



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 037

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, March 15, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, March 15, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table, in both official languages, a guidance paper for the special joint parliamentary committee that will be reviewing Canadian foreign policy.

\* \* \*

### ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments made by the government.

Pursuant to Standing Order 110(1), these orders in council stand referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

\* \* \*

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to three petitions.

\* \* \*

### NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION DIRECTOR REMUNERATION DISCLOSURE ACT

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-224, an act to require charitable and non-profit organizations that receive public funds to declare the remuneration of their directors and senior officers.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to introduce a private member's bill entitled the charitable and non-profit

organizations director remunerations disclosure act, the purpose of which is to bring public accountability to all organizations funded by the taxpayer in the matter of salaries and benefits of their directors and principal officers.

Once a group receives public money directly or indirectly it must be prepared to surrender its right to privacy. MPs declare their pay, and the same principle of salary disclosure should apply to all persons charged with the public trust. This bill addresses that principle.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

\* \* \*

## PETITIONS

LATVIA

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my honour to present a petition signed by residents from British Columbia, Alberta, Quebec and Ontario, which I think highlights the importance of this petition.

The petitioners state that whereas Russian troops continue to occupy a large radar station in Latvia; whereas the maximum intensity of electromagnetic radiation from the station has had a profoundly negative effective on the health of the surrounding population; whereas Latvia as an independent state has repeatedly demanded the withdrawal of these Russian troops, the petitioners pray and call upon Parliament to urge the government to urge the Russians to promptly withdraw these troops from Latvia and further to remind the Russians that future Canadian aid and credits will be tied to the timely compliance with this request.

The petitioners will forever pray.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, Question No. 13 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 13—**Mr. Grubel:**

*Government Orders*

Under the family reunification program, (a) what is the number of immigrants admitted to Canada during the last 12 months (b) what was the average age of the immigrants admitted to Canada (c) how many immigrants does the minister of immigration expect to admit annually during the next three years?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Under the family reunification program:

(a) Preliminary data for 1993 shows that 109,765 immigrants landed in Canada under the family reunification program.

(b) There are three major categories under the family reunification program: spouses, dependent children, and parents and grandparents. The principal applicant may bring with him/her dependents as specified in the regulation. Of the 109,765 immigrants, 50 per cent landed under the spouses category, 12 per cent under the dependent children category and 38 per cent as parents and grandparents.

The average age for principal applicants in the spouse category was 31 years. Ninety per cent of the dependents of spouses were under 19 years and nine per cent were between 19 and 30 years old.

The average age for immigrants in the dependent children category was 16 years.

The average age of principal applicants in the parents and grandparents category was 64 years. Fifty-three per cent of dependents in the parents and grandparents category were under 30 years, 20 per cent were between 31 and 50 years old, and 26 per cent were over 50 years old.

(c) The immigration plan for 1994, which was tabled on February 2, 1994, announced a level of 111,000 family class immigrants for the 1994 calendar year.

No immigration levels for 1995 or later have been identified. On February 2, 1994, the minister also announced that he was launching a new public consultation process that will help shape Canada's immigration policy for the next decade. The process will culminate this coming autumn in a new, 10-year strategic framework for immigration policy, within which new five-year immigration plans will be set.

Levels of immigration for 1995 and after, including family class immigration, will be announced after the consultation process is complete.

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** The question as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary has been answered.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

(1010)

[*Translation*]

**CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY**

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs)** moved:

That a special joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate be appointed to consider Canada's foreign policy including international trade and international assistance;

That the document entitled "Guidance Paper for the Special Joint Parliamentary Committee reviewing Canadian Foreign Policy" be referred to the committee;

That the committee be directed to consult broadly and to analyse the issues discussed in the above-mentioned document, and to make recommendations in their report concerning the objectives and conduct of Canada's foreign policy;

That the committee be composed of fifteen members of the House of Commons and seven members of the Senate;

That the members of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade be appointed on behalf of the House as members of the said committee;

That the committee have the power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House;

That the committee have the power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers and records, and to print such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee;

That the committee have the power to retain the services of expert, professional, technical and clerical staff;

That the committee have the power to adjourn from place to place inside Canada and abroad and that, when deemed necessary, the required staff accompany the committee;

That a quorum of the committee be twelve members whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses are represented and that the joint chairpersons be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, whenever six members are present, so long as both Houses are represented;

That the committee be empowered to appoint, from among its members, such subcommittees as may be deemed advisable, and to delegate to such subcommittees all or any of its power, except the power to report to the Senate and House of Commons;

That the committee or its representatives meet on occasions it deems fitting with the special joint committee or its representatives charged with reviewing Canada's defence policy;

That the committee be empowered to authorize television and radio broadcasting of any or all of its proceedings;

That, notwithstanding the usual practices of this House, if either the Senate or the House are not sitting when an interim report of the committee is completed, the committee shall deposit its report with the Clerks of both Houses, and said report shall thereupon be deemed to have been presented to both Houses;

*Government Orders*

That the committee present its final report no later than October 31, 1994; and

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems advisable, members to act on the proposed special joint committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we believe it is time to review our foreign policy in light of the changes occurring in the world, our national interests, our capabilities and the new constraints that we now face.

Our red book outlined several initiatives a Liberal government intended to pursue. Since my appointment as Minister of Foreign Affairs on November 4, 1993, I have taken steps to implement these initiatives.

First, the government will soon be ratifying the law of the sea convention. We recognize that Canadians, especially those from the Atlantic region, want a more effective international regime for managing fish stocks on the high seas. To this end, my colleague the minister of fisheries went to New York yesterday to attend a special United Nations conference on this issue.

Furthermore, I have asked my officials to produce a working paper on UN reform issues in preparation for the 50th anniversary of the UN in 1995. I want to point out that Canada has always played a relatively prominent role at the UN. We have given an important grant to the United Nations Association in Canada to promote Canadians' awareness of UN reform in the context of the 50th anniversary.

Together with my colleague the Minister of the Environment, I am also pursuing means to make sustainable development a key component of our approach to international assistance.

In our red book, we also spoke of our desire to make Canada's foreign policy development more democratic. Our determination has not flagged.

(1015)

This is why I am pleased to open the debate on Canada's foreign policy review in this House today.

We promised to develop an independent foreign policy for Canada. What does that mean? It means first and foremost to have the political courage to say what we think. To dare say what we think, sometimes in spite of others, to say it often before others, but also to always say it better than others. Our foreign policy must not only be independent but also more democratic. And the best way to make it more democratic is of course to listen to the concerns and interests of Canadians. This is why we want to broaden the public consultation process and enable Parliament to play a major role in this review.

We promised to allow Parliament to express its views on major international issues. Indeed, the members of this House have been able to debate our peacekeeping role in Bosnia and cruise missile testing in Canada. I believe that these new

initiatives must be pursued. I also think that the parliamentary committee has a unique opportunity to debate the major issues which must be reviewed in the context of our foreign policy review.

I do hope that parliamentarians will hold public hearings across the country and will invite Canadians, not only to submit briefs and testify before the committee, but also to establish a dialogue with the government through the members of that joint committee of the House and the Senate.

We will also invite Canadians at large to play an active part in this review. On March 21 and 22, we will hold a national forum, here in Ottawa, on Canada's international relations. This forum will be sponsored by my colleagues, the Minister for International Trade and the Minister of Defence, and myself. The Prime Minister will preside at the opening of the forum.

More than 100 Canadian personalities from different walks of life will be invited to examine the major directions of our foreign policy in light of the overwhelming changes of recent years. Their comments will be extremely useful to us in assessing our foreign policy. We should be able to determine which policies continue to serve our interests and which should be redesigned.

After the forum, the government will ask the joint parliamentary committee to undertake its own review of Canada's foreign policy, taking into account what will have been said at the forum, and to make specific recommendations. I hope the committee will have the opportunity to hear the views and opinions of all Canadians across the country.

(1020)

Meanwhile, together with my colleagues, the two secretaries of state and the parliamentary secretary will continue wide-ranging consultations with all those who are interested in international issues, especially the international development assistance program.

The recent annual human rights consultations with non-governmental organizations were very productive for us in preparing for this year's meeting of the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva. The recent International Development Week was more than a mere listening exercise for me; it enabled me to pursue and develop co-operative ties with our partners. We intend to continue in that spirit, because many people in non-governmental organizations follow Canadian foreign policy and contribute to Canada's good name throughout the world by serving Canadian interests abroad in a worthy and very substantial way.

I would like to emphasize in this House the importance that I attach to the consultation process. The forum and the work of the joint committee will certainly not be the last step in this consultative process. Indeed, the government intends to pursue these consultations, as I was saying, and we hope that it will

*Government Orders*

become a good precedent that will be followed throughout this government's mandate.

In the coming years, we want this forum to be used to examine some particular aspects of Canada's foreign policy. The government will seek to maintain an ongoing review of its foreign policy that will involve Canadians and their elected representatives, because in this world where rapid change and upheaval are the norm, we must establish and develop a flexible and effective mechanism. That is what we intend to do and that is what I promise in this House.

