

Soviet officials. In the interests of mutual security, these talks must be resumed in the very near future. It is for the purpose of supporting the negotiation process that we intend to pursue this objective with determination.

Our second objective is a renewal of the commitment made by the international community toward non-proliferation. Our success will depend to a great extent on the period of preparation before the third review conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty to be held in 1985. In spite of the differences of opinion between the super-powers, there is a community of interests, as the American Secretary of State, Mr. George Schultz, emphasized in a recent speech on this issue. However, he noted that this community of interests cannot be taken for granted, even when the super-powers agree; consequently, the tasks which await us at the review conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty will be arduous and their success is far from certain. This was the unequivocal message given by Mr. Mohamad Shaker of Egypt, who was recently elected chairman of the conference.

Canada's policy of positive internationalism can be and is being applied in practice. In Geneva, Canada took the initiative of searching for a new consensus of non-proliferation; in Vienna, Canada was at the forefront of the efforts made to strengthen the guarantee systems of the International Atomic Energy Agency; in London, we consulted many countries, both from the East and the West, as well as neutral countries, which export nuclear material or techniques to ensure the safety of these exports, while pursuing the noble objective of co-operating with recipients of these exports. Within the United Nations, we continue to fight with determination for non-proliferation.

The third objective to which Canada's positive internationalism is and must be applied is the prohibition of nuclear weapons. We can all be glad that the three powers in possession of nuclear weapons, namely the United States, the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R., have accepted to stop surface nuclear arm testing. We can also rejoice that these tests have been limited to 150 kilotons. However, it is not enough. Talks among these three countries have been suspended and are now continuing in the larger context of the Conference on disarmament in Geneva.

One of the major questions at the Conference still is verification. And Canada is doing her share in that regard. Along with other nations, we are currently taking part in the international exchange of seismological data. If successful, that project will be a major contribution to what I would call the "verifiability" of a treaty banning nuclear arms testing. But we want to go still further. Last fall, in the United Nations, we co-sponsored a resolution calling upon all parties to ban nuclear testing. The combination of public positions and private endeavours in the area of practical negotiation that such a co-sponsorship entailed seems to me to be a creative example of Canada's positive internationalism.

### *Supply*

These three goals—a resumption of superpower discussions, non-proliferation, and a test ban—are feasible. They give Canada an opportunity to use her influence and take initiatives.

Canada has the eminent responsibility of contributing to arms control and disarmament measures, and this Government is committed to setting up a system that will provide genuine collective security.

At about the same time last year, Mr. Trudeau launched his peace initiative, the goals of which were endorsed by all Canadian men and women. More recently, Mr. Speaker, the Right Hon. Brian Mulroney described the nuclear arms problem as a serious problem.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would ask the Hon. Minister to conclude her remarks.

**Mrs. Vézina:** I therefore urge all Members to support their Government, and abstain from undermining in this House our constant efforts towards peace and a reduction of tensions.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Questions, comments. The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** Mr. Speaker, without trying in any way to diminish the new Minister's importance, I would have hoped to see on such an important resolution the Right Hon. Prime Minister and/or the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) in attendance. And this, I repeat, with due respect and without in any way diminishing the importance of the Minister's intervention. This I repeat with due respect, because good manners have still their place in this House.

I should like to ask the Minister whether she has had the time to examine the amendment moved by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) and whether her government intends later today, first of all, to support this amendment which is obviously quite acceptable—I do not see why not, since she herself referred in her remarks on several occasions to the essential elements of this amendment. I shall begin with this simple question.

**Mrs. Vézina:** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that elegance fits in well with the customs of this venerable chamber. I take into account your remarks and comments which I do not dare describe openly, although I certainly reserve the right to describe them for my own benefit.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** I do not understand.

**Mrs. Vézina:** Your reference to the fact that the minister responsible for the government is not the one which the House wishes to hear.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** I never said that.

**Mrs. Vézina:** As to the part—