

has said the report of the special joint committee is replete with ideas—

[*Translation*]

—which, I must say, reflect the philosophy, ideas and concerns of Canadians throughout the country. Canadians today feel very strongly that, through the Minister and his Government, our country ought to play a leading role on the international scene.

Despite the positive elements . . . I am nearly finished, Mr. Speaker, if you would allow me 15 seconds, even less. Despite the positive elements of the response to the committee report, including the commitment to increase the number of foreign students in Canada by sponsoring them through CIDA scholarships, and several aspects of the human rights policy, the Government did not quite rise to the challenges and opportunities I referred to in my remarks this morning.

[*English*]

**Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to thank the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) for having sent his response to the opposition critics last evening, giving us a chance to go without sleep last night in order to read the very comprehensive response that he has provided.

I would like to note how satisfying it is that this particular reform of the House proceedings has been put in place which requires the Minister to respond to reports of committees within a certain period of time. I think we should ask the relevant parliamentary committee to look into the question of how we can develop time for fuller debate, particularly with respect to a report of such magnitude as was the report of the Special Joint Committee on Canada's International Relations. Indeed, I wish to refer to that report, having been a very active member of that joint committee.

I feel that the Minister's response to the committee has not been as forward-looking as was the committee report itself. Indeed, I am sorry to have to say this to the Minister, but comparing his response to the report of the joint committee is to see how regressive the Government and the Minister are becoming. It is not a response that picks up on the forward-looking, progressive type of initiatives that the committee frequently recommended. We were unhappy that the committee did not do more in some areas, such as in the area of a Canadian mission in Managua, but also in other areas.

As I read the response of the Government to the committee's recommendations what struck me was that the Minister is moving more toward the Reagan approach to international relations on many matters. When he is not moving toward the Reagan approach I am sorry to say that he is moving toward the Thatcher approach. I am thinking of South Africa in particular. In the few minutes available to me I would like to take perhaps half a dozen of the committee's recommendations and illustrate how the Government in its response has been doing exactly what I have just said.

### *Statements by Ministers*

In response to recommendation 16a with respect to encouraging a reaffirmation of the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty interpreted strictly as prohibiting all but basic research on such defence systems, the Minister's response is that the "Government believes that the first priority of the international community should be to bring about a mutually-agreed and verifiable radical reduction in nuclear forces of the superpowers. The Government will continue to press both the United States and the Soviet Union to maintain the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty until an updated treaty is in place". This means that the Minister has accepted the Reagan doctrine of revisionism. That is not what the committee recommended at all, and is something which I found very discouraging to see.

With respect to recommendation 16e regarding the prevention of an arms race in outer space, the Government's response is that "Canada is making substantive contribution to the discussion of this subject at the Conference on Disarmament". The Government states that Canada's verification research unit has commissioned research on space-based verification as a basis for further Canadian proposals. There is nothing in the response whatsoever to show how Canada is helping to prevent an arms race in space from taking place.

● (1210)

On the matter of foreign aid, the Government is again being as regressive as the Liberals were when they were in power. The Government does not accept the committee's recommendation that the goal of achieving .7 per cent ODA by 1990 be restored. Instead, the Government's objective is to reach a foreign aid GNP ratio of .6 per cent by the middle of the next decade. That is terribly regressive and will be a great disappointment to the other members of the committee.

I mentioned South Africa a moment ago. The committee recommended that Canada should move immediately to impose full economic sanctions, seek their adoption by the greatest number of Commonwealth countries and promote similar action by non-Commonwealth countries. The Government has responded by saying in effect that it will impose "limited sanctions as a more fruitful tactic that will strike at apartheid without destroying the South African economy on which the blacks depend". That sounds just like the words of Mrs. Thatcher. The blacks themselves have asked for full economic sanctions and the Minister knows that. He is moving backward on that issue as well.

To use a final example, since I have insufficient time to respond to all of the Government's responses, the committee recommended that Canada put pressure on the United States and the Soviet Union to secure demilitarization in the Arctic region. In the most incredible officialese, and by the way, this response is full of officialese, the Government ends by saying that singling out the Arctic for demilitarization does not seem practicable. The Government does not even say that it will try to talk to the Soviet Union and the United States on this matter.