

The Address—Mr. Stevens

Why then has our Department of External Affairs not moved . . . and demanded the withdrawal of Syria and the PLO? Why is the double standard now once again applied against Israel? Condescending statements are made castigating Israel for its presence in Lebanon, and calling upon Israel to withdraw unilaterally from Lebanon. Madam Speaker, such an unfair, unrealistic, and bankrupt policy is a disgrace.

With those words on the record of a supporter of this Minister you would have thought that yesterday evening the Minister would have seized the opportunity to state once and for all what the Government's policy is with respect to the matter to which the Member for Eglinton-Lawrence was referring. His supporters are concerned. Many Members of this House are concerned. Yet we find this Minister chooses to make no comment. It is not only that he did not state a policy initiative or make a reference to these matters last night, but there has not been a policy stated by this Government with respect to foreign affairs since 1970. That policy was drafted in the silly sixties. We now find that in the dramatic and realistic eighties we are living with a policy that presumably was conceived in those silly sixties.

That brings me to another omission yesterday. External Affairs, as it is now structured, has an extremely important element, which is trade. There was no mention of trade. Yet we find that a special committee of the House dealing with Canada's trade challenge, in its report on a National Trading Corporation in June 1981 pointed out that every \$1 billion in additional exports, especially in the manufacturing field, generates 42,700 jobs. In many ways, Mr. Speaker, the secret to reducing the unemployment of this country is to be found in trade, especially in manufactured goods and the export thereof. This is where this Government is letting us down. Last night the Minister did not even refer to that subject. In that omission alone, Mr. Speaker, I think the Government deserves to lose the confidence of the House. To that end I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen):

That the Address be amended by adding the following words:

"This House regrets to inform Your Excellency that your Ministers have failed to proposed measures that would result in lasting and equitable solutions to the hardships imposed by the high level of chronic unemployment that is being experienced in all regions of Canada as a consequence of years of economic mismanagement by your Ministers."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A period of ten minutes is now provided for questions and comments.

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, I have just one question for the Hon. Member for York Peel. He was refreshing our memory about the points that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) had made in his speech at about the same time as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was speaking in Guelph. He caused some confusion at the time by requesting that a non first strike policy should be considered by the Western Alliance. Since the Member reiterated that phrase in exactly the same language I used, would he tell us today whether in fact his Leader meant that we in the Western Alliance should consider a no first use policy?

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, there is a very short answer to that. No, we mean exactly what we say, which is, to direct our Secretary of State for External Affairs to go further in the non

first strike policy by urging consideration of such a policy by NATO.

● (1540)

Ms. Jewett: Confusion reigned at the time because the Conservative finance critic who was their external affairs critic did say that there was not a non first strike policy already in place in NATO and had been for some time. Indeed, as the sophisticated students of this matter know, there is a substantial difference between the two. Therefore, what the Leader meant was no first use.

Is the Hon. Member telling me that he does not know what NATO policies are now and is asking NATO to consider a policy which it already has?

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, it shows you how much tunnel vision some of these representatives of socialist international tend to have. Surely if there is a substantially agreed to non first strike policy by most nations in NATO, does that mean that it cannot be considered, looked into and discussed? That is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition was hoping to achieve by asking the Minister to raise the question at NATO so that, if the Hon. Member is completely right that the non first strike policy is already agreed to by most nations, it can be reconfirmed as a policy at the NATO level.

Ms. Jewett: That has confused things even more. Apparently the Member does not know what non first strike is all about in the Article. Since the present critic for finance, the Hon. Member for St. John's West, said that what was really meant was no first use, will someone, perhaps in a subsequent speech, assure the House that the Conservatives do in fact know the fundamental difference between non first strike and no first use? If they do not make it clear—obviously the Member who just had the floor is not able to do so—it really makes it almost impossible for the rest of us in the House to know where that Party stands and where the Leader of the Opposition stands.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the only confusion is in the mind of the Hon. Member who has asked the question. On October 27, we referred to non first strike, and that is what we referred to today and what we will be referring to tomorrow.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague a question regarding human rights abuses by the Communists, particularly in Russia. As we know, over the last thirty or forty years they have killed 83 million people. We have seen some recent examples in Afghanistan of human rights atrocities where the Communists fly over small villages and towns in Afghanistan and drop toys to the children in the streets. The children pick up these toys, which are actually explosives. I have seen pictures of Afghan children with their hands blown off by these devious Communists.

Would my colleague at any time suggested unilateral disarmament? Would he trust the Communists with any kind of unilateral disarmament or would you watch them very, very closely with a jaundiced eye?