

They would respect that, but would the East bloc? Would the Warsaw Pact respect the sovereignty of Canadian territorial waters? Do they today? Would they simply do so because we proclaim it? We are talking about nations that will not allow an international tribunal to come in and verify whether or not torture or human rights violations are taking place. It is incomprehensible from what we know about the Warsaw Pact countries and the way they operate that a debate such as the one that is taking place today, with people in the galleries and the press in the galleries, could even take place in those countries. Those people would not know about our initiative, unless their Government chose by means of propaganda to make them aware of it. We contrast that—

● (1750)

Mr. Benjamin: Go ahead, smother it.

Mr. Hawkes: The desire of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) is to take this unilateral action in the belief that others will follow. I have tried to contrast that with the reality of the international community as we experience it. That is the reality. In my opening remarks I stated that we in this Chamber have a special responsibility for decision making on behalf of Canadian people. We have the responsibility to ensure that they can live in safety, without the fear of being taken over.

We could look at Afghanistan some five years later. We are a nation which has never started a war. We could also look at Iran and Iraq which have had 600,000 or 700,000 casualties in the last few years due to war. Those are real situations which exist in the world. Because Canada does not start a war it does not follow that other nations will not start a war. Our special responsibility in this Chamber is to make decisions, and hopefully, with respect to nuclear weapons, those decisions will be taken in the direction which will bring about a nuclear weapons free world.

I would like to read into the record a small part of what the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) said at the United Nations about Canada's commitment to the topic which we are discussing today. In September of 1984 he said:

We shall seek, through concrete and realistic steps, progress toward a comprehensive test ban treaty. We shall encourage superpower and multilateral discussion on all outer space weapons, and shall commission further studies on how a space weapons ban might be verified. We shall work for the success of next year's Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, in order to prevent the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. We shall bring to bear our technical expertise in verification measures to ensure mutual confidence and security in areas where arms control agreements can be achieved. We shall encourage agreement on a mutual and balanced reduction of conventional forces in Europe, and hence reduce the danger of escalation to nuclear war. We shall continue to press for a verifiable convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons. Canada will continue its financial support of the World Disarmament Campaign. We shall, in addition, expect that the newly-created Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security will contribute its share of studies and advice on specific arms control proposals and measures to reduce international tension.

In other words, Canada is committed to achievable and realistic measures. It will continue to be an active participant in the Geneva conference on disarmament, in the Stockholm conference on confidence and security-building measures and

disarmament in Europe, and in the Vienna mutual balanced force reductions talks.

Those are the kinds of steps which I hope would have all-Party endorsement. Then we would be a real player in the real world. Within that context, we could always move to help member nations take tiny steps toward the goal which we all want. Or we can cease to be a player. That may raise the position of our soapbox, but it will reduce the size of our influence. Surely members of all Parties in the Chamber would prefer that Canada have influence. It is an area in which there should be little political gain or loss. The over-all goal of restoring peace and stability in this world, and the goal of nuclear arms reduction and ultimate elimination, are goals which we all share. That is only achievable in a real world, by using real methods which are designed to work.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, since you have given me the floor, and pursuant to Beauchesne's, Citation 234, I therefore move, in accordance with Standing Order 8(4)(a), and I have the text of my motion here, to extend the time for this debate so that we can hear more Members on this subject—

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. Mr. Prud'homme, seconded by Ms. Copps, pursuant to Standing Order 8(4)(a), moves that the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour for daily adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of Bill C-218. Will those Members who object to the motion please rise in their places?

And more than 25 Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Since more than 25 Members have risen, I declare the motion lost.

Motion (Mr. Prud'homme) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I will recognize the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lanthier) on debate.

[Translation]

Mr. Claude Lanthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that I may speak until the end of the agreed time limit? I had prepared a very interesting speech, now unfortunately—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member has two minutes.

Mr. Lanthier: All right. But the subject is far too broad for two minutes.

I just want to summarize in a few words the speech I prepared this afternoon. It is unfortunate to see the lack of order in this House, Mr. Speaker. Nevertheless, I sincerely believe I cannot support the proposal being made in Bill