

*The Address—Mr. Broadbent*

sensitivity. We must speak with a softer voice but one that carries a more substantial message.

The challenge is overwhelming. It is at times frightening in itself. But as Browning so eloquently said, "Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?"

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Mr. Speaker, in discussing disarmament today and nuclear disarmament in particular, we are participating in some small way hopefully in the resolution of an issue that has engaged the fears and apprehensions and hopes of all of humanity for many of the most recent months.

Both the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) have made reference to the role that politicians have played or ought to be playing in the resolution of this profoundly important matter. I want to begin my comments today by saying that we in the House should be giving thanks to those to whom it belongs above all others. That is, we should be thanking the ordinary people of this country, men, women and children, who began not last fall or indeed last spring, but some two years ago outside of the House of Commons, to put the profoundly important question of nuclear disarmament on the political agenda of Canada.

I want to pay tribute to all those citizens who make up some 500 groups in our country, such as volunteer groups of medical practitioners, unskilled workers, veterans, both men and women, who took it upon themselves long ago, along with other groups in the world, to educate all politicians in order that we may exercise our responsibilities in dealing with the political policy-making role which must eventually be the means of resolving the problem.

In saying this, I want to pay particular tribute to members of my own caucus. I want to say to the Prime Minister that, like the Leader of the Opposition, I and my colleagues share completely in the stated goals that he established last fall before he embarked on his travels outside of our country. But I remind him and the people of our country that it was almost two years ago that the New Democratic Party put the same subject matter before the House of Commons, not simply for a debate but for a vote. Peace has been an issue of central concern to us not in recent days, weeks or months, but for years.

The Prime Minister, in travelling abroad, took with him four key proposals. There was the suggestion for a five-power nuclear conference. There was the suggestion that an effort be made to broaden the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Third, there was an attempt to get agreement on the notion that a balance of conventional forces in Europe be achieved at a lower level, not a higher level. Finally, there was the proposal that an agreement be reached on the banning of testing of anti-satellite weapons.

Although news reports would indicate that the Prime Minister failed to obtain substantial agreement on the specifics of these ideas, it would be a serious mistake for us to suggest, in

light of this, that the initiative taken by the Prime Minister was in any sense a failure itself. In my view, it is an important initiative not only for Canadians but for others in the world who are looking for a way out of the impasse of nuclear disarmament. It will have only been a failure, from our point of view, if we do not follow up with the appropriate steps which I believe flow from the matters that were raised in that important trip outside our country.

It is obvious that one of the results of the Prime Minister's trip was to force into the open a debate about some of the basic assumptions behind nuclear escalation. Such a debate in Canada, if it is both honest and thorough, can lead to a change in policy if certain assumptions are seen to be clearly erroneous.

● (1230)

To refuse to do this would mean that the initiative taken by the Prime Minister was at best wasted and at worst mischievous. The Government must now assume that the political focus in Canada does continue to include major efforts to bring about disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. To this end the Government must ensure consistency in terms of its stated principles, on the one hand, and its actions here in Canada and abroad on the other.

I believe this can best be done by systematically pursuing for Canada an anti-nuclear weapons position in every conceivable aspect of our domestic, foreign and defence policies. I believe this can and should be done. I also believe that if we do this systematically here at home, we can influence other nations. Our motto, if I could suggest one, should be this. If we desire a non-nuclear world abroad, we must first achieve a completely non-nuclear Canada at home.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Canada must make sure that the disarmament debate remains one of our main political concerns. We must do our utmost to foster disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. To reach that goal, our principles must logically be translated into positive action. I firmly believe that we will be successful by standing up against nuclear weapons for Canada and for other countries. There can be no contradiction in our foreign and defence policies. Our example can influence others. The principle we have to endorse is simple: if we want a nuclear-free world, we in Canada must be prepared to respect that commitment.

[*English*]

I would like to spell out as clearly and as concisely as I can certain proposals on behalf of my Party that seem to us will move us in this direction. First, Canada should be among those nations supporting confidence-building measures that are both serious and balanced, and when we hear any of them, whatever their source, we ought not to hesitate to give our public support to them. One such example is Sweden's nuclear freeze resolution at the United Nations. This calls for a mutually verifiable freeze on the production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons. Support for this resolution, I would argue,