

things are, one was almost watching a group of boys—since all of the foreign ministers and most of the delegates were men—sitting under a mushroom cloud moving toy soldiers and tanks. It was not a reassuring feeling.

The women were outside the conference in peace and disarmament groups. These included women from Greenham Common with whom I had a most interesting conversation. There were many other peace groups, predominantly women, who were pressing for the discussion to take on some sense of urgency on the matter of disarmament and that it not be put off, as it apparently will be, for two years.

One of my hopes and expectations was not only to see some movement in thought and action toward disarmament, but also to be assured that Canada's peace efforts, which are at the moment embodied in the efforts of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), were known, understood and appreciated and that we would be encouraged to have the Prime Minister continue them.

• (1710)

My expectations and hopes. It was dashed. No one made any mention in the formal speeches of the Prime Minister's initiative and no one in private conversations made any mention of them either. I got wondering why this was the case since we are very interested in them and most Canadian journalists are too. I talked about this at some length with the Swedish Prime Minister and with others.

I think the reason the Prime Minister's peace initiative was not discussed, was not referred to, unless one referred to it first in private conversation, is that as far as other NATO countries are concerned they have also been taking a great many initiatives—not so well publicized in their countries as the Prime Minister's has been in Canada—a great. Indeed, the Federal Republic of Germany was the country that was chiefly responsible for the presence of political ministers at the Stockholm conference. It was the Federal Republic of Germany which was chiefly responsible for encouraging Secretary of State Shultz to attend the conference, a very important initiative. Other members of NATO have taken other initiatives. For example, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom is going to Hungary this week, which is one of the reasons our Prime Minister is not going there. I could name many more initiatives. This peace initiative is not something that is simply being carried on by the Canadian Prime Minister. On the contrary, there is a good deal of feeling that the initiatives taken by others within the NATO Alliance have been having more effect and are, therefore, the subject of more discussion.

On the part of the Warsaw Pact countries there is the fairly strong attitude, and I think a justified one as well, about Canadian policy and Canadian actions. For instance, our policy on the testing of the Cruise missile and our votes at the United Nations against nuclear freeze resolutions, and so on, all of which pretty well follow the majority of NATO countries, have placed Canada fairly clearly in the eyes of the Warsaw Pact nations on one side of the issues. This is also to some extent the attitude existing among the neutral and

non-aligned countries that Canada is not by any means neutral and non-aligned, and to take an initiative of this kind vis-à-vis both superpowers and both alliances is much, much more difficult when one is a member of one Alliance. I think that clearly makes sense.

When one listens to the contributions of the neutral and non-aligned countries, Sweden, Austria, Yugoslavia and so on, at the Stockholm conference, one became very aware that what they were talking about is not military security—and security is almost invariably in the eyes of NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries military security—but a common security; not security in a narrow sense for each nation but security for all. Canada has not thrust herself in that direction, and probably cannot given the present Government's policies, policies which would be followed by the Conservative Party if it were in power.

For an individual, the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) or whomever, to take a personal initiative that is not backed up by his own Government's policies is fruitless. I am very sorry to say that but it is fruitless. How much, much more could have been accomplished had this Government, or the Conservative Government when it was in power, taken the steps to show the world that Canada was going to move through its own actions toward disarmament and peace. We could have also perhaps even influenced other countries if we had shown more independence, particularly on matters like the testing of a new generation of nuclear weapons. If we had said: "No, our traditions have been non-nuclear; we are going to stick with them and we are not going to participate in the escalation of the nuclear arms race", that would have had, as I talked to many Europeans, an enormous effect. Or instead of simply reiterating constantly that all the NATO partners were following a two-track policy, if we had looked a little more honestly at what was really happening, particularly at American policy under President Reagan, we would have had more effect.

The Minister yesterday reiterated that after Williamsburg the two-track policy—that is, the possibility of the deployment of nuclear missiles along with continued negotiations for arms reduction—was still the policy being followed by all NATO partners. In fact, the Minister did not mention that it was President Reagan himself who immediately after Williamsburg made it quite clear that he did not see any point in further negotiations or discussions until deployment had taken place. That was just as clear as clear could be. Then the Soviets said: "No, discussions must continue and we will not continue them after deployment", making that very clear. Canada could have spoken up then and said that the two-tracks must both be followed and one cannot postpone genuine negotiations until after deployment. But we did not do that, Mr. Speaker. That means we are regarded as subservient to whatever administration happens to be in power in the United States.