

mines has been widespread. Bombs have been concealed in pens, soap, matchboxes and bundles of bank notes. For more than a year now we have had proof of the most horrendous of their activities, the use of butterfly shaped bombs disguised as toys whose primary target are children.

● (1810)

Canada's Ambassador to the United Nations, Stephen Lewis, has stated: "It is inconceivable that in 1986 any invading army, no matter what the circumstances, no matter what the provocation, would use such weapons against innocent children. But it is being done. It suggests a sickness equivalent to depravity".

There is no question that Afghanistan has become one of the great horrors of our time, a scene of devastation, torture, massacre and famine. Surely, in light of the Soviet Government's role in these atrocities, Canada should be considering strengthening our stance in opposition to the U.S.S.R., not weakening it. The United Nations has put the number of official political murders at 12,000 and disappearances at 9,000. Amnesty International adds another 4,500 unofficial "liquidations". About one half million people have been reduced to a state of famine. Total casualties amount to over one million while 4.5 million refugees have fled the country. These figures are appalling, yet the international community seems to be reluctant to intensify pressure against the aggressive and repugnant tactics adopted by the Soviet Government. The United Nations Human Rights Commission Report of February 1986 sums up the situation. It concludes: "Continuation of the military solution in Afghanistan will lead to a situation approaching genocide".

It is clear that Canada must not forget with whom we are dealing. To suggest that the pursuit of normal relations with the Soviet Union will allow us to exert a more effective influence on the Soviets *vis-à-vis* Afghanistan, is to, and I quote from the Minister's own statement at the CSCE Conference in Vienna: "—forget that one participating state, U.S.S.R., has over the past seven years violated virtually all principles guiding relations between states".

The time for questioning the effectiveness of sanctions has passed. Canada has a duty and responsibility to uphold sanctions until such time as the Soviets cease their illegal occupation of Afghanistan.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs in answer to my question stated that sanctions have helped to galvanize world opinion on Soviet atrocities in Afghanistan. He was correct in this assessment and I urge him to once again focus international attention on the abhorrent situation in Afghanistan by setting an example of Canadian commitment and opposition to Soviet aggression. Canada has a moral obligation to do so.

In accepting the Nobel Peace Prize last year, Elie Wiesel said:

We must always take sides, neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented. . . . When human lives are endangered, when human dignity is in jeopardy, national borders and sensitivities

Adjournment Debate

become irrelevant. Whenever men and women are persecuted because of their race, religion or political views, that place must, at that moment, become the centre of the universe".

Will the Minister accept this noble challenge on behalf of Canada? And will he act to ensure that Canada's opposition to the unconscionable Soviet occupation of Afghanistan is expressed by strong and tangible action? Will he reimpose sanctions against the U.S.S.R.?

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I know of no Minister more aware of the cowardice of the neutrality position than the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark). I welcome the Hon. Member's intervention and his expansion on his earlier question.

● (1815)

In response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan the Government did in fact introduce, in concert with similar actions by our NATO allies, sanctions designed to demonstrate our condemnation of this unjustified act of military aggression. As was stated before by the Secretary of State for External Affairs: "These sanctions were successful at the time because they helped galvanize world opinion against the Soviet actions in Afghanistan". They were also intended to warn the Soviet Union against further adventures of this kind.

It is clear, though, that by their very nature many of these sanctions could only be temporary since high-level dialogue, wider contacts and greater co-operation are all necessary in order to develop more secure and broadly-based East-West relations. In deciding to resume our academic, scientific and cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union, we not only acted in accord with our efforts to contribute to better East-West relations, we also took into account our own interests and needs. The program we have drawn up is very much on a mutually profitable basis.

Moreover, the resumption of these exchanges at last puts Canada in a similar position to its NATO allies, many of whom did not suspend such exchanges. In fact, since Afghanistan, Canada has been generally more conservative than many of its NATO allies in the reinstatement of suspended programs.

With respect to Afghanistan, we are bringing pressure to bear on the Soviet Union by other means. We do not accept the continued Soviet military intervention in that country nor its flagrant violations of human rights.

We are working hard to ensure a continuing and increasing international pressure on the U.S.S.R. *vis-à-vis* Afghanistan. The statements by the Secretary of State for External Affairs during the Shevardnadze visit and at the opening of the CSCE review meeting in Vienna leave absolutely no doubt about that.

While our sanctions against the U.S.S.R. were meant as a political signal that would have an immediate impact on that country, our sanctions against South Africa are intended to convince the South African authorities that they should