

government formally recognized the provisional revolutionary government of the Republic of South Vietnam. And yet at the same time, by another error the minister might call a false move, the Canadian Department of Immigration, pleading its ignorance of the record, allowed in with impunity some South Vietnamese people like former General Dang Van Quang and other well known exploiters of the Vietnamese people. This might harm our reputation abroad, more particularly in South East Asia, and this contributes to delay unduly the resumption of diplomatic relations between Canada and the new government in South Vietnam, and consequently, that of CIDA's activities which were interrupted in mid-April last, some time before the temporary withdrawal of our personnel from the Canadian embassy in Saigon.

Will all this not hamper Canada in the eventual task of contributing to the rebuilding of Vietnam? The question must be put. The incoherence of our policies, the incoherence between the two departments internally, and consequently the projection abroad of an incoherent image. Another source of incoherence in the field of external policies is the attitude of our government towards the status, if any, of the PLO on the international scene.

Before the Canadian-Israeli committee, on April 30 last, and again in the House today, in reply to the questions of an hon. member of the opposition, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) stated specifically that:

Canada recognizes the right of the Palestinian people to make itself heard and to participate in the negotiations which will seal its fate.

But then, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, why does Canada put up with, or put off denouncing the presence of the PLO at international conferences such as those soon to be held in Canada, under the aegis of the UN, first in Toronto, then in Vancouver in 1976, or at the Labour Conference now under way in Geneva, where the attendance of the PLO led to the withdrawal of the American and Israeli delegations. All those conferences, that I know, contribute in no way to "sealing the fate" of the Palestinians.

For the time being—we know, from having heard it from the Prime Minister himself—that we will have to take a stand with regard to the UN conferences. *Hansard* reports that:

The whole matter will be brought to the attention of the cabinet.

● (1620)

[English]

As a matter of principle our party stands unequivocally against terrorism, whether it be international or national, whether it be the FLQ, the PLO, or the IRA. Specifically, as far as the PLO is concerned, we blamed the government for its wishy-washiness at the United Nations. We condemned the government for abstaining when a procedural vote was taken prior to the invitation extended to Arafat, and now that the United Nations fifth congress on crime prevention is to take place in Toronto, reflecting a majority opinion held by Canadians we should consider it to be an affront to our standards of decency and justice if we were to support this presence of the PLO in Toronto.

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

### *Business of Supply*

**Mr. Wagner:** The government of Ontario has also indicated that it is reconsidering sponsoring certain social events if the PLO is admitted.

I repeat what I have recently stated in the presence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, that while Canada must seek friendship and discussion with Arabs and Israelis, we have no cause, no justification, and no rationale for opening doors, or standing back while doors are opened for terrorists and those who support terrorists.

The issue is no longer that of whether we support the state of Israel. The issue is not that we want to see peace. The issue is where we as Canadians and our government stand on international lawlessness. There is nothing any terrorist wants to say that Canadians should want to hear. There is nothing any terrorist should be able to do to win a world audience in a body committed to the peaceful resolution of international difficulties.

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, our international policy is not firm enough. This day, June 17, when the civil court in Paris will pass judgment on the Canadian sailing ship *Green Peace III*, we should recall the words of the *Green Peace* owner, Mr. David McTaggart from Vancouver, and I quote:

The Canadian government waited until my case had been before the French court for 17 days before extending me any support.

So, Canada will not have shown character or quickness towards France.

There is still another issue where Canada is lacking in firmness, that is when Soviet Jews want to emigrate to Israel. How many Dina Podriachik will have to campaign in Canada or elsewhere to get their sons or other relatives out of the USSR? We are not satisfied that Canada exerted enough pressure on Soviet Russia to have a reasonable immigration program for Jews. Therefore, Canada appears to be lacking of firmness in some fields.

Finally, too often our external policies are characterized by ambivalence. As recently as yesterday, answering a question put by my friend the hon. member for Central Nova (Mr. MacKay), the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs stated:

Canada has always followed a one-China policy. We believe the government of China is the government at Peking. The question of Taiwan is one to be decided by the Chinese people and not by us.

That, Mr. Chairman, was a very clear and also a very ruthless answer. First because we could question the statement that "Canada has always followed a one-China policy." Particularly because we wonder whether Canada does not have commercial bilateral relations with Taiwan and her friendly countries. And if in a more or less distant future Taiwan were to insist on self-determination and become completely independent, we wonder what would be the position of this government. Did not Canada slam the door by such a clear-cut decision?

The ambivalence of our position is especially obvious when Canada is canvassing foreign countries to buy CANDU reactors. The Leader of the Opposition described the situation exactly and he suggested to the government some middle or long-term solutions that they should endorse and I hope that later this evening the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) will reply to the suggestions of the Leader of the Opposition.