

*The Address—Miss MacDonald*

He did not, of course, state the obvious: first that those reviews back in the 1960s had been carried out in camera with only the elite being permitted to participate. Second, and more important, he did not state that the world has changed dramatically since the 1960s. Now, maybe it has not for the right hon. gentleman opposite; maybe he still sees himself as the style setter of the swinging 1960s. But, Mr. Speaker, for the millions who have had to suffer war and starvation and relocation, who are having to absorb the shock of a largely unheralded energy crisis, or who as new countries are struggling for a footing under the Roman arch of nuclear missiles erected by the super powers, for these peoples and countries the world has indeed changed since the 1960s.

My colleague the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) detailed and analysed many of these changes in his lucid speech of last Thursday, and with these changes has come the need for Canada to play a more dynamic role in the world today. In so doing we will be required to face up to the political realities of the world as they exist, not as we wish they might be. We cannot ignore the growing instability in the world, nor can we fail to respond to it. Our response must address both humanitarian needs and political realities.

As a government, we did that. We greatly increased our humanitarian aid to relieve the suffering in Vietnam, in Kampuchea and in Laos, but at the same time condemned the government of Vietnam for the inhuman atrocities they were perpetrating on defenceless peoples. We pursued new initiatives in disarmament but, knowing the strategic lead of the U.S.S.R. in weapons buildup, we supported a modernization of theatre nuclear forces in Europe so that the NATO alliance could bargain from strength, not weakness.

During the election campaign I attempted to find out where the New Democratic Party stood on that issue. After reading this morning's newspaper I am still trying to find out where they stand, Mr. Speaker.

Only by taking a firm stand which combines compassion with tough-mindedness, only by joining a solid commitment of assistance with a condemnation of any country which seeks to exploit or diminish the integrity of another—only by such a realistic approach can we contribute effectively to a reduction of the rapidly increasing instability we see around the world.

As a government we felt this must be done in a comprehensive and coherent manner, and that is why we had initiated the over-all foreign policy review. And as my leader said the other day, we will carry on with it despite the government's intention to terminate it, to whittle it down, or respond to events only in an ad hoc manner. A task force responsible to the minister rather than to Parliament and on only one aspect of foreign policy is no substitute for a comprehensive, over-all foreign policy review.

Let no one be misled by the fact that political instability around the world is not on the increase. Two of the most blatant examples of this increasing instability have occurred in recent months. First, the breaking of the age-old Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Immunity by the seizure of the United States embassy and staff in Iran was, and continues to

be, one of the most reprehensible acts ever committed by one nation against another. Second, the invasion of the neutral country of Afghanistan by Soviet troops has created the greatest potential for global conflict since the second world war. In both these cases, Canada's answer under the Conservative government was swift and straightforward. We advised our friends and allies, and the Canadian people, of the sanctions that we would be prepared to impose as retaliation.

With both these events there were certain actions that Canada took unilaterally and others that we took in concert with our allies and with like-minded countries. Our allies knew where we stood. As the *Wall Street Journal*, in an editorial on February 1 of this year, wrote concerning the Conservative government's foreign policy:

Its leadership has deliberately sought to put Canada on a new course, staunchly in the western camp and on the side of political humanism, after the long Trudeau regime that at times tended toward ambivalence.

No, sir, it was not our style to be ambivalent. But since the Liberal government has taken office, we have seen a public foreign policy review rejected; we have heard absolutely nothing from the present government about the sanctions against Iran which we had undertaken before the United Nations Security Council last December 30. We do not know whether they endorse them or not; and we have seen them retreat from the sanctions we had imposed against the Soviet Union as a result of its invasion of Afghanistan.

The decision of the previous government to boycott the Olympic Games in Moscow was a clear message to the Kremlin that aggression will not be tolerated. That boycott now includes some 53 countries representing all of the many regions, races and religions of the world. The Prime Minister might smugly continue to rebuff our demands that his government support a boycott, but how long can he remain deaf to the desires of the people of Afghanistan and elsewhere to be free—free from subjugation, free from occupation and free from Moscow's tyranny. How long can he remain deaf to that?

● (1430)

Even if this government eventually does decide to join a boycott of the Moscow games—probably in the wake of Secretary Vance's visit—its indecision and ambivalence will have reduced the impact which Canada could have both in Moscow and with our allies.

In addition, our athletes—those who will be called upon to sacrifice so much for principle—no longer know if this government has pursued the holding of international games of comparable standards. I would say to you, sir, that this morning's replies in question period did nothing to reassure our Canadian athletes that such arrangements were being carried on by this government. Over three months ago Canada was in the lead in organizing such games in the various sites around the world. Now this is not mentioned.

One other international commitment from which this government seems to have retreated is the commitment that Canada made last June in Tokyo, along with other members of the economic summit, to a reduction in the annual rate of