

global security". If a nation perceives the need to use nuclear weapons, a treaty in face of that perception will become meaningless.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that his time has expired. I call upon the hon. member for Lac Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaïel), but the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) may continue if there is unanimous consent. Are hon. members agreed?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Wenman: I will conclude very quickly, Mr. Speaker. In discussing strategic nuclear weapons, it is important not to be obsessed by their undoubted power of destruction, so obsessed that one neglects to realize their power to deter major war. The world has had great cause to be gratified that all wars since 1945 have been well below the scale of global war. For most countries, including Canada, they have been quite small and far away. If we have strategic nuclear deterrence to thank for that, let us give that deterrent its proper due, notwithstanding the potential power for destruction if the deterrence should ever fail.

We have not had global conflict in the past 37 years, since the advent of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons have been invented and they cannot now be uninvented. It is exactly because nuclear war would be so terrible that the most important responsibility of government is to adopt policies which will prevent it. There are no simple answers, however, to these complex and intricate problems. One should also, however, not limit the scope of possible solutions. Politics is the art of the possible; and we must reconcile the art of the possible with the ideal, and strive for it.

One practical alternative to disarmament is arms control. Arms control can reinforce deterrence and stabilize the military balance at lower levels of risk and effort. The overriding objective for arms control is reducing the risk of war. The most concrete hope for achieving this goal is through the negotiated mutual, balanced and verifiable reduction of nuclear arms at all levels to the lowest possible levels. This would encompass the successful completion of START, include the zero option for Europe, and would also, hopefully, be linked to a just and speedy conclusion to the negotiations for mutual balanced forces reductions, MBFR, in Europe. Bilateral negotiations, based on the mutual self-interest in the continued survival of one's national way of life, is a practical and legitimate solution to one of the most vital concerns facing humanity today.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is again a consensus in this House of Commons. There is a consensus that the objective we seek here tonight is a way to peace, to stability and to a better way for this world. Let not one of us put down the other point of view. Let us examine all of these points of view, let us establish a balanced, verifiable, mutual reduction in arms in the world, keeping these objectives before

Supply

us and, above all, hold forth the objective of peace for ourselves, our country, our nation and our globe.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, I have a few minutes left, about ten I believe, to try to express what I felt during the sittings of this committee on disarmament and more specifically what I feel reading the motion now under consideration. The Chairman of the committee has asked me to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that, in my opinion, he did an excellent job as chairman. In fact, he did an excellent job in general.

I now come back to the motion under consideration. I would like to quote the last lines of this motion, which read as follows:

—signed by six members of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence in April, 1982, calling for, *inter alia*, a world-wide nuclear freeze, no cruise missile testing in Canada and a worldwide pledge against first use of nuclear weapons.

That is signed by Mr. Broadbent.

Of course, the man in the street who would get to read such a resolution could not object to such pious wishes. No one could. It is obvious that no one wants a world war, that no one would want us to build missiles here, or anywhere else, that no one wants to be the first to attack. Everyone wants peace. I can understand such thinking on the part of Members of Parliament because they have to reflect the views of their constituents. When we meet with people, they tell us that they do not want war. However, we should always keep in mind that our constituents, first and foremost, want security. They do not want anyone to come around and take away their property, their homes, their country or their territory, and Members of Parliament may sometimes forget that fact. However, when someone who shows off in front of the people of Canada and the rest of the world as a candidate to the office of Prime Minister of Canada is seen moving such a motion in the House of Commons, I find it impossible to understand or justify, and even dangerous. I consider it dangerous that one of the three men now in full time competition to become one day Prime Minister of Canada should believe that such pious wishes can be approved by an assembly such as this one without endangering all Canadians.

Either this man completely fails to understand what Canada is all about and even less what the Soviet regime stands for and what the dangers are which now exist in the world, or he does not care what he does as long as he is gaining political advantages. There is no other answer, Mr. Speaker. If at the age of 32, after two years in this House, I can understand that a motion like this one, approved by such an assembly as ours, could open the door to the Russians, open up whole territories and place us in a situation where we would be unable to go anywhere, where we would no longer have any weapons, I do not see how someone who has been a Member of Parliament for as long as the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), who is a party leader and who wants to become Prime Minister of Canada, can fail to do so.