

*International Peace and Security*

Canada's foreign policy should always rest on a bipartisan search for consensus. Later on in my remarks I will return to the application of those words to this Bill. The second principle enunciated by the Leader of the Official Opposition was that the cornerstone of our security is NATO solidarity; and the third principle was that only through the strengthening of the non-nuclear deterrent can we reduce the present reliance on nuclear weapons. There is a great deal within those three principles to offer some guidance as we consider the best way to set up the proposed peace institute and the best manner in which it will conduct its operations.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House that it is our view, and certainly my view, that had the peace initiative undertaken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), which as far as I know had the support of every Canadian, been set up in a manner following the principles laid down by the Leader of the Official Opposition with respect to bipartisan consensus, and had that initiative come from a resolution made by the House and a discussion in the External Affairs Committee, I believe it would have been strengthened domestically and, to that extent, strengthened in its international projection.

I also believe that the Prime Minister's peace initiative, worthy as it was, was deficient in that it lacked a broad consensus internationally. I believe that had the approach of the Canadian Government which was reflected in the person of the Prime Minister been built into a common front or a coalition of like-minded leaders around the world, it would have gained much more impact and stature and I dare say it would have had much more effect internationally, particularly on the two superpowers to which the peace initiative was directed.

Those two thoughts are linked in my mind with the need to establish a bipartisan consensus here, particularly on the grave matters that affect the continuation of life on this planet, and with the need to operate in a stronger way multilaterally. I believe that is a role for Canada to play. Considering the way the Leader of the Official Opposition has set out his thinking on the subject, I believe that when such circumstances arise that he is able to exercise leadership for all of Canada, following that perspective will lead to a more fruitful course of action.

I make those comments not in any critical way but only in a way that responds to a certain frustration that is in the minds of many Canadians who want more progress made on this crucial issue of the continuation of life on the planet and who want Canada to respond to this crisis in ways that are more thoughtful and more reflective of a sense of both domestic and international co-operation. I found some words to reflect the heart of my thinking. These words were uttered only a few paces from where you are seated, Mr. Speaker, when the President of Mexico, President de la Madrid, spoke to a joint session of the House on Tuesday of this week.

If I may, Sir, I would like to take a moment to read the words of President de la Madrid. I commend to the whole House for re-reading the entirety of the speech made by the President of Mexico. I believe the words that I am now going

to read are directly applicable to the kind of thinking we ought to be bringing to the Bill which is before the House today. As reported on page 3537 of *Hansard*, the President of Mexico said:

The world would seem to be skidding down the slope devised by the promoters of force. Technological development has relentlessly built up a deposit of destruction and terror. Both usable weapons and the leftovers of war are employed in attacks on the survival and dignity of mankind. While innumerable people are afflicted by hunger, unhealthy conditions, ignorance and death, millions are being spent to build an apocalyptic arsenal that is becoming increasingly difficult to control and presents a great risk of thoughtless use. We are witnessing an irrational cult to the capacity for self-destruction and to excessive spending to build up force.

● (1250)

Those are words which reflect the concerns of many Canadians as well as concerned people around the world.

All Members of this House would not agree totally with the comments which were made by the President of Mexico. That is to be expected. But I think there was agreement when he said:

In looking toward the future, each country must decide whether it will act in favour of a collective effort or to pursue sterile and egotistical interests in isolation.

I think that the time has come for Canada to play a very significant role multilaterally, and in doing so it will recapture some of the history of this country which made us an important force coming out of World War II when there was leadership on both sides of the House. When I say this, I am thinking of Mr. Lester Pearson and certainly Howard Green. There were leaders on all sides of the House who had the understanding that we must operate together and that we ought to be building a consensus of support that responds to the true needs of Canadians.

I think that the proposed peace institute—while it certainly leaves a lot to be desired, in my view, as to the fullness of Canada's response—is an effort that will make a step forward. In this kind of world, I think that one step forward is a heck of a lot better than standing still, even if the race is not won.

In the opening speech for our Party's response, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) said:

—the concept of the establishment of a peace institute centred in Canada is of great importance to us. That concept enjoys wide support.

I think the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead properly assessed the mood of the House and, indeed, the mood of the country when he went on to give essential support to the concept of the Bill and said that the institute ought to play a "three-fold contribution to world peace and the Canadian policy: by helping the world nations to draft policies and plans likely to minimize the risk of nuclear conflict"; secondly, "by keeping Canada's own politicians and population well informed so as to increase their influence over public policies"; and thirdly, "by symbolizing the commitment of the Canadian Government and Parliament to make the quest for peace one of our great national priorities".

In laying down those principles, the Right Hon. Member very properly pointed to the fact that the Bill is flawed. It is