

Supply

ask the parliamentary secretary to do his job and to get these questions, which are straightforward, answered as soon as possible.

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I am not familiar with the exact progress which has been made in answering this question, but I will be happy to look in on behalf of the hon. member.

I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West) moved:

That this House deplores the failure of the Government to represent Canada properly or adequately in our external relationships or in accordance with the views and principles of the Canadian people specifically by its failure to oppose in any convincing and meaningful way the violation of human rights within Poland and the imposition of martial law therein, by the failure to support the United Kingdom and the rule of law in international affairs by opposing in a meaningful and convincing way the armed aggression of Argentina in its invasion of the Falkland Islands and, this House deplores the failure of the government to strengthen the Department of External Affairs as recommended by the McDougall commission as well as its failure to eliminate all aspects of patronage in the operation of that department.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is more in sorrow than in anger that I rise to speak on this motion. This is an occasion for sorrow among Canadians because of the level to which our external relations have fallen. The motion mentions four particular areas of our foreign policy or our external policy which are the cause of great sorrow and, in fact, can certainly inspire anger as well.

Canada is not a nation which wants to subjugate others through military or economic power. We are a middle-ranking nation which wants stable world order. We want a world order in which we can trade and increase our own wealth and prosper. We want to assist others for humanitarian purposes as well as for our own enlightened self-interest. However, it has become very obvious that we are not any longer a nation which is trusted as an honest broker or even a truth teller or as a nation which could be a trusted go-between. We are a nation which no longer can even defend our own national interests against other small or medium-sized powers. We suffer from impotence with respect to defence. We are unable to defend ourselves even from small or middle level powers, should that become necessary.

The white paper on defence in 1971 was the last such paper, and it said that there were four major areas of activity Canada should involve itself in in defence. The first was surveillance of

our own territory and coastlines to protect our own sovereignty. We are no longer in a position even to do that. It would not be a question of Canada's seizing, for example, St. Pierre and Miquelon, if we did desire to do that. It is more a question of whether St. Pierre and Miquelon might seize Newfoundland from Canada. That is the posture into which our military defences have put us, and the state of our navy is not due to any fault of those who serve on those forces but to the fault of a government which is uncaring about that aspect of our national being.

The second priority was said to be the defence of North America in co-operation with U.S. forces. As all hon. members of the House know, we are completely dependent upon the United States of America for our defence, yet we have a government which, having put us into that position, is forever carping and criticizing our defender and making snide comments, feeling itself to be morally superior to the United States of America. We depend on the United States to defend us with their nuclear arms, their military spending and their defence activities, but our government seems to think it puts us in a morally superior position to be defenceless and to depend on the United States of America and then to cavil and criticize them and feel superior to them.

Last night I came across a quotation from Fisher Ames, who said in 1800—and it is certainly true: "Nations that want protectors will have masters." This nation has wanted a protector, and it has a protector—or protectors—but it also has masters, and it is just as well for us to recognize that fact.

Going back to those defence objectives, our third defence objective was to fulfil NATO commitments. All hon. members of the House know we are not fulfilling our NATO commitments in any way, shape or form. We are seriously deficient in that respect.

The fourth objective was supposed to be international peacekeeping. We are attending to our international peacekeeping role to some extent.

Our foreign policy in the last number of years has largely been the creation of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who claims to have a special expertise and a special interest in that area. He paints himself as a world leader in that area. However, he has failed to provide any leadership in the foreign policy field. Under his direction the government has taken a very narrow view of our interests in foreign affairs.

Most importantly, in our view this government has failed to express the desire of the Canadian public for moral content and spirit in our foreign policy. Canadians want a foreign policy and they want a government that will take foreign policy stands which project abroad those values that govern us internally, by which we define Canada to ourselves and by which we want to define Canada to the world. We do not believe we can stand for freedom at home while we condone repression abroad. We do not think it is a great accomplishment to have a Charter of Rights and Freedoms for Canada, but our government demonstrates hardly any sympathy at all for the loss of those same human rights and freedoms which