

*Government Orders*

utter disrepute. We cannot find anybody in the country who would be willing to say a good word about it.

There is an opportunity as well as a necessity for the government to rethink its foreign policy and to begin to ask serious questions about how Canada can live up to its new responsibilities in this new situation. How can Canada live up to the responsibilities that it has in its unique geopolitical context, being situated between the superpowers.

How can we move in the Canadian Arctic to establish principles of common security and confidence building and various other arrangements which would assure the superpowers that the Canadian Arctic was not being used in a way that threatened either of them. We have an opportunity to break new ground as to how the superpowers will relate to each other.

Obviously both superpowers, in differing ways, are coming to the end of their tether. They are coming to the end of their hegemony over their respective spheres. It is coming more quickly in the Soviet Union. The United States still likes to think that Central America belongs to it as the Panamanian invasion shows so clearly. Whether it likes it or not, even it is coming to the end of the day when the world is divided into these two camps.

We are going to be living in a multi-polar world, for better or for worse. It is in that multi-polar world that Canada will have an opportunity to practice what it is best at. That is the kind of peacekeeping, constructive, mediatory role that Canadians have fashioned for themselves over the years and which will become even more important in this multi-polar world. There is an opportunity here for the government to do some creative thinking. I am glad to have had the opportunity, in the context of the this bill, to encourage it to do that.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, I am going to follow to some extent upon the dissertation of the member for Winnipeg—Transcona on the responsibilities of Canada in the kind of situation in which we are finding ourselves. We in the New Democratic Party have no difficulty in supporting this particular bill and we intend to do so. It is an act to amend the

Geneva Conventions Act, the National Defence Act and the Trade-marks Act.

The bill itself is the incorporation of the two protocols that were signed in 1977, Schedules 5 and 6, into the present bill, the Geneva Conventions Act. These are the portions of this bill which we accept. We have signed these protocols as a country and we depend upon our experts to make sure that we have not put ourselves in a difficult position. Therefore, we welcome the bill and we will support it.

• (1650)

There is a rub in this kind of bill, as far as Canada is concerned in the world, in what has been historically a very aggressive approach to the world, with the requirement of forced views to dominate and to control.

This type of bill is setting the rules for war, and by doing so we are having the tendency to legitimize war as a method of solving problems between countries or within countries. One of the measures in the bill extends the Geneva Convention to human rights and the protection of prisoners, and children in countries where there has been insurrection, where there is a kind of war which some people will call war for freedom and others would call a revolution.

The very fact that we need such a convention is a statement to some extent of the continuing barbarism of humankind. War has often been described as the legalizing of devastation of humanity, the legalizing of killing. Those conventions are part of the rules under which war is supposedly to be conducted. I suppose it is better than having no rules, no convention, but it is a bit hypocritical on our part as Canadians, and I guess on the part of other nations of the world which proclaim that they want peace and work for peace and still find it necessary to put in place rules which make war less barbaric than it would be without those rules.

It is hypocritical too in the sense that it has a tendency to promote war, in the sense that if you conduct war within these rules you are not going to be condemned quite as much as in other circumstances.

As my colleague for Winnipeg—Transcona indicated, we have in Canada, and I guess in the world, a very difficult kind of definition of security. Preparations taken and made by countries in the name of security often have