

### *Nuclear Disarmament*

Whether this rule would apply as between a motion and a bill is a difficult matter to decide, but it is unlikely that substantially the same question could be raised by a motion and a bill as a whole. A motion can do no more than affirm in general terms the desirability of legislation while a bill is likely to contain qualifying provisions and conditions, sufficient to differentiate its subject-matter from that of a motion. In any case a bill and a motion have different purposes. The question has been raised, but so far no case for the application of the rule has been made out.

The Chair has looked at the motion and at the two Bills to which reference was made. As the Chair has said, Bill C-204, which was presented to the House by the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant), was defeated. Bill C-203, which on the surface appears to be essentially the same but has a few changes in paragraphs, was presented by the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish). Inasmuch as the motion which is before the House contains the key words "in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of", and under those circumstances it is just an expression of opinion of the House, the Chair has no difficulty in allowing debate to continue on the motion.

However, the Chair will take this opportunity to suggest that it will be looking closely at the similarity of the two Bills, Bill C-204 which was defeated, and Bill C-203 which has been brought forward already for debate in this session. The Chair will consider whether there can be resumption of debate on Bill C-203 at the appropriate time. Therefore, for continuing debate on the motion, the Hon. Member for Thunder Bay-Atikokan (Mr. McRae).

**Mr. Paul E. McRae (Thunder Bay-Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, I find myself rising for the second time in three days to debate essentially the same motion. I respect the ruling of the Chair on this. I find the motion supportable and support the intent of the motion, but I worry about why we are debating a Bill three times which really will do nothing to prevent the holocaust which I think is going to occur if we do not bring the super powers together to stop the warring which is going on.

I do not think that our being pure is going to influence either of the super powers in the direction in which they must go. In response to a question asked of the very distinguished Rear Admiral Carroll at a gathering in Toronto in March, he said that the armaments, the computerization of arms, the speed and so on would make a nuclear war very probable in about six to eight years. We all know there is no possibility that human life could continue in any normal fashion after such a war. The social values which we all appreciate would cease to exist under these circumstances. It seems that a hardness has developed between the two super powers at this point which could very well continue, depending upon what happens in the American election. I have no qualms about talking about American internal politics because the Ambassador from that country has no qualms about talking about how we run our operation.

I believe that unless there is a change in the scene in the United States, this hardening will become much worse. I would be much happier if I heard Members of the NDP

talking about this very serious problem rather than seeing the answer as our being pure.

● (1730)

The problem possibly stems from the attitude of Hon. Members on the other side. Because they essentially have not held power or been close to power for the last 20 years, they find it hard to deal with reality. When we have to deal with our relationship with NATO, when we have to deal with the Government of the United States and the Government of the Soviet Union and when we have to try and move those Governments, the problem becomes very different.

Let me give you an idea of that. Let us suppose that tomorrow, a motion is put before the House to support the ten points common ground that were listed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Suppose that motion contains some additional points calling for no first use and no testing of the Cruise. Those are things that I support. However, if we along with the other countries presented such a motion to the two super powers, something which I think should be done, then the same thing would happen as happened to the motion of the four-continent group, a motion into which I have been very proud to have had some input. Within 20 minutes, the U.S. Government would reject the entire thing. How would that do anything in terms of closing the gap between the two super powers?

**Mr. Young:** What do you suggest?

**Mr. McRae:** If we do not close the gap, then the war occurs. We are pure, we are not doing anything wrong, but how are we closing that gap? It seems to me that we would then invalidate anything that could happen because the two super powers would not speak to us.

I would like to begin to understand the dimensions of this issue. I simply do not believe that in this world, Canada will be able to change anything. One might think that we could change things by bringing the two super powers together. In those ten points of common ground to which I have referred many times, there are areas about which both sides can agree and there are more to those areas than what appears on the surface. Then, with the right negotiating techniques, we may be able to change things.

I would remind Hon. Members on both sides of the House that the issue we are dealing with today will be a very large issue in the elections in both the United States and Canada. Both countries will be holding elections during almost the same period of time. If there is a change in the U.S. Government after the November election, then we will be faced with a new situation and we will have a chance to develop these things. I believe that that is what will happen. However, I am opposed to trying to inject ourselves into a situation in which we would hope for some successful negotiations between the two super powers in such a way that we would automatically and without any question be rejected. I do not think that that will achieve anything positive. In fact, I think it may achieve the very opposite.