

will lead not only to mutual economic improvement but to the enrichment of our social and cultural life.

I am pleased the government intends to place North-South issues on the agenda of the summit. But I must also register my dismay that it has taken it so long to express its concern for this issue. After all, it has been on the international agenda, at least on the agenda of those countries of the South, during the whole of the tenure of the present Prime Minister. His recognition of this issue, though belated, is welcome.

However, it is not sufficient—and I say this is all seriousness—that the travel to Lagos, Brasilia, and Algiers to address this question, important though those visits are. When has he explained it to the steelworker in Hamilton, or the housewife in Regina, or the textile worker in Shawinigan? The greatest selling job needs to be done here at home, a task largely ignored to date.

By choosing to make North-South issues one of the focal points of our foreign policy in the decade to come, we will be taking a large step to define the areas in which we intend to concentrate our efforts. In my comments today I have sought to point to some of those areas. It should be clear that our foreign policy cannot simply be a series of well-intentioned, high-minded actions. We must protect our economic and security interests by close co-operation with our like-minded allies in western Europe and North America. We must be sure that we take the appropriate steps to play our part in those allied activities which establish the common purpose and common interests of the West.

On the other hand, each state, however much committed to the alliance, must be free to analyse and respond to the great issues of international politics which lie ahead. Each member of the alliance must be free to choose the areas in which it will take the lead and implement fresh ideas.

Today I have tried to suggest the directions Canada should take. We must ensure that a clear and persistent voice is heard in support of the ultimate objective of arms control in reducing the prospect of the resort to nuclear weapons. We should be willing to lead the way in order to achieve a more effective control over the spread of nuclear weapons through the exploitation of civilian nuclear technology.

I have suggested that we have a traditional interest in human rights that we must apply without favour to all states—yes, including ourselves. And with others, I am enthusiastically in favour of initiatives and long-term policies which will reduce the gap between the rich and poor nations of the world. In emphasizing these initiatives, I do not ignore or disregard the importance of our military contributions to western European and North American defence, or to the protection of our own national interests.

But if we also allow ourselves the opportunity to pursue internationalist policies, then we will not only be returning to an honourable tradition in Canadian foreign policy but will be creating the grounds for popular support of foreign policy, even, perhaps, evoking the admiration of other states.

North-South Relations

I want to quote from the task force report, Mr. Speaker, as follows:

Leadership cannot come from governments alone. It must flow from, must involve all Canadians. The challenge of international co-operation must enter our every-day concerns.

I fully support that view and the parallel recommendation that Parliament be given a continuing mandate to play an active role in overseeing and evaluating foreign policy. The time when foreign policy could be left to the dictates of anonymous bureaucrats is long since past. The success of policy now depends on the co-operation and support of many individuals and private groups. That was the approach I tried to take as minister when I initiated the review of foreign policy through the parliamentary process.

As the task force has so well shown, Canadians, as individuals and groups, have found a forum for their views in presenting evidence to the committees of Parliament. As with the sub-committee on Latin America, Mr. Speaker, I hope to see that process continue and become as an essential element in the renewal of our foreign policy.

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I was indeed glad that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) opened the debate today, the second debate we have had in the past decade in this House on foreign policy. It is only the second. I was very sorry indeed that he did not give to the subject matter the same kind of rigorous thought and attention that he clearly gave to an earlier speech in this House on the Constitution. I do not think that is because the Prime Minister is not interested in foreign policy; I think he is. It is probably because he has not yet decided, nor has the government decided, what route they would like Canada to go. I am sure everyone in the Department of External Affairs would have been as grateful as I had we had something more than vague generalities from the Prime Minister today, whether he was talking about the East-West, the North-South, or a combination of the two, in Canadian foreign policy.

I was particularly distressed, as I was when listening to the hon. member for Kingston and the Island (Miss MacDonald), by the tendency of both the governing party and the official opposition to talk a good line but to do nothing in practice, whether talking about the arms race and our complicity in it, or about the North-South and the absence of any improvement in our own aid policies and assistance policies generally, over the past decade.

I want to say a further word or two about this lest the public be under the impression that both the government and the Conservative party, when it was the government, have policies that are concretely addressed, not to trying to find some agreement in some major council but, to what Canada should be doing explicitly.

I will start with the arms race. It is all very well to say that we do not allow nuclear arms on our territory, although there are still some available at Comox. The Prime Minister reiterates this. Every time we ask a question on the neutron bomb, first strike capacities or the Cruise or Pershing II missiles, he