

to engage in fruitful dialogue. May the Holy Spirit lead them to adopt peaceful ways of safeguarding liberty which do not involve the threat of nuclear disaster.

Thank you.

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that this type of motion should come from the hon. member from St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). He must have found it very difficult to develop his position on Saint Pierre and Miquelon, which he already mentioned in his speech, and to produce such a motion. He has to be some kind of an acrobat.

● (2050)

In any case, tradition has it that the role of the opposition party is to oppose the government; but tradition also has it that the opposition party should oppose the government on sensible policy grounds and not just for the sake of opposition. Its motion already contradicts the affirmation of the government of the United Kingdom when it says that it is satisfied with the support that Canada has given. It has not put in any requests which have not been satisfied, and this has been established quite a few times. The opposition party's motion before the House today "deplores the failure of the government to represent Canada properly or adequately in our external relations or in accordance with views and principles of the Canadian people". Then it proceeds to list, in a shotgun approach, a variety of subjects concerning which the government policy has allegedly produced failure, which the opposition party calls upon this House to deplore.

Allow me to recite some of the opposition's complaints. It complains about the government's response to the violation of human rights in Poland. It complains about the government's response on the imposition of martial law in Poland. It complains about the alleged failure of the government to strengthen the Department of External Affairs. My colleague, the distinguished member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Patterson) dealt with this question with eloquence.

The opposition party also complains about the alleged failure to eliminate patronage in the operation of the Department of External Affairs, but this complaint does not come from the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) because during the tenure of the Clark government he was the champion. He affirmed that he was or would be the champion of patronage. The opposition also complains about the alleged failure to support Britain and the rule of law in respect to the current crisis in the Falkland Islands.

Others from this side have adequately dealt with the other question or aspects of the motion. I will mainly deal with the question of the Falkland Islands. I would like to address myself to this question because of the situation that it represents today. It represents a demonstration of support for a principle of international relations which is perhaps the most important event in mankind's struggle for the supremacy of the rule of law since the Korean War, when the nations of the world united to resist an act of flagrant aggression. I say this because what is happening in the Falklands today is a reaffirmation of

Supply

the principles so clearly laid down in the United Nations Charter that international disputes must not be resolved by armed force or the world will subside into the rule of the jungle.

It has taken modern world society ten years of violent, total warfare in World War I and World War II to come to the belated realization that war can no longer be the plaything of states and generals in charge of such states and that it must be replaced by the rule of law. That is the reason the government has taken the stand it has in opposition to Argentina's clear act of provoked aggression—

Mr. Crosbie: What stand?

Mr. Dupras: —and territorial greed. I was glad to hear the minister clearly enunciate that again in his speech today.

Mr. Crosbie: What speech?

Mr. Dupras: I was also glad to hear the minister reiterate the government's view that it takes no stand on the question of the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands, which is the core of the current dispute on the grounds that this is a matter for negotiation and agreement between Britain and Argentina.

Mr. Crosbie: What nonsense!

Mr. Dupras: Clearly Britain has a very strong case for its claim to sovereignty, but we must concede that Argentina also has a case, a case which it has maintained for many years. I would like to read an editorial from the *Ottawa Citizen* of May 7, 1982, which states:

That the Falklands have been under British control since 1833 is a fact. Whether the Falklands are British and the British have the right to continue to control over them is for the world court or for an arbitrator and not for one of the parties to the dispute to decide.

That is the government's position. It is clear from the evidence I have just cited that, contrary to the views of the opposition party, it is indeed in accordance with the views and principles of the Canadian people.

The issue, therefore, is not the question of sovereignty but the method by which Argentina has sought to resolve a dispute. The minister, in his speech, pointed out the history of the past two decades of negotiation between Britain and Argentina up to and including the most recent negotiations which concluded only a few days before Argentina's unilateral action. Negotiation is the civilized modern manner to resolve these disputes as demanded by the Charter of the United Nations as so aptly stated by *The Globe and Mail* editorial on May 11, last:

The transfer of sovereignty must be negotiated by Argentine diplomats, not imposed by Argentine admirals.

This is the position of the government as reiterated by the minister in his remarks today. It has been the position of the government throughout and was eloquently expressed by Canada's representative to the United Nations in his interventions before the Security Council as illustrated by the minister.

It seems clear from some of the remarks made by supporters of the opposition party's motion that the Canadian role should