

Passage, the government announced a series of measures designed to affirm its claim in the north, and it takes pride in rehearsing them in the Speech from the Throne. But, one year after, where is the project for a class-8 icebreaker? To what extent has Canadian surveillance been stepped up? And what is the outcome of the talks that Canadian officials and ministers have held with their American counterparts, talks which, according to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, "shall only be on the basis of full respect of Canadian sovereignty"?

I ask honourable senators whether the government, in the period of two years, has lost sight of what it said about the United States in 1984? It stated then:

Our relationship with the United States affects virtually every aspect of our national life. It is essential to our security and prosperity.

I ask why, in 1986, has this government replaced the United States at the top of its foreign policy agenda by Africa? Yes, Africa is the only continent singled out for attention under the heading "Constructive Internationalism". Of course, we know why: apartheid and famine. The government has been vocally strong in its denunciation of apartheid in South Africa, and can produce a list of approximately 27 measures adopted to demonstrate its opposition to apartheid. It has also taken forward positions on famine relief in Africa and on aid to African countries, particularly African countries south of the Sahara. We applaud and support such efforts, although I must add that under both headings the cost to Canada is not all that great.

I do not intend to deal in detail with our sanctions against South Africa, except to observe that the Minister of External Affairs told the House of Commons yesterday that in his view sanctions were generally ineffective. He seemed to be saying that we need a policy, any policy, even an ineffective policy.

I will not go into that, but I cannot pass over this government's performance in the field of aid, which is the acid test of the depth of any government's commitment to the amelioration of the condition of the poorest and least developed countries in the world.

I will return to something that I said in November 1984, following the 1984 Speech from the Throne. I had already pointed out Mr. Clark's solemn statement before the United Nations that

Our new government intends to maintain Canada's commitment to reaching .7 per cent of the GNP by 1990 in official development assistance.

That, of course, had been repudiated shortly afterwards in documents released by the President of the Treasury Board. The new target for 1990 was .6 per cent and the .7 per cent target was postponed until 1995. But even those revised figures have been superseded. The targets are currently .5 per cent until 1990 and .6 per cent in 1995. As to the .7 per cent target, it has dropped out of sight altogether. No wonder that with this downward slide the government no longer states in the Speech from the Throne, as it did in 1984, that

[Senator MacEachen.]

Canada's record in official development assistance has on the whole been constructive.

I must say, as I look at Canadian foreign policy, that it does not take much courage in this country to adopt rhetoric in favour of the poor and in opposition to racism. Canadians are universally behind such statements, so it does not require a particular type of political courage to take such a stand. But rhetoric on racism and for the poor is not good enough as a foreign policy in our day and age. What is the foreign policy now with respect to the United States? The government has been put on the run in its trade dealings with the United States. It is the most important foreign policy item, but it is not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and it was not mentioned yesterday by Mr. Clark in his speech in the House of Commons. There was nothing about the United States. What is the policy now that the government has been put on the run in its trade conflicts with the United States?

We know, and the government should know, that the whole world is, indeed, a deeply troubled place. If Canada is to maintain its standing on the international scene, it must be ready to run the risks and incur the costs of bold policies which will truly protect its interests. Let us consider the export of arms. We should be pleased that Canada should clarify and tighten its policy; pleased that no Canadian military equipment should get to violators of human rights. But why keep the list of embargoed countries secret? Is it to protect Canadian export interests? Is it to avoid diplomatic embarrassment? The true cost of secrecy is to the government's credibility at home and abroad, and one asks whether this government is capable of facing the cost of its own decisions.

Let us also consider the problem of refugees. Let us consider the well advertised case of the Tamil refugees. Canada has been true to its long-standing tradition as being a country of asylum; but what have we done to deal not with the symptoms of trouble—the flow of refugees—but with the cause, the tensions, the intolerable situations, the breakdown in the political and social framework from which those people are fleeing?

I ask also, honourable senators, why are countries in our own hemisphere seemingly beyond the scope of our concerns? Over the years, we have had a strong and healthy relationship with the Caribbean. Has it lost favour? Is the government recognizing how dramatic is the current fate of Mexico? That is a country with which we share, along with the United States, the northern part of this hemisphere. It is a country rich in promise, a traditional friend, victim of the oil price vagaries with which I dealt earlier. It is badly in need of cooperation to surmount the problem of its staggering debt. With a 50 per cent drop in the price of oil, the national income of Mexico was reduced by 4 per cent, and its budgetary revenues were cut by one-sixth. That is what happened in Mexico. There is not a word about this, our own hemisphere, in the Speech from the Throne. Is the government insensitive to the threat of destabilization hanging over a country like Mexico, in light of the conditions I have described? I must ask: How dynamic are our ties with Latin America and how serious are our concerns with Central America if they do not even rate