

### Supply

be in support of Britain regardless of the issue of principle involved. This is not, however, the position of the government or the view of informed Canadian opinion as demonstrated by the following quotation from an editorial in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of May 2, last, which states:

Muddy thinkers have suggested that those who are supporting Britain in this dispute are doing so for reasons of tradition or of support for a last fling at colonialism. Nothing could be further from the truth. Canada, the United States, the European Economic Community and others are applying economic and diplomatic pressure to Argentina because of the principles that force must not be allowed as a way of conducting international relations and because free peoples have a right to self-determination, no matter how small the numbers involved.

In the wintry seas of the South Atlantic, Britain is placing at risk the lives of its soldiers, seamen and airmen so that these principles may be upheld. It would be far better if this were not necessary, if Argentina would listen to reason and behave like a mature and responsible state rather than an international outlaw.

The financial and human cost to Britain of this principled action has been high. It is a price that democracy should be prepared to pay, however, both for the immediate reasons and because of the undoubted contributions that this action is making to international stability. If the member states of the League of Nations had shown the kind of resolute commitment to lawful behaviour now being shown by Britain, the tragic trail of the 1930s might not have led to the Second World War. Had Japan paid a high price for its Mukden venture in 1931, had Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy been subject to crushing sanctions and the threat of joint military action in the mid-1930s when they were flexing their muscles, all three countries might have enjoyed the blessing of their dictatorships collapsing or being overthrown.

All over the world today, cruel and greedy dictatorships are closely watching the development of the Falklands crisis. Had Britain taken the easy way out, washing its hands of the 1800 Falkland Islanders and conceding Argentina the right to grab them and their land by force, the world now would be seeing a rash of such military ventures. Whatever the outcome of this crisis, much credit for sustaining decent standards of international behaviour is due to all countries, including Canada, that have participated in opposing Argentina's lawlessness.

That is precisely the point of view of the government and the basis on which the government's actions have been taken. It is clear from the editorial I have just cited that it is a position widely endorsed by the Canadian people and proves the shallowness of the opposition's argument that the government has failed to respond to the views and the principles of the Canadian people.

**Mr. Crosbie:** You've done nothing.

● (2100)

**Mr. Dupras:** The minister in his speech demonstrated that Canada acted quickly and resolutely in response to Argentina's action.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Did what? How did Canada react?

**Mr. Dupras:** It acted in full support of the principle of international law which Britain, at tremendous cost to itself, has undertaken to support. As stated by the *Winnipeg Free Press* on May 18:

The world stands in debt to Britain already for the costs it has incurred and the risks it has taken in support of that freedom.

The opposition motion argues that Canada has failed to support the United Kingdom and the rule of law in international affairs in this matter, but the facts obviously demonstrate clearly the fallacy of this argument. As the minister pointed out, Britain's main request to Canada was to support

them in upholding the rule of law, and this we have done forthrightly and repeatedly.

As the minister mentioned, the British government has expressed its full appreciation for our action. In respect of more practical support, the minister has assured the House that no British request has gone unanswered, and I think that we can all take satisfaction from that fact as well. The opposition attempt to demonstrate that Canada is a meek, disinterested observer in this matter lends no credit to itself or to its responsibility as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

I was humiliated in committee about three weeks ago when members of the Conservative Party said that Britain should need our help, that she cannot win the war by herself. I was surprised and disappointed in this, because, as I said already, we have satisfied all of their requests; and I have pride enough and knowledge enough of their capabilities to know that they do not need Canada's effort or its contribution.

In respect of the international negotiation process, the minister explained that Canada has repeatedly indicated its willingness to facilitate negotiations or to participate in any agreed settlement that might emerge from the negotiation process. That is in accordance with our traditional image and role as a responsible member of the international community. The House should fully support the government, Mr. Speaker, but what I am really worried about is this.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, what I am really concerned about in this conflict is the post-conflict period. Not a single opposition member has thought about this side of the matter or what Canada could do and what its role will be after the conflict. If the people of the Falkland Islands are given a choice, they will surely prefer to retain British citizenship and refuse, for very obvious reasons, to live under Argentine rule.

It seems to me, and the facts appear to be supporting this more and more, that the support Argentina has received in this conflict from the Latin American community is based on some vague romantic principle instead of on more tangible values such as respect for human rights, freedom of religion and freedom of expression. Mr. Speaker, what frightens me is the consequences the conflict will have on this community and on the credibility of the institutions involved—I am, of course, referring to the Organization of American States. What will be left of the credibility of this institution? Will the old alliances and friendships that existed for so many years be able to survive the conflict? Will certain countries be willing to accept Argentina's new-found friendship with the Soviet Union, for instance? Will our neighbours to the south continue to enjoy the influence they seem to have over a number of countries in Central and South America?

Mr. Speaker, all these questions have drawn very few comments or proposals for solutions from the members of the opposition. I feel that there is here a very basic and valid reason why the Canadian government should maintain the position it has adopted and which I described in the first part