While we are engaged in our foreign policy review, we cannot ignore our international responsibilities. In this regard, we are to participate in five major multilateral meetings this year. At the start of the year, the Prime Minister took part in the recent NATO summit. This summer, he will go to Italy for the annual G-7 summit. In the fall, he will go to Asia for the summit of APEC, which stands for Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation. Finally, he will attend the summit of the Organization of American States and of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

We will therefore be very visible on the international scene this year and we must seize the opportunity to make our views and interests known at these gatherings.

[*English*]

This government was elected with the mandate for the renewal of our economy, our society, our political integrity and our confidence in the future. We have already begun the hard work and we know much more will have to be done. The obstacles are many but our duty to move forward is clear.

(1025)

Many of our most difficult challenges and hardest choices must be faced here at home. As we said in the red book, finding jobs, protecting the environment, enhancing national unity, providing political security and enriching the cultural identity of Canada are all goals intrinsically linked to how Canada acts in the global arena.

The international community faces difficult problems. Answers will require a concerted effort by countries working together in common. Whether we talk of the economy, of international security, of respect for international law, no nation can stand alone. We face common burdens and share links that cannot be severed.

[*Translation*]

This government knows how hard the task of national renewal is, but we also know that our well-being as a country depends on a stable international environment in which we can prosper.

As the Prime Minister said in our red book: "Canada has always adapted to change and overcome adversity, and that will be the key to our future". We cannot dissociate change abroad

from change at home. We must show determination, imagination and courage. We are confident of success in meeting the challenges of our times. However, we will need the support and confidence of all Canadians to meet these extraordinary challenges. We have shown in the past our desire to solve this country's problems in a shared, open and co-operative manner.

The foreign policy review process that I am launching today is intended to observe these same principles. But we do not seek to be iconoclasts. We do not seek to overturn all the values that have guided us in conducting our foreign policy until now. We must achieve a balance between continuity and change. Many sound elements of our foreign policy remain valuable and necessary today, objectives and characteristics that have helped to define us as an independent nation in the eyes of the international community.

I would say that the whole world expects something of us that it does not expect of others. We must keep in mind that Canada is a country which has something special that few countries in the world can pride themselves on having. We are in a sense universal. We have a universality that is unlike any other country in the world. We are Americans and because we are in America, we have forged special ties with our American and Mexican neighbours through NAFTA. But being Americans and members of the Organization of American States, we are also partners with countries in the Caribbean and Central and South America. But we are not only American; our geography also makes us an Atlantic people. Because of our past, our transatlantic past, we have forged very close ties with countries on the European continent. Within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, we have developed ties of friendship and co-operation with European nations. However, we have also looked to the Pacific. Within APEC, Canada is developing increasingly important ties with Asian nations. We must not forget, however, that there are three oceans. There is also the Arctic. Given our geographic location, we must also develop relations and maintain important co-operative ties with northern nations.

(1030)

We are fortunate to benefit from both the French and English cultures and languages and to belong to both the Commonwealth and la Francophonie. Canada plays a major role within these organizations. We have become a major trading partner of several African and Asian countries. As a former British colony, we maintain ongoing, friendly relations with Australia and New Zealand, as well as with a number of other African and Asian countries.

Canada acted as a negotiator and helped to bring India and Pakistan closer together with a view to achieving peace. We were involved in settling the Korean War conflict. Following World War II, our military was actively involved in establishing a new peace in Europe. More recently, with the UN peacekeeping missions, Canada has made its presence felt just about

everywhere in the world, but particularly in the Middle East, contributing in the process to making the world a better place.

When we look at what Canada has done and at the extent of its participation, we can see that few countries in the world can claim to have such tangible, important relations with countries on all continents.

We have to bear this fact in mind when we consider ways of improving and changing our foreign policy, while remaining faithful to those before us who helped to develop it.

Of course, we will have to make some difficult choices in some cases, but we cannot betray the hopes and trust that many countries around the world have placed in us. As I said earlier, they expect more from Canada than they do from other nations.

[*English*]

As we embark on this foreign policy review process, we must take heed of what has served us well, of what policies have gained us international respect and admiration, the positions we have taken and the progress we have achieved in critical areas such as peace and security, north-south relations and human rights.

We can be proud of Canada's historic leadership in the international struggle against apartheid in South Africa and of Canada's vision in creating peacekeeping. We have consistently pursued our international values and interests, not through force of arms or belligerent diplomacy but through force of reason and commitment. We have always willingly fulfilled our responsibilities as a global citizen seeking to build international understanding through co-operative multilateralism. We have welcomed international trade and investment rather than retrenching ourselves behind protectionism. Canada played a key role in the successful conclusion of the Uruguay round and toward the creation of the World Trade Organization.

(1035)

We will continue to build on the strong foundations of our support for peace and security, international prosperity and development, respect for human rights, democracy and good governance, the rule of law and free trade.

[*Translation*]

These elements will continue to be basic objectives. While the dramatic events of recent years give us a sense of hope, modern times, unfortunately, are as dangerous as ever. The war in the Balkans is, sadly, an all too obvious example.

### *Government Orders*

We must continue to move from security structures originally designed to contain the Soviet threat toward a new system designed to manage risk and unpredictability. Thus, we must consider the future of multilateral organizations such as NATO and the CSCE. We must also redefine, as I stated earlier, the role of the United Nations and we must also endeavour to make regional organizations such as the Organization of American States more relevant.

We must also nip possible new sources of conflict in the bud by continuing our assistance to programs aimed at dismantling nuclear weapons and by broadening and enforcing non-proliferation treaties, especially in North Korea, South Asia and the Middle East.

[*English*]

Chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction raise new fears. Recent treaties to halt and reverse their proliferation are steps in the right direction, but improved verification and universal accession are essential. International action is also needed to arrest and reverse an excessive stockpiling of conventional armaments.

Large scale movements of people, whether refugees displaced by persecution or persons seeking improved economic conditions, will continue. The scenes of displacement and despair we see every day unfortunately on our television screen are graphic reminders of how much remains to be done.

Countries will have to work together to address the root cause of migratory pressures. Stopgap measures to ease the pressure or stem the tide will fail.

[*Translation*]

The rise of ultranationalism as a political ideology puts progress toward democracy at the mercy of intolerance. We must act internationally to respond to problems related to the treatment of ethnic, religious and cultural minorities. Canada has much to offer the international community in this regard. The political, social and economic components of various environmental issues must be studied as parts of a whole. The solutions we must find to new environmental threats will not always be easy to accept. Sustainable development is the only way for both developing and industrialized countries.

(1040)

[*English*]

Economically we are faced with explosive change. Dramatic developments in technology are driving changes in the organization of production, in investment patterns and in financial transfers which defy traditional frames of analysis and forms of control.

My colleague, the Minister for International Trade, will discuss these changes and their implications for Canada in greater depth.

*Government Orders*

I would like to note that economic, political and social changes cannot be separated. As we can see in eastern Europe, they intercept, overlap and occasionally conflict.

[Translation]

With this in mind, we wish to benefit from the knowledge and experience of Canadians. I know that our fellow citizens care about their country's foreign policy. We must therefore listen to Canadians. They can best tell us what values and interests this country must promote abroad, and how we can best contribute to the international community.

However, I think that we should take into account our important cultural contribution abroad in our review of Canada's foreign policy. We must recognize that our international contribution in this area is directly tied to our national actions to support creativity, innovation and human resources development.

Of course, our policies must be realistic. Unfortunately, we will not be able to do everything we want to do. So, difficult choices will have to be made. Our resources are limited, and we must focus our efforts where our contribution will have the greatest impact. No single issue will be off-limits in this debate on foreign policy. However, as a government, we must give the broad outline of this policy and we intend to pursue our action in the following areas: first, the pursuit of international peace and security. Second, defining Canada's place in a world where the role of regional associations is growing stronger. Third, linking Canada's values and interests, including our economic and trade interests.

Geoffrey Pearson aptly described in his book entitled *Seize the Day* how Lester B. Pearson and his ministerial colleagues shaped Canadian foreign policy to be independent, original, forward looking, based on truly Canadian values but requiring at the same time a sustained involvement in international organizations such as the United Nations and NATO.

In fact, Canada has always centred its security policy on two multilateral institutions: NATO, to contain the threat of communist expansion and to protect democracy; and the United Nations, to promote the values of dialogue and co-operation to resolve or prevent conflict. The end of communism has reduced NATO's importance as a military alliance. However, much can still be done by NATO.

In the unstable new Europe, NATO must transform itself into a collective security organization while welcoming into its orbit the countries of eastern Europe which want to join and become our friends instead of our enemies. This is an opportunity that the western world cannot ignore or refuse to see and take up, one that will have to be acted upon as soon as possible.

(1045)

While NATO's role has changed, the UN has had to face a multitude of new demands and its role, instead of declining, has grown considerably. As you know, Canada has greatly contributed to the building of the United Nations, which reflects many values held dear by Canadians. After 40 years of near paralysis caused by the cold war, the UN is now being asked to play an increasingly active role in seeking and maintaining international peace and security.

Of course, this transition has not been an easy one. Far from yielding to the temptation of easy criticism, we must admit that the United Nations has been asked to assume almost overnight a role for which it was never prepared. Indeed, one wonders how it has been able to function in these trying times. I think that it is in order to thank the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and to hail his remarkable efforts. He needs the support and encouragement of all peace-loving nations and all representatives of UN nations.

Canada has led appeals for a sweeping reform of the United Nations, but we must show as much courage, innovation and determination today as in the aftermath of the second world war, when the nations of the world united to create major international institutions which, I would say, have served us very well over the years in spite of their little flaws.

[English]

Institutional inertia has frustrated creative thinking. We accept that the world is far more complex than it was five decades ago. We realize there are many more countries representing many more interests and perspectives. We understand we cannot tear up everything and start anew, ignoring the significant contributions made by international organizations, in particular by the United Nations. Lester B. Pearson said many years ago: "We cannot abandon the United Nations as the main structure of peace".

We do believe, however, that it is time once again to encourage fresh ideas about where we want to go as a world community. We could draw on our expertise and our experience to develop new ideas on peace making, peace keeping, peace building; on arms controls and disarmament; on forms of adjudication and redress for interstate conflicts; on reform of the UN's specialized economic, social and cultural agencies; on practical measures to strengthen co-operative security organizations; on improving multilateral development mechanisms to deal with chronic underdevelopment; on dealing with international ecological disasters; and on reacting to international population migrations.

Obviously this list is not exhaustive, but it is indicative of the areas where the government believes Canada can help make a difference for the better. Now that the cold war is over we must continue to bring the nations of the world together in the pursuit

*Government Orders*

of peace. We must continue to work on frameworks that will enable dialogue and co-operation between nations.

(1050)

Lester Pearson said in accepting his Nobel peace prize in 1957:

The best defence of peace is not power but the removal of the cause of war and international agreements which will put peace on a stronger foundation than the terror of destruction.

[*Translation*]

Canada must review its geographic priorities in this new international context. The end of a world divided into two camps and the emergence of new economic powers have contributed to the development of regional groups. Regional institutions can benefit the international system in many ways. They are sometimes the best tool for economic development and mediation.

We hope the growing power of certain countries will give them the necessary confidence and determination to promote co-operation between regions on a large number of international issues. We wish to establish strong ties that will enable us to initiate open and honest dialogue on our economic, social and political concerns, and on human rights in particular. However, these regions may form hostile and aggressive blocs. Canada has much to contribute in avoiding such a development.

We Canadians know the importance of dialogue and co-operation. The government is determined to help the countries of the world to adopt this course. To this end, we will have to review our priorities. We will maintain our relations with Europe because of our historical, cultural, political, economic and security ties with that part of the world, but we will also have to see how this new Europe will be affected by the growing development of the European union. This union will admittedly play an increasingly important role in Europe and lead North America, and Canada in particular, to reconsider its position in relation to the old world.

[*English*]

It is clear that North America will have to adjust its presence and influence in a Europe growing stronger and more united. Our political task in Europe today is building the economic and democratic structures and security of eastern and central Europe including Russia and Ukraine.

The past election in Russia has confronted us with new challenges. The results of the upcoming elections in Ukraine could also be critical in determining that nation's progress. We have already mentioned our interest in developing a special relationship with Ukraine. I have already announced specific measures toward that goal.

There is a great deal to be done. We will continue to work closely with our traditional allies and our new friends in Europe to promote security. However the respective roles of North America and Europe will gradually change. The transition will lead to a new relationship as rich and as harmonious as the one

that saw us through the cold war, but it will be focused on new issues that reflect the new world environment.

Canada is by geography a nation of the north. Our relations with the United States are of paramount importance to us. We have already established a businesslike atmosphere in which to pursue our many bilateral interests. We intend to keep it that way.

The United States today is adapting to changed circumstances at home and abroad, and we share many of the same concerns. We believe Canadian experience, particularly our approach to multilateralism, can prove useful to the Americans as they develop new perspectives. We look forward to working constructively on the international scene with our neighbour.

(1055)

This however does not imply that we will jeopardize our concern and our interest so as to avoid disagreement between our two countries at any cost. This is what I have indicated very candidly and very forthrightly to my American counterpart, Warren Christopher, during my recent visit to Washington last month. I made Canada's concerns about efforts by a certain group in the U.S. to reduce our agriculture and other exports quite clear and unequivocal to him.

I also indicated to Mr. Christopher that this government was determined to set its own independent course in foreign policy. By being independent I do not mean that we are opposed to the American policy but that we want to see action being taken with a Canadian point of view in mind. Our hope to see the end of the American commercial embargo against Cuba is a clear affirmation of our wish. This is a point I discussed recently with my Mexican counterpart, Secretary Tello, when I visited Mexico as the head of the Canadian delegation to the bilateral joint ministerial committee.

In the past Canada has been in the forefront of diplomatic initiatives. Canada recognized China before the Americans did and in a certain way paved the way to bring President Nixon to China and change substantially the relationship with this giant of Asia.

We Canadians believe that we could play a very important role to bring about democracy and respect of human rights throughout the entire hemisphere. Canada will pursue vigorously such a policy in every area of the Caribbean, Central America and South America in co-operation with other countries. Certainly it will not be against the wish or the will of the Americans but in co-operation as a partner within the Organization of American States.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

It is obvious that we must further develop our ties with Latin America. We are very enthusiastic about the possibility of creating a community that will include the entire Western Hemisphere, from the Canadian Arctic to Tierra del Fuego. The potential for our trade and investment is enormous. The trilateral North American Free Trade Agreement shows us the way to go. Many steps must be taken, however, before we can achieve such a community.

We wish to encourage open and honest dialogue with our partners regarding our common and respective problems. Together, we must define the results we expect to achieve in order to clearly establish our priorities.

The Organization of American States can play a decisive role in our hemispheric relations, and Canada wishes to make this organization more effective and dynamic.

This government's creation of a position of Secretary of State responsible for Latin America is an indication of our interest in the region. My colleague, the hon. member for Northumberland, has already made two trips to Latin America to promote Canada's ties with its hemispheric partners. I will leave it to her to talk about our objectives in more detail. She is also responsible for Africa. It is in this latter capacity that she will lead the Canadian delegation to the election-monitoring mission in South Africa and visit some African countries to maintain our very close ties with that continent.

The Asia-Pacific region has become a major economic power.

(1100)

As we stated in our red book, our economic prosperity partly depends on our determination to develop our trade relations with the Pacific rim countries. We will work continually with our private-sector partners to increase export opportunities for our businesses.

We also expect to see the region play an increasingly active role in politics and security as its economic power grows.

To show the importance we attach to this area, we have also appointed a Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific. I know that the hon. member for Richmond has already taken initiatives to improve Canada's ties and exchanges with the countries of the region, and that he intends to explain them to you later in today's debate.

With its west coast open to the Pacific, it is in Canada's interest to develop and diversify its economic and social ties with the countries of the region, as the Prime Minister demonstrated at the APEC summit in Seattle in November 1993.

Canada's interests are worldwide, and we will continue to have an active foreign policy that reflects our interests. Over the years, Canada has played an important role in the quest for

peace. We are actively participating in the Middle East peace process, and we chair the refugee working group.

Last month, we chaired a meeting in Montebello to co-ordinate the work of all multilateral groups involved in the Middle East peace process.

We are actively participating in South Africa's transition to democracy. Elsewhere in Africa, either bilaterally or as part of the Commonwealth and la Francophonie, we are actively working with governments and NGOs to contribute to the economic and democratic development of these countries.

We will, of course, continue to be active around the world. In these days of budget constraints, however, we must restrict our scope of action. Changes in the world and in our own country are forcing us to make important choices.

If we want to have a coherent and effective foreign policy, these choices must be guided by our desire to build regional and inter-regional mechanisms that will serve us well in the fast-approaching 21st century.

*[English]*

We will remain globally active and committed but we cannot be everywhere in equal force any longer. That is very important. We could continue to be present but not everywhere with equal force. Change in the world and in our own capacity means that choices will be necessary. This parliamentary committee will have to help us make these choices and these priorities.

*[Translation]*

In closing, I would like to address the issue of human rights in our foreign policy. Some people would like to see a foreign policy aimed solely at promoting human rights and their values, while ignoring Canada's other interests. Others insist on a foreign policy that would serve only Canada's economic interests.

It is far too easy and dangerous to simplify the debate in this manner. In so doing, we would only compromise this country's foreign policy. We must recognize that such a cut-and-dried version of the world is wrong. Of course, our economic interests are important. Of course, we want to promote human rights. Nevertheless, we do not have the right to impose one at the expense of the other. Insecurity, instability and war are detrimental to international trade. Human rights, democracy and good governance are the best defences of peace and security.

(1105)

History shows us that economic development and respect for human rights sometimes go hand in hand. Increased prosperity often triggers social change. When we talk about economic prosperity, we are also talking about international trade and investment. The development of international trade and investment is clearly vital to Canada. We depend on it for our own development, for job creation and for our economic recovery.

*Government Orders*

There is thus a complex interplay of values and interests, both in developing countries and here at home.

Is there no way to better reflect our values and interests in our foreign policy? Is there no way to combine them? Can we build economic and political mechanisms that will show that the way to universal prosperity lies through fundamental rights for all?

It is my profound belief that the concept of intervention as a right and a duty represents a turning point in the history of humankind. The world has only recently understood and accepted this concept which, to some, constitutes interfering in a country's domestic politics but to many others is a sign of hope.

I say this because I have seen the results. In Haiti I spoke to Canadian members of religious orders who work in that country, and these quite remarkable people taught me that intervention could be a duty. Considering Canada's intervention capability, we cannot afford not to use that capability to advance the cause of human rights. We cannot remain indifferent to the fact that throughout the world, millions of human beings are being denied their most basic rights.

Indifference is the modern barbarism, and we must therefore make every effort to advance the cause of democracy where we have an opportunity to do so as Canadians, because democracy remains the highest value, in the Northern snows and in the rice paddies, in the tall grasses of the savannas and the tropical rain forest, on the hot sand and in the desert. Everywhere, democracy remains the supreme value.

And if democracy is to be truly synonymous with peace, we must support it through our foreign policy. Where there are democratic governments, these governments support the cause of peace and promote peace in the world. In a democratic system, there is respect for minority rights and human rights are protected.

(1110)

We must act as tireless promoters of democracy throughout the world, and in doing so, we will have an impact on world peace and security. This does not mean we must cut our political and economic ties with countries that do not respect democracy and human rights. If we isolate them, we will never be able to influence them. That is why I say, to those who insist that we make respect for human rights a pre-condition for our trading relations with certain countries, that they are on the wrong track.

We must persevere in our efforts to advance the cause of democracy in countries where it does not exist. We must do so carefully and with respect but we must persevere. I believe that if we do, if we are determined, Canadian values will be appreciated and indeed emulated by these countries which we must

help, not for the sake of their leaders but for the sake of their people who are suffering and who deserve a better life.

*[English]*

This brings me to our development assistance program. Canadians are proud of our development assistance record, but they are concerned about program delivery and the long term effectiveness of aid.

The pressure for review of the aims and utility of the development assistance program is increasing as governments and societies struggle with deficit, debt and structural adjustment. The countries we assist are also coming under increasing pressures to provide proof that aid works and to show that the aid provides value. Developing countries will have to demonstrate they have or are prepared to adopt the social, political and economic policies that will maximize the impact of development assistance programs.

The government's earlier policy statements recognized the interdependent relationships between developed and developing countries. There are those who argue that we should abandon our commitment to the developing world because we cannot make a difference. My answer to that is that we must make a difference or we will see the level of global insecurity, instability and uncertainty increase to our peril.

We must work domestically and internationally with other donors to ensure that our assistance is applied coherently, consistently and to the maximum possible benefit.

*[Translation]*

We believe economic and social development in developing countries is a basic element of our own security. The consequences of underdevelopment, such as uncontrolled population growth, environmental damage and mass human migrations, have a long term effect on our security. Perhaps even more dangerous than the threat of nuclear war is the gap between rich and poor on this planet, a gap that is widening steadily. Unfortunately, the poor are very much aware of this situation.

With the communications media we have today, we can no longer hide this fact.

(1115)

The people of the south who are suffering and destitute know that the people of the north live in wealth and opulence. If we cannot act to ensure that the people in the south benefit from the wealth of the north, we are going to have a very serious problem, because ultranationalist, extremist and fundamentalist movements will use this human misery to turn people against the richer countries and take advantage of this situation to become a

*Government Orders*

revolutionary force in the world. It is therefore imperative for us to collaborate with other partners and the world of poverty.

I believe that when formulating our foreign policy, we must ask ourselves the following question: What kind of world do we want to live in?

[*English*]

In formulating a foreign policy, questions of Canada's future should never be separated from the wider question: What kind of world do we want? This will be the question that the members of the parliamentary committee will have to answer in formulating suggestions for our foreign policy. I look forward to receiving their views and advice in this regard.

Let me indicate the kind of world I would like to live in. I dream of a world where there will be no more arms race, no more famine, and no more economic deprivation. I dream of a world where every child will go to school during the daytime in a safe environment and will go to bed at night well fed and in a decent home.

This is obviously a dream. But Canada should work hard to make this dream come true. After all, great events, unthinkable a few years ago, have given rise to a renewal, a new sense of hope, and must inspire all of us as parliamentarians engaged in this democratic decision making process for this country.

Nelson Mandela was released from his prison cell and now leads his party in South Africa's first democratic election. The Gdansk naval yard electrician and underground union leader, Lech Walesa, is now Poland's democratically elected president. A political prisoner and playwright, Vaclav Havel, is now the Czech republic president.

This was unthinkable just a few years ago. But dreams came true.

[*Translation*]

I believe we must work hard to give Canada a foreign policy that meets our foreign aspirations and this includes maintaining our presence on the international scene, in accordance with a tradition of excellence that we will maintain in the future.

(1120)

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the government for giving us this opportunity to address some very important issues that will most certainly generate some very interesting discussion in this House and in the committees that are formed to address the twenty-first century and determine the kind of relations we want to have with the rest of the world.

I would say that I found the minister's approach to the problems and the issues facing us today most interesting. I felt there was a certain vigour in the approach to the future taken by the minister and the government, and I believe this augurs well for the coming series of extremely important discussions.

We know that such discussions were long overdue and that it was very important to get this process under way. Tremendous changes have taken place within a very short period of time. In

1989, we saw the Berlin wall crumble, and subsequently, everything that happened in the Soviet empire.

These changes, and I assume we will have an opportunity to discuss them at length in committee so I will not describe them all today, are taking place as a result of two important facts. The first one is, of course, the end of the cold war, and as a result, the end of the polarized state of international relations which had lasted for several generations.

However, the situation that existed before the present changes took place had the advantage of a certain simplicity. At the time, there were the good guys and the bad guys, and it was relatively easy to define Canada's role, for instance, in the struggle between the oppressors and the other side that wanted to liberate the oppressed and acted in the name of democracy. We all knew where we stood, so there was no need to sit down and wonder whether or not we would support the forces of democracy against stalinism.

Today, things are not that simple. The fragmentation process had led to the emergence of many new players on the international scene, where conflicts have become far more diverse and complex. As far as Canada is concerned, the situation is a far cry from the problems that existed in the golden age of Canadian diplomacy, in the days of Lester B. Pearson, for instance. After World War II, in which Canada had fought on the side of the Allies and helped to win the war, Canada played a very important role and won the recognition of the whole world. The Canadian economy was in excellent shape.

It was a time when there was no deficit and Canada's public finances were not in the vulnerable state they are now. When people talk about changes on the international scene, there have been changes that affected everyone, and these I mentioned earlier: the end of the cold war, the advent of many different players on the international scene, and so forth.

However, for Canadians and Quebecers, there is a new dimension with respect to the international environment. We have a debt that exceeds \$500 billion, 40 per cent of which is financed by foreign interests. When we speak of independence, we speak of a concept that is no longer the same. When one is grappling with \$200 billion in debt financed abroad in the very short term, a new kind of vulnerability enters the picture and becomes one of a range of factors to be considered when the time comes to define our collective future in terms of our foreign relations.

*Government Orders*

Clearly, independence does not have the same connotation it had in Mr. Pearson's day. Mr. Pearson did not have to concern himself with the reaction of Canadian lenders. He did not have to worry about the reaction of those abroad who finance Canada's debt. He could, with full knowledge of the facts, define with his government and with Parliament the country's foreign policy directions which depended very little on the reaction of others, in any case, but certainly on the reaction of financial markets. Therefore, many questions arise and it is not my intention, or was it the intention of the minister, to suggest a set course for our foreign policy in the future. What we are beginning here is a process of reflection.

(1125)

This debate must fuel this process and provide an opportunity to formulate the major questions that we need to ask ourselves. Thus, we must devise a framework for action for the committees that will be sitting. The parameters must be more or less defined so that more specific proposals can be put forward.

With your permission, I would like to identify a number of questions and problems that need to be resolved, new problems stemming from the changes that have taken place.

The geopolitical changes alluded to carry enormous implications. For example, the end of the cold war has also signalled an end to ideology clashes. Today, few people in the world are arguing about who was right, Marx or Henry Ford. I am not saying that the issue is settled and that theorists now believe that Ford was right, but I will say that fewer and fewer people are interested in engaging in this kind of intellectual debate which, what is more, affected the political life of nations.

In Europe, it was extraordinary; some societies were torn by these debates, even at the political level. We were not affected to the same extent but our American neighbours lived through the excesses of McCarthyism. That a great democracy like theirs could be sidetracked by the fears born out of the cold war shows the impact ideology had on the world scene.

We ourselves witnessed the impact of Marxist-Leninist schools of thought and the emergence of various political movements on the evolution of life in Canada and particularly in Quebec. But it is now over in the sense that there is no longer any ideological war. We will not see a Canadian Parliament or a Quebec or other provincial legislature divided between Marxists on one side and capitalists on the other. It is over. This ideological war has been replaced by—

**Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine):** Oh, Oh.

**Mr. Bouchard:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my speech and deal with these issues at the appropriate level instead of responding to sarcastic comments from the other side. I am

sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I would like the hon. member to be called to order.

**The Speaker:** We all want to listen to what all hon. members have to say and we hope that we will be able to listen attentively to what the Leader of the Opposition is telling us.

**Mr. Bouchard:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to sound presumptuous but the ideological war has been replaced throughout the world by a trade war. Competition is now at the centre of international concerns and has given birth to a very widespread anti-protectionist movement. We saw that the GATT has been reopened, that free-trade movements are gaining momentum and that we, in North America, are at the cutting edge of this trend, having taken concrete action and signed with our great American neighbour and now with Mexico a free-trade agreement that will be extended, we hope, to other countries of this hemisphere. Chile may be the next country to apply; the last treaty that was signed contains an admission clause. Some very important changes have taken place.

All these changes have created new problems. For instance, since international economic development erases borders, economic boundaries will become the fundamental criteria on which international movements will be based. There are dangers on the horizon. For example, it is not a coincidence that concern for the environment surfaced at the same time as the trend towards global economic development. People saw another threat to the environment. We saw that if economic development becomes the rule, we must find ways to subject it, for example, to the constraints of sustainable development. Develop the economy, sure. Create a huge area transcending political boundaries for the movement of goods and services and capital, sure. But not at the price of increasing the pressure on this planet and our environmental heritage to meet such demands. Economic development should not mean killing our forests with clear-cutting, allowing our rivers and lakes to be polluted with toxic substances for the sake of market globalization or clearing our rivers and the oceans of fish. When you see what is happening on the coasts of Newfoundland for instance, it is obvious that economic development is not a cure-all and that such factors will have to be taken into account as we consider and develop our foreign policy.

(1130)

There are other risks as well. Who will benefit from this economic development? If we are not careful, is there not a risk that only the mighty will gain? Is it not to assert the "survival of the fittest" principle in a new way to allow unrestricted, unrestrained economic development and trade? We must therefore look for ways of making all of this work. We are in favour of free trade. We know this is the way of the future, but we must make sure large, powerful nations are not the only ones to gain. So, we have to ensure that we too, in Canada and in Quebec, can

*Government Orders*

benefit from this arrangement and that the mighty, such as Japan and the USA are not the only ones that stand to gain from this.

We must look for solutions. What can be done? I will come back to this in a minute. But there is a risk. If commercial interest becomes the golden rule, what will become of the third world? The minister mentioned earlier the widening gap between developing countries and ours. That is a fact we are aware of, but mentioning it does not solve the problem, especially since the Western economy, the have nations are largely responsible for this problem. Take our international development programs for example. We did spend a lot of money on supporting development efforts abroad. Yet, the gap widened. On the whole, we can see that what we have given third world, developing countries in terms of assistance is less than what we have gained from that investment in terms of commercial interest.

So, if market globalization means allowing free trade without taking any of that into consideration, there is a risk. A new economic order is required. So we must think about it here in our country and take concrete action to provide a minimum structure not only for making speeches deploring the widening gap between south and north but also for ensuring ways to remedy the deficiencies which we have observed.

Another very obvious problem also arises. Since international relations are no longer governed by two superpowers confronting each other, we have witnessed a great increase in the number of players on the international stage. I believe that the UN now recognizes 175 sovereign countries. Some claim that there may be nearly 200 or 275 by the end of the millennium in a few years. And it goes on. It goes on because the small and middle powers who had little say now have the opportunity to act themselves—it is no longer just a monologue between the Soviet empire and the Americans. It is growing because the natural lines of force have resurfaced. As the imperial structures break up like the Soviet Union, we see nationalism coming to the surface again, this old nationalist feeling which sets political boundaries. So there will be more participants in international life.

(1135)

What should we do about it? Obviously the situation is more complex than it was. It has become more difficult than it was in Mr. Pearson's time, for example. It is no longer a question only of managing a relationship with two players confronting each other; now it is a matter of establishing a certain order in relations among nearly 200 actors. Imagine all the permutations of bilateral relations.

There are two dangers there. First is the danger of disorder and disorder leads to threats to peace. We finally realize now that in this tense face-off that we lived with during the cold war, there was a sort of stability, the stability of deterrence; we know how we learned to live with it and it worked in a way that prevented direct confrontation between the two superpowers.

Now we are hundreds and it is not so easy, especially since there are many more sources of conflict and I would say in a way, paradoxically, that the conflicts are somewhat less rational since they involve religious, territorial or ethnic conflicts. Sometimes the irrational takes the upper hand so that the sources of tension and threats to peace are increased. They may be less serious because those countries are not armed with the destructive capacity that the nuclear powers confronting each other had, but there is still a danger.

The other danger is standardization. As you lower economic barriers and have one large area where all kinds of goods can move around, cultures also circulate, but which cultures? The issue has been raised and I think that we will have to discuss it thoroughly in committee. Cultural and identity issues will become more important than ever, because it is dangerous to have a standardized culture take over national identities. The one thing everyone needs when confronted with an intrusive culture is to have familiar anchor points.

It is here that the debate will have to take place regarding the concept of nationalism. I know that this concept has often been debated in this House. It has also been the subject of a recent debate in the Senate. Not long ago, I read a speech on the word nationalism made by a senator from the other place, and I think such a debate will have to take place because there are all kinds of nationalisms.

I was pleased to see earlier the minister allude in his speech to the emergence of this element in international relations and refer to ultranationalism. The minister talked about the bad consequences of ultranationalism, including the resulting intolerance, while in the copies distributed a little earlier the word nationalism and not ultranationalism was used. There is a big difference, because those two concepts are opposite.

I want to remind the House that not everybody thinks the same about nationalism. In fact, there are all kinds of nationalisms. It is somewhat like the comment made by the Greek poet Aesop when, referring to the human language, he said that it was the source of all evil but also the source of all good. It all depends on how you use it.

I want to refer to a speech made by Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the current UN Secretary-General, in Montreal, on May 24, 1992. If you will allow me, I would like to quote two excerpts of this speech made by the UN Secretary General, in which he wonders about the different connotations of what we call nationalism. He begins with this quote: "The best contribution one can make to the world is oneself", which is from the French writer Paul Claudel.

*Government Orders*

Mr. Boutros-Ghali goes on to say: "To enter into a relation with someone else, you must first be yourself. This is why a sound globalization of modern life is based on strong identities, since the globalization of a standardized culture could crush other cultures and melt them together, something from which the world has nothing to gain".

(1140)

In order to communicate you must have something to communicate: To have a dialogue, you must have something to say. So, when you are present on the international scene and you want to transmit your culture to others, as the minister mentioned earlier when he said that he intends to spread our cultural values abroad, you have to know that culture. You have to preserve it, because it must exist. In other words, our identity must be affirmed at some level in our rapport with others abroad.

Mr. Boutros-Ghali also said this: "Each individual needs an intermediary between the universe which is greater than he is and his solitary condition, if only because he needs a source language to understand and decipher the outside world. An individual needs practical interdependences as well as a set of cultural references; in short, he needs an access code to the world. It is in the context of those needs that nation-states operate, in the sense that they go beyond the immediate interdependences of family, clan and village. A nation is a common will to live together which is the first step towards universal civilization. In today's world, if you destroy nations, you will not have a vast universal solidarity; rather, you will have tribes and primary links, whether ethnic or religious, such as in Somalia or in Yugoslavia. You will also have super states to exploit or dominate the former".

There is such a thing as chauvinistic nationalism, the ghetto-building kind, which is turned inwards. There is also the kind that produces great nations, like the United States, France, Great Britain, Germany, Spain and Russia, people who live their identity through political structures adapted to their needs and concerns and their relation with the rest of the world, and who in the process become assets to civilization. Nationalism, if properly understood, is a link to the universal. It is the bridge between the individual and the universal, between the individual and others.

No one will ever say anything against nations as such. Canada can hardly criticize nations because it is one. There is in English Canada a nation which to me consists of people who have a culture and language in common, people who speak English and have an anglophone culture, and the majority of whom occupy the rest of Canada.

In Quebec, there is a nation, predominantly francophone with a francophone culture, which has a francophone vision of the

world but at the same time is linked through its language to a universal language, French, just as anglophones are connected by English. That is what culture is about. Culture is a way to reach the universal from what one happens to be, and we are not all the same. We are not all the same as individuals, and we are not all the same as communities.

In Canada, the problem is we have two communities. We have two groups that define themselves according to different elements. The basic elements in this case are language and culture. As long as we have not resolved this problem, we will have to live with the political consequences.

To support what I just said, I would like to refer to a passage from a report on UN activities, covering the forty-seventh session of the UN General Assembly and dated September 1993. I am not quoting a pathological nationalist but people who live at the apex of the pyramid of world diplomacy and know everything about relations between nations and countries. I will quote two short passages: "Individuals find their identity in a nation. Nations find their identity in universality. There can be no international communities without nations. Hence, the so-called incompatibility between the nationalist and the internationalist perspective is merely an illusion". A second and last passage from the same page: "Sovereignty is the art of making unequal powers equal".

I think that in the course of the discussions we will have in these committees, which should be held at the appropriate level, we will have to examine these issues, because the Canadian problem, the problem of relations between Quebec and Canada, the problem of our two nations, is, in my opinion, not unique. It is a universal problem. It can be found at the centre of all international relations, and if we are to define a new international policy without taking this into consideration, it will not be long before we have to start the review process all over again.

(1145)

Earlier on, I spoke of the international disorder to which we become vulnerable when fragmentation occurs among players. We cannot oppose or prevent this phenomenon because there is some good to it, namely that it reflects reality and the will of the people. To this extent, we must respect it.

However, it increases the need for international relations which are more multilateral in nature. Fewer relations will be of the bilateral kind. Major international organizations will be called upon to play an increasingly important role. This is especially true of the UN which will become increasingly important, even essential.

Within this community of several hundred sovereign nations, there will have to be forum in which discussion can take place, general policies formulated, ideas on common values shared and

*Government Orders*

peacekeeping operations conducted. I believe that the UN will increasingly be called upon to serve as this forum.

Here in Canada, we are facing a dilemma, as the minister alluded to a while ago in his speech. Our dilemma stems from Canada's geographic location as described by the minister. Our country borders on three oceans and is open to the Atlantic and to the Pacific. We also have the United States as our neighbour. And, although it is true that we must participate more and more in multilateral relations, that is relations where everyone speaks within a common international organization such as the UN, we cannot overlook the United States.

We are fortunate to have the United States as a neighbour. We have to recognize that this country is a considerable asset to Canada. We also enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world and this is due, at least in part, to the fact that we are part of the vast North American continent which has an extremely prosperous economy. We should not lose sight of the fact that the United States are on the receiving end of 80 per cent of our exports.

Let us not forget that Ontario's economic development is closely tied to the Auto Pact. Let us not forget that the United States are vitally important to us. Most of our large companies that succeed are based on US capital. We must not forget this. In some ways, it will be impossible for us to avoid having bilateral relations with the United States. In our committees, we will have to find a balance.

So, I say yes to the UN and yes to multi-faceted relations with all international players. Obviously, there must be a more open relationship with Asia and Europe, too often forgotten in discussions at the Lester B. Pearson Building. But our relationship with the United States calls for a very delicate balancing act. I think there is a lot of work to do in this area.

I do not want to take too long, as my colleagues will speak after me. I think we can draw a few conclusions anyway. The first one is that we have the nation and we have the individual and that the individual now has a place in international life. In the past, we did not talk much about the individual in international relations but that has changed. We are now talking about it to the point of invoking the duty to intervene, as the minister was saying, in sovereign foreign countries that violate human rights.

I think that our policy should be centred on promoting individual rights. We must also realize that there can be no valid policy on individual rights without a national policy. Individuals form communities. It is very difficult to separate one from the other. Communities bring us to the subject of democracy. Democracy and human rights are, of course, the foundations of the international policies we must define together.

If we are looking for a role that Canada can play, it is to continue to promote democracy in concrete terms at the international level. To travel, for example, to the site of an election so that foreigners can benefit from the expertise of Elections Canada in this field. The Director General of Elections in Quebec also provides expertise and advice abroad. We must actively participate in operations like that in Eritrea, where we have to ensure that the referendum on access to sovereignty is held in a democratic fashion.

(1150)

The second conclusion is that we must respect democratic rights everywhere. We must recognize the democratic decisions made by others in an appropriate framework under criteria we deem compatible with democratic principles.

Third, we must define methods of intervention. This is not easy because the concept of security has changed, too. For a very long time, security was seen as the need to protect ourselves against foreign military attacks or invasions. I would venture to say that the whole Canadian defense system is directed at the North where the threat has almost disappeared. So we must rethink all this and look at the new, very insidious threats to security, in particular social inequities.

The problems of overpopulation, illiteracy and poverty throughout the world will exert very strong pressure on immigration and create a gap so large that it could lead to all kinds of disasters. There is also the issue of the environment. In a way, the environmental issue is a matter of territorial integrity or should I say ecological integrity. In that context, the enemy is not only others but ourselves mainly. We are the first ones to pollute our lakes and rivers and to clearcut our forests. We are. So, a totally new concept of environmental safety and environmental threat is required.

As for the extremely important but sensitive issue raised by the minister, namely the right or duty to interfere, I think that refinements will nonetheless be required, absolutely, in certain cases. Which ones? Not everybody should have the right to interfere and arbitrariness should not be the rule. The nation exercising the right to interfere should not be the one setting the conditions under which it can be exercised. I think there should be an international process. It is imperative, in my opinion, that some screening be done, by the United Nations say, to determine when, how and by whom this right can be exercised. I would not want superpowers to decide for themselves where and when they can use it.

Of course it is understood that the intent is to promote human rights, but as we have seen, selective use can be made of this right. We all saw how quick we were to intervene in Kuwait against Iraq. Why was that? Because there was oil under the desert. In other cases, we were not so quick, in Yugoslavia for example. We had to be reminded often of the horrors happening in Sarajevo before we took slightly more drastic actions. Much remains to be done. That is what we see happening in Sarajevo,

but similar things are happening elsewhere in Bosnia, in other enclaves, where there are no TV cameras, and perhaps because there are no cameras.

So, yes to the right to interfere, but let us beware of facile enthusiasm where the obligations and conditions involved would be overlooked.

Finally, about the conclusions to be drawn, I would say that some targeting will have to be done because the minister was quite ambitious in his speech. He gave a very broad outline of what Canada should do, what its role should be in this world. That is all very fine, but there is a need to target our action to be more efficient. I think that very delicate and important work has to be done in that area too and that it should be done in committee.

(1155)

[*English*]

In conclusion, we should be aware of the fact that one of the radical changes in the international environment is that foreign affairs are no longer foreign affairs. Foreign affairs are very much internal affairs.

When we speak about the creation of jobs in Canada, and we badly need to create jobs, we should know that we will never be able to create the jobs we need if we do not have the kind of international trade activity we need. More than 25 per cent of Canada's standard of living is earned through our exports. It is much less in Japan where it is about 12 per cent. It means that we have to be very active abroad. We have to be innovative. We have to implement a very positive relationship with the rest of the world in order to be competitive so we have a very intimate blend of domestic and international issues.

It would be the same when we talk about the question of identity. The identity question, which we thought was a domestic issue, is a very strong one all over the world right now. We believed it was only a question in Quebec but it is not. It is also a question for Canada because Canada will be a big player in the globalization of the economy. As such, Canada will be threatened by invading cultures. English Canadians will have to be very vigilant to protect their own identity. Quebec will have to do the same thing.

There is quite a rapprochement of issues, whether international or domestic. The fact that we have such a huge deficit should be in our minds when we address those questions. We might have great ambitions as far as Canada's role, visibility, presence, prestige and involvement in peacekeeping missions in the world are concerned but do we have the means? We should take a hard look at that. Until we redress the mess we have in our public finances we will not be able to play any real role in the world.

### *Government Orders*

The government should be very vigilant and realistic and clean up our domestic mess before thinking we can be present all over the world. We cannot do that. We cannot sustain an army. We cannot fight the environmental threats with the finances we have. The government is now trying to sweep it under the carpet but we all know that the deficit is a terrible one. It is a cancer eating up the country. If we do not address it, all those exercises and features are useless.

[*Translation*]

I would like to conclude with two reservations that we in the Bloc Québécois have about the process, not about the content.

The first reservation is that we are concerned that two processes are going on in parallel, the defence committee and the foreign affairs committee, to review fundamental government policies.

However, the two are closely related. I would say that they belong together. We cannot define one without defining the other. The ties are so close that we are worried about having two different operations going on parallel tracks, especially since the deadline for producing reports is not the same in both cases. The left hand does not seem to know what the right hand is doing and it is impossible to define a foreign policy without including the basic elements of a defence policy; similarly, it is impossible to define a sensible defence policy without harmonizing it with a foreign policy.

It all goes together. In reality, there is only one policy. We will have four groups working: a group from the House on defence, a group for foreign policy, and two joint committees that overlap the previous two and will consider the same things, without co-ordination and without having to present their reports at the same time. I find that very disturbing. I wonder where we are going with that. We risk scattering our efforts and fragmenting our thinking, which will not lead to as logical and coherent a conclusion as we might wish.

(1200)

My second concern is the creation of joint committees. First, two committees of the House already exist. I think that is quite enough, in terms of cost and consistency and efficiency, and now we add joint committees with representatives from the Senate.

The Bloc will vote against the resolution. We want to form a committee where we can work, an effective committee of elected members who democratically represent Canada, Quebec and the various provinces, not unelected senators who are appointed for life by an order in council, a stroke of the pen, and do not represent the people.

By their presence, the senators will make the committees more cumbersome, increase expenses and drag out the discussions, because they are not so in tune with the contemporary

*Government Orders*

everyday reality of electoral democracy; it is not really worth knowing what the senators think. We can do anything and not bother about what the senators think.

I am convinced that it is a very serious mistake to involve senators in these committees. Elected people should do the job. We are mandated to do so and I am sorry that the government decided to include them. I would like the government to rethink this matter, because then we could vote with it on forming a committee of people who should really deal with these important issues.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I would advise members in the House and particularly those following in the gallery or elsewhere that while the first two speakers, the hon. minister and the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition, had unlimited time and no question or comment period, we will now enter the next stage of the debate pursuant to Standing Order 43.

I will recognize the member for Red Deer who will now proceed with a 20-minute intervention followed by 10 minutes questions and comments.

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, initially I would like to say that we are very strongly in favour of this proposed review of foreign affairs and international trade.

Canada needs a new foreign affairs policy that is more flexible and able to meet current issues quickly and effectively. The review must bring us to a foreign affairs position which allows us to leap into the 21st century.

If Canada wants to regain its middle power role in international relations in the post-war period, it must choose particular global issue and then diligently follow that issue to its end, utilizing our solid skills and resources. This will make Canada's influence felt. There are simply too many current issues for Canada to be involved in each.

Before getting into some of the details of what I feel this review should incorporate, let me outline how I intend to deal with this issue today. First, I would like to evaluate the process itself. I would like to look at the forces that I see operating in the world. Then I would like to look at the specific areas that this review should cover and, finally, what the goals should be of this whole process.

Regarding the process itself, while agreeing with the need for review and modernization I would like to make several comments about the process itself. First of all, there is the involvement of the Senate. I was very pleased to hear the last speaker agree with our position on involvement of the Senate. We feel this will greatly weaken our ability to present a policy that is

truly representative of the people and one that will be accepted by the people.

The Senate is not accepted by the grassroots of Canada and I would defy any member here to disagree with that. The public view is one of being a bunch of members overpaid, big spenders, political appointments, no credibility, no accountability and no constituents to represent.

The international view is much the same. It is a position that cannot even be explained. They are not elected. They have no credentials other than political. They are out of touch and they have no constituents. Their only role is as consultants and advisers but not as equal participants. This will immediately affect the credibility of this review. It may be seen as just another unrepresentative political study to be put on the shelf.

(1205)

The argument given by the minister as to why we should include them was simply that they may duplicate the effort and the cost. My answer to that would be let them do that. Let them carry out their own study. I submit that it would be like the \$6,000 Senator raise. The public would hold them accountable.

In the area of travel, I believe it is justified for the subcommittee to travel. I believe it is a very strong point to go out and get the views of the grassroots and let them speak on this very important matter.

Canadian policy should not be defined by diplomatic relations. It should not mirror what the consultants and what the political people want. It should be from the people. Direct democracy methods need to be instituted and this is a good way to do it. Consult Canadians directly. If you do not do that, at least go to the elected members.

On public hearings, while the need for consultation is vital in developing a credible Canadian foreign policy, there must be a constant vigilance by the committee to avoid being over-influenced by the many very efficient and sophisticated lobby groups which have been catered to in the past by previous governments. These hearings could easily become a honey pot, attracting a disproportionate number of special interest groups to the exclusion of many grassroots Canadians. A special effort should be made to hear the concerns and desires of the majority of Canadians.

The timeframe I think also has to be dealt with. While all of us would deplore a study which might drag on, it is important to note that this foreign affairs policy document must be open to change. This policy must be designed to take into account the constantly changing world in which we now find ourselves. I ask members to think back just a few years: Who would have forecast such major changes as the end of the cold war, the

*Government Orders*

collapse of the Soviet Union, the fall of the Berlin wall and so many other economic changes that have occurred all around us?

What are the major factors that are operating in the world that must be considered? The department of foreign affairs and international trade needs to be able to explain its relevance to the Canadian public. The Canadian people must think of foreign affairs and international trade as a way for us to enter the new era and play an important middle power role.

There have been an enormous number of changes on the world scene. Let us examine just a few of them. Let us start off with some of the political ones. Of course the most notable is the end of the cold war. Predictability is gone and now we have a rise of international, religious and ethnic wars which have plagued us in the past but were suppressed by the cold war. Of course we could talk about examples such as Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ireland, the Baltics, the former Soviet Union and many parts of Africa.

We have as well on the scene Zhirinovskiy, the wild card, the possible threat to eastern Europe. That must be considered in all of our deliberations, the growing gap between north and south, between rich and poor, and the lack of a real solid superpower or are there other superpowers which are going to rise and become a problem to world peace.

Second, we have to look at globalization. This is possibly one of the most important phenomena occurring in the world today. Globalization is moving Canada toward an alignment with the western hemisphere and away from the alignment with Europe. It is clear that our military presence in Europe is not essential to Canada–Europe economic ties. Canada will succeed in the European market on the strength of its diplomats and entrepreneurs, not its soldiers.

It is likely therefore that Canadian–European defence policy will now be one that integrates its European interest into a more global co–operation and security force, possibly using the United Nations.

Having said this we should re–evaluate our policy commitment to NATO and NORAD to determine if these alignments are in the best interest of Canada in 1994 and beyond. Globalization is also moving Canada away from the European trade links and toward the western hemisphere and the Pacific rim. Furthermore, with the European Economic Community coming into place, Canada needs to secure its trade position within North America. The Canadian–American position is without a doubt the most important bilateral relationship in Canadian foreign policy. This is especially true with regard to the FTA, NAFTA and a possible future strengthening of the OAS to a level comparable to the EEC.

(1210)

While the western hemisphere is of utmost importance to Canadian trade, we must carefully evaluate our future trade in light of all the alternatives. We must look to the assortment of possible trade alignments, especially in the Pacific where we will have to work hard to overcome our reputation as a small player.

While this is a highly competitive market, it is one in which we can successfully expand and do well. Some of our Canadian entrepreneurs are already leading the way.

Third, we have environmental concerns. The environment must also be addressed at the national and international levels. The continuing dangers of ozone depletion, loss of species, accumulation of hazardous waste, loss of arable land all become serious potential international crises. This will be a particularly difficult issue for Canada.

On issues such as the forests in Brazil, Canada has asked that other countries begin a process of sustainable development in a way that mirrors our national plan. Unfortunately for some countries, this becomes an issue of environment versus development. Likewise, these countries look for financial assistance from the north to offset their development losses. Currently Canada cannot afford to provide this assistance in light of our present domestic economic situation.

Failure to address these environmental concerns will greatly handicap our ability as a country and, more significantly, the world in total to move ahead with normal sustainable development.

Fourth, we have to look at the world population. With shrinking fiscal resources our ability to help in the ongoing problem of overpopulation only worsens. However, it is essential that efforts continue to try and control this overriding world problem.

The International Monetary Fund must also be considered. Putting our domestic affairs in order is of obvious importance to our international affairs. We must remember that our public and private international indebtedness is the highest of any G–7 country. If the IMF is forced to become involved in our domestic policy, we would suffer a major setback in our international reputation. This threat remains as long as we fail to deal with our rising debt and deficit.

Next I would like to talk about the areas that I and we as a party feel should be reviewed and covered in this overall look at foreign affairs policy.

First, what is the role of Canada in the world? In response to the new challenges of global competition, environmental problems, emerging nation states, in a time of shrinking fiscal resources and greater political uncertainty, what role should we

*Government Orders*

play in the world? We must target effectively those areas in which we can be leaders and target areas in which we can build a domestic pride inside Canada and a reputation as leaders internationally.

Canada can play a leadership role as a major middle power, not by big spending and glitzy, showy consulates, not by being me too U.S. followers but by being ourselves; hard working, reliable, good managers of money and people. This is one area of government where we really can recreate a national pride which has been tarnished by recent governments.

What about our foreign affairs and international trade department? The operation of this department must be part of our evaluation. We must be sure that some basic criteria are followed. The group must be efficiently managed. Emphasis on Canadian strong points are of most importance.

(1215)

A lean mean group of dedicated, highly motivated individuals is critical. The group must be flexible in this rapidly changing environment. Cost must always be uppermost. Overexpenditures and waste will not be tolerated by the public any longer.

We also have to ask if privatization is feasible. Another speaker will discuss this further. We must get more for less from this department.

Two of my colleagues will be discussing the area of peacekeeping further. Conflict resolution must be seen as an international growth industry with new hotspots continually emerging. We must enhance our reputation as international peacekeepers.

