to adopt, had made a real impact on this House and on the Canadian public. The parliamentary secretary said that it has stimulated debate on the points of view which vary from the majority report. He said he thinks we can live with these points of view and that they are important. That was terrific. I thought, "There we are; we have a majority in favour of our recommendations." The parliamentary secretary went on to ask how he could vote for them when it would be a vote of non-confidence. I plead with all hon. members of the House not to regard this as a vote of non-confidence but to regard it as a free vote so that every member, with his knowledge and conscience, will vote freely. I will return to that later in my remarks.

● (2030)

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, perhaps most unexpectedly, shed some hope on the acceptance, although maybe not today, of the four major recommendations made in the minority report on security and disarmament. Of course he is very annoyed that members of the NDP on that committee were among the six who signed the minority report. I cannot understand why he was so petulant about the NDP and its support of the recommendations today. He did not refer to the fact that there was a Liberal member and two Conservatives who also signed the report. I cannot quite explain his petulance unless he is perhaps a closet NDP, to paraphrase him.

I was unhappy that he focused on half of the signatories to this report. None of us wants this to be simply an NDP move. It is not in this Parliament and it is not in this country. There are people from all walks of life and of all political beliefs who believe in the very things we advocate in this report. I regret very much that he wanted to have it as something that only the NDP was pursuing. That simply is not the case.

As I understood the minister's remarks—and I have not seen all the "blues"—he implicitly gave a great deal of support to the minority report on security and disarmament. I would draw your attention to his reaction to our first proposal for a nuclear freeze, that:

Canada should put its full strength into the campaign now gathering strength in many parts of the world: a global freeze on the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles.

It is true that he did not mention this first proposal specifically but it seems to me that implicitly he supported it. Some people might even argue that he went further. The reason I say he supported it is that by far the most important thing he said this afternoon, in my view, was that the goal of the government in UNSSOD II would be balanced deterrence through radical reduction in nuclear weapons.

As has often been pointed out, Mr. Speaker, if a freight train is coming down the track you cannot throw it into reverse until you first stop it. In other words, you cannot have radical reduction until you first have a change of direction—until you have first halted the arms race.

In our recommendation on the nuclear freeze in the minority report that section reads:

Rather, a practical policy is to promote mutual, balanced and verifiable disarmament by first of all freezing further growth.

In other words, you will not get radical reductions until you have created a freeze to get a change in direction. You have to stop the arms race so that it can be reversed. This was also a very important part of the House-Senate joint resolution in the United States. It was the second of two points and reads as follows:

Proceeding from this freeze, the United States and the Soviet Union should pursue major, mutual and verifiable reductions in nuclear warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems, through annual percentages, or equally effective means, in a manner that enhances stability.

When the minister said that our goal in UNSSOD II and elsewhere will be balanced deterrence through radical reduction it seems to me he is implicitly agreeing; otherwise there is no logic to a nuclear freeze. It is the first step to radical reductions.

At the moment, the wonder of the world is why people of conservative thought are rejecting the idea of a nuclear freeze, particularly those who know and understand that there is rough global parity and that this is the moment for the freeze.

The syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick writing in the *Los Angeles Times* of March 22, 1982, had this to say:

Where are my brother conservatives? What are they doing about the most awesomely important political issue in the world? Alas, the answer is, not much.

He identifies this as follows:

—an issue of life-or-death meaning to the whole planet, and there is not a sentence in their resolution that thoughtful conservatives could not support.

He was referring to the Kennedy-Hatfield resolution. He continues quoting the resolution:

"The greatest challenge facing the Earth is to prevent the occurrence of nuclear war by accident or design." What is wrong with that? "The nuclear arms race is dangerously increasing the risk of a holocaust that would be humanity's final war." Can anyone deny this? "A freeze followed by reductions in nuclear warheads, missiles and other delivery systems is needed to halt the nuclear arms race and to reduce the risk of nuclear war." Isn't this an idea worthy of exploration?

He goes on to say:

The resolution urges that the United States and the Soviet Union jointly "pursue" a complete halt to the arms race, that the two nations "decide" how such a mutual and verifiable freeze could be arranged, and that, proceeding from such a freeze, the two nations "should pursue major, mutual and verifiable reductions in nuclear warheads, missiles and other delivery systems."

The article continues:

Otherwise, unless words have lost their meaning, the Kennedy-Hatfield liberals are proposing exactly what Reagan's START proposed in November.

I think that is the direction the government is going, if I take the remarks of the minister this afternoon to mean that there must be a freeze before there can be radical reductions.