

I say all this because I feel it should not be forgotten that while the Minister refers to the remarks of the Prime Minister made in Guelph on October 27, on exactly the same date in Concord, only a few miles away from Guelph, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) set out his position with respect to the question of peace and how we can achieve meaningful disarmament.

Let me remind Members of what he said that evening. He said he felt there should be a program to continue the Canadian and other initiatives aimed at improving the atmosphere of dialogue—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but for the sake of decorum I would like to appeal to Hon. Members who wish to have conversations with their colleagues in the House to please be seated and do it in a subdued way so as not to detract from the Hon. Member who has the floor.

Mr. Stevens: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On October 27 the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, first of all, that he felt the Canadian initiatives and others in improving the atmosphere for dialogue between East and West must continue. He said that there should be a reference, as I mentioned a moment ago, to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. Thirdly, he felt that Canada should resume its role in promoting nuclear non-proliferation among those countries which now possess nuclear technology and which have the potential of developing non-peaceful uses of such technology. Again, he called on the Soviet Union to return to the INF disarmament talks in Geneva, failing which he recommended that consideration be given to seeking a new forum under which all disarmament talks can take place. He also called upon the Secretary of State for External Affairs to go further in the no first strike policy by urging that it be considered at a future meeting of NATO.

I was a little surprised to find out last night, Mr. Speaker, that this has not yet been done, but he called for the appointment of an ambassador for disarmament with adequate funds and sufficient personnel to enable him to encourage the disarmament discussions now going on at the United Nations and to play a meaningful role in this whole question of disarmament. In that respect, Members will recall that when I asked the simple question of the Minister last night as to whether such an ambassador had been appointed, he surprised me, frankly, by saying, no, that is still a vacant position. It surprises me because if you read the last Throne Speech in 1980, you will find that that office was specifically one of the things this Government cited as being such an important step ahead in the name of disarmament, and now we find, as we debate the new Throne Speech, that they have to admit that, while the office at one time was filled, it is currently vacant.

The Leader of the Opposition said that there should be an all-Party delegation at the highest level sent to all forums for discussion of disarmament issues. Again the suggestion was raised that there should be encouragement, both at the UN

and regionally, to restrict the transfer of conventional arms, especially in areas of current conflict.

I mention this only to put into perspective the debate in which we are now engaged. But let me emphasize the omissions last night. This is the first time this Minister has spoken during this session of Parliament. We have not heard in the House from the Minister in any formal way, other than in response to questions, since September 12. I would have thought, for example, that we would have been told the Government's current position with respect to that tragic shooting down of Korean Airlines Flight 007 early in September. What about the compensation? What about the next of kin who have received nothing to date? Is it enough for the Government to indicate that the grand claim could amount to \$2.1 million and then have to admit that the Soviets have not even accepted the claim and will not even negotiate? We know there were discussions in Stockholm with Mr. Gromyko. We have not heard what the Soviet replies were. Is it enough for the Minister to quote in the House, as he did on September 12, our ambassador to the United Nations who said:

● (1530)

The deliberate in-flight destruction of this civilian, unarmed, easily identifiable passenger aircraft by sophisticated fighter aircraft of the Soviet Union, no matter where it occurred, is nothing short of murder.

Is it sufficient to call it murder, as he did on September 12? On January 25 we find it is not even included as a reference in the Minister's remarks to the House.

I would like to touch on this other question again. What is the government's current position with respect to Grenada? At the time that that intervention occurred, very pompous statements were made. The Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) said:

After a period of time, the facts of life are accepted and recognition is given.

That is before he knew of the intervention. That is when he wanted, presumably, to give recognition to the coup group which had murdered so many and which had seized power through violence. On October 27 the Prime Minister made the comment that he did not know why the invasion was necessary. What is the Government's current position? Does it now believe that some type of intervention was necessary? Does it propose to give some financial help, aid, or assistance in the form of trade to that island? Does it intend to help Grenada go down the democratic route? Or is it going to sit back and let those comments that are on the record remain as the apparent policy of the Government with respect to that important incident in our hemisphere?

I would like to touch on another subject. We have had great concern among certain of our people in Canada, especially the Jewish community, with respect to certain comments made by this Minister while he was in the Middle East. Most of us are familiar with the anxiety that those comments triggered. Let us not use words of others; let us use the words of a Member of the House, the Hon. Member for Eglinton Lawrence (Mr. de Corneille). In a statement he said: