

*North-South Relations*

We usually think of crisis as a sudden shock, as a surprise, a burst of violence, an invasion. Obviously, the world needs to prevent such incidents when prevention is possible, and to contain them when they occur.

It must be understood, however, that such incidents usually result from pent-up tension. They are the flash-points of deep-seated problems. If the world hopes to prevent such shocks, we have to deal with the basic conditions which cause them. The only effective way to manage a crisis is to go to its roots.

Unfortunately, a succession of jarring events can so monopolize the attention and energy of governments that they neglect to deal with the persistent, underlying problems in world affairs, thus guaranteeing more shocks in the future. Effective management of crises means getting at the basic causes of the conditions we deplore, and really changing them. The challenge is extremely complex and difficult, but not hopeless. If we can muster the will to do the job, it can be done.

The necessary strength of will and sense of common purpose which is required of the industrialized democracies will not likely be forged out of any perception of immediate physical danger to ourselves, posed by the anger and frustration of the suffering peoples of the world.

The starving refugee lying in the hot dust of the Sahel can scarcely summon the strength to help himself, let alone strike out at us. If his children survive they will remember us, and with fury in their hearts, you can be sure. But that is a threat for another time. It does not frighten us into action today.

[If the more powerful countries are to summon the will to respond in a more effective way, and with greater unity, to the problems of a chaotic world, it will be because of two things: first, a decision to give practical application to the human values which we in the West say we hold in common; and second, a better understanding of the less noble-sounding but no less compelling imperative of our own self-interest.]

What are these values that we hold in common? Surely the most basic is freedom, the freedom of individuals and of nations, the political freedom which distinguishes East from West, the freedom of the market system upon which our economies are based. The freedom of which I speak is not an abstract concept divorced from our daily lives, or reserved for patriotic speeches on national holidays; it is the very foundation and life-giving spirit of the societies which we have built in the various countries of the West.

[Within our own borders we have long realized that there can be no freedom for some without freedom for all. An assault against the basic rights of my neighbour inevitably places in jeopardy my own rights, my own security and freedom. We have little trouble accepting the truth and the implications of that statement within our own borders.

We have more trouble in giving a modern answer to the very old question: Who is my neighbour? Is she the woman rummaging for food in the back streets of an Asian shanty town? Is he the man in South America in prison for leading a trade

union? The people dying in Africa for lack of medical care, or clean water, are they my neighbours? What about those who are dying in the spirit in the villages of India for lack of a job, or an education, or hope? Are my neighbours the children running from the sound of gunfire in the streets of Beirut?

● (1520)

If we, the peoples of the North, say yes, then we will act; we will act together to keep hope alive. If we say no, then they are doomed and so are we.

The urgency of those problems constitutes one of the major reasons why this government has been eager, as has the New Democratic Party, in arranging time for this important debate on Canada's foreign policy.

I began, Madam Speaker, by saying that we live in an unstable world where we no longer enjoy the comfort of being able to predict future events with a fair degree of certainty. Though political and economic instability may be most visible in the Third World, we must remember that all the great problems of the world are interrelated. The problems of East-West and North-South relations, of energy, nuclear proliferation, the Atlantic alliance, the law of the sea, the environment, refugees and sporadic outbursts of violence and war—all of these form a complex of cause and effect.

There will continue to be shocks and confrontation between cultures and technology, between rich and poor, between generations, even between neighbours, as the world community attempts to live more successfully with the one predictable factor on our planet, the inevitability of constant and rapid change. That is the theme of my remarks today: the management of change, the management of the crises which change can represent.

These are troubled times for the world. Economically, the eighties and nineties will not have much in common with the fifties and sixties, when we became convinced that rapid growth was as certain as the sunrise. Now, after having been psychologically conditioned to expect constant expansion, countries have to learn to manage the experience of economic compression.

That is another example of the instability which we must learn to manage. It will surely be one of the major preoccupations of the summit meeting here in Canada next month. In that perspective, the Ottawa summit could be more crucially important than any of its predecessors.

The impact of a summit on world problems is not immediate, largely because it is not meant to be a policy-making occasion. Its great value is that it permits the leaders of the principal industrialized democracies to share their analyses of problems, to strengthen their sense of common purpose, to assess where they can come closer together or move forward together.

Originally, the subject matter, as we know, was limited to economic issues. More recent summits have turned also to international political issues. The Ottawa summit will undoubtedly continue this trend, if only because of the preoc-