Furthermore I advocate using our conflict management experience to create international peacekeeping centres to train other countries in effective peacekeeping. International training would not only bring in funds but it would also present us as a world power and would allow us to use some of our abandoned military bases.

In the area of trade, Canada is a trading nation. One of my colleagues will be developing this topic further a little later. We must remember however that only by developing our position in international trade will we truly be leading into the 21st century.

The role of the United Nations has been discussed. There is reason to question the current ability of the financial and political capabilities of this whole organization. The UN's administration and guidelines that shaped international reaction must be reviewed. Therefore we support the call for a United Nations charter review conference in 1995.

With respect to the issue of Quebec in the short term we must review the ramifications to Canada internationally should the

Bloc Quebecois and Party Quebecois realize their goal of separation.

Specifically we must look at trade and trade agreements as well as the international treaties. Quebec would have to renegotiate some 170 treaties with the U.S. alone, including the FTA. Also to be considered would be Canada's international position with the absence of Quebec.

There are many other areas that should be examined. Some of our future speakers will be discussing such things as CIDA and the whole foreign aid situation and certainly the area of human rights. I will leave those issues to them.

Finally, what should be the goals of our review and of our subsequent foreign policy that we will be developing?

This review should cover all of Canada's affairs outside our borders such that all other related reviews and agencies can focus their policies and concerns solely on Canada's domestic situation. The last speaker mentioned there are many studies going on. We must focus these studies and this one particularly. Conflicting points of view in this area will do nothing but send the wrong signals to our international partners.

The goals can be summarized simply: First, to raise the profile of Canada as a truly influential middle power player on the world scene. Second, a policy which will allow us to move our human and capital resources on to the world scene quickly to take full advantage of opportunities presented by new technologies or new demands. Third, send a message to government, business and labour that we are open for business and that co-operation will be the only way to open and enlarge our status on the international scene. Finally, a policy of aid based on respecting human rights and basic democratic principles and on our ability to help those who want to help themselves.

We in the Reform Party look forward to working with other members to achieve a truly representative foreign affairs policy to serve Canada well into the 21st century.

Given my comments, I move the following amendment to the motion:

That the motion be amended by:

- a) Deleting in paragraph one the word "joint" and the words "and the Senate";
- b) Deleting in paragraph four the words "and seven members of the Senate";
- c) Deleting in paragraph five "on behalf of the House";
- d) Deleting in paragraph ten (i) the word "twelve" and substituting the word "eight", (ii) deleting the words "so long as both Houses are represented", (iii) deleting the words "joint Chairpersons" and substituting the word "Chairperson", (iv) deleting the word "six" and substituting the word "three";
- (e) Deleting in paragraph eleven the words "Senate and";
- (f) Deleting in paragraph fourteen, (i) the words "either the Senate or the House are" and substituting the words "the House is", (ii) deleting the words "Clerks of both Houses" and substituting the words "Clerk of the House", (iii) deleting the words "both Houses" and substituting the words "the House"; and

*Government Orders*

Deleting paragraph sixteen.

(1220)

We do this to complete the review and allow it to be more effective, more cost effective and more meaningful as a Canadian foreign affairs policy.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The amendment is deemed acceptable.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** Mr. Speaker, I will just speak briefly, mostly on the amendment proposed by the Reform Party. I will say that we, Quebecers, have the same concerns about the involvement of the Senate, that we should call the other place, I believe, when we refer to it in the House. I am totally in agreement with the amendment which would remove any mention of that other place.

I think that the government—as the leader of the opposition was saying a moment ago—is putting two trains on different tracks, and we do not know where they are heading. There is already a committee on defence, and then a joint committee on defence policy was agreed to a few weeks ago. There is a House Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade and now we want to set up a joint committee. I agree that the other chamber does not need to sit on the committee, does not have to be part of our reflection, because it does not have a democratic mandate. The leader of our party said so in his speech. We certainly are in favour of a review of our foreign policy, as it is necessary, but it should be done by a committee of the House only.

(1225)

In that sense, the amendment of the Reform Party is certainly desirable. I hope we will do without this relic of colonialism that we call the other place and that is made up of people without a democratic mandate, people who sit there as a political favour, former fund raisers for the two main parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives. There is no reason why these people should be involved in defining our foreign policy. There are enough elected members, including 205 newly elected ones, who have something to say. I could say too that expanding a committee or creating a parallel one is a waste of money.

I wish to congratulate the hon. member for introducing this amendment. I share his views on the relevance of senators in this committee and also on cost, since increasing the number of members would increase the cost should the committee be called upon to travel. This, in my opinion, is a shameful waste of money and, as far as we are concerned, we would rather see the Senate abolished that have it participate to committees.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, certainly I appreciate that support. As I mentioned in my speech we feel very strongly about it. I trust many of the members on the other side will agree that the other place does not need to be represented. We certainly look forward to the vote on that item.

**Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I also enjoyed the presentation of the member for Red Deer.

One thing that made me very happy was his indication that Canada should identify its role by being what we are. We are good money managers and I thank him for that recognition.

He also made reference to Mr. Zhirinovsky. About a month back I read an article in one of the papers about how Mr. Zhirinovsky was carving out his own version of Europe, chopping borders here and there. Today as we are dealing with a global economy we need to bring rest within our trading partners and throughout.

How do we deal with those issues when we have comments such as those where at the utterance of one word we could create stability or instability? How do we address those types of outbursts from people such as Zhirinovsky?

How do we force new players in this world which is unfolding before us almost daily? How do we recognize newly formed countries? Do we set preconditions? Do we ask them to come to the table and before handing out any blank cheques say that we should resolve those differences before recognizing them? How would we address those types of comments?

**Mr. Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, this points out what we have pointed out a number of times in the past. That is we must have a little bit of a go slow attitude when it comes to reacting to certain individuals and what has happened in those unstable places like the Soviet Union.

I heard an interesting comment from a speaker yesterday. It was that in Russia the Reagan poodle has died and we are now waiting to find out whether a Rottweiler or a Labrador retriever will take over the country. I particularly like that interesting analogy.

I agree that the poodle is dead. I wonder whether Mr. Zhirinovsky is the Rottweiler. His answer was that for a number of reasons he is not. There are other people to fear in that area. In particular to the Soviet Union, there is a rise of nationalism. The change in the economy has not been good when we look back to the good old days. We must be conscious of all that. It is to our folly—and the last government fell into it—to jump in too quickly and so on.

(1230)

I suppose NATO recognizing places like Poland should be looked at very seriously. We should take our time. We would

*Government Orders*

agree with the government and certainly those people on the foreign affairs committee in that whole area. I would say go slowly and intelligently, not with knee-jerk reactions.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup):** Mr. Speaker, I too want to congratulate the hon. member for the amendment that he moved and say that we intend to vote for it because it relates to an area where Canadians and Quebecers really want to be represented by those whom they elected. I think this would show respect for the opinion of the people who just voted last fall, in the general election, on the way they see the future of the foreign policy, that is that it be made by the people who were elected in the general election.

By the same token, it would be for us an indication of our willingness to do things at a lower cost and to take into consideration all the criticisms that we may have received on the unnecessary spending there may be in the Canadian federal system as well as in all bureaucratic systems. However, we do not intend this morning to put the federal system on trial. In that sense, the amendment from the Reform Party suits us very well and we hope that the government will also see fit to vote for it.

[*English*]

**Mr. Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his comments. They reiterate a very strong point and we appreciate the support.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I do not want to confuse members, but there was mention made in the intervention of the hon. member for Richelieu that we commonly refer to the Senate as the other place.

Today, with the word Senate being in the motion, I would deem it acceptable for members in replying to questions or comments to use the same term as in the motion. Ultimately we must be vigilant and remain respectful of all members in the House as well as senators in the other chamber.

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the discussions today of Canada's foreign policy initiated by my colleague, the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

I want to share with members today some thoughts on the role of trade in our total foreign affairs policies, sketch out possible policy directions, and encourage discussions on how we can best proceed in the future.

I am also very pleased to co-sponsor the foreign policy forum which will involve people across Canada from the private sector on March 21 and March 22. It will seek their views on public policy. I look forward to the subsequent work the parliamentary committee will undertake under the initiative of my colleague, the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The importance of trade to the making and implementation of Canadian foreign policy has long been a central principle of our vision of international relations. Lester Pearson entitled his 1957 Nobel peace prize address "Four Faces of Peace". Significantly his first face of peace and the one about which he spoke most eloquently was trade. Mr. Pearson noted:

The higher man sets his economic goals in this age of mass democracy, the more essential it is to political stability and peace that we trade as freely as possible.

He spoke of the high political purpose of civilizing the commercial policies of governments through the reduction of trade and investment barriers.

(1235)

Mr. Pearson understood that trading agreements can underpin human development, including greater respect of basic human rights, by expanding the scope of international law, by generating the growth required to sustain social development, and by making governments that have opened their markets more sensitive to the reactions of international business and other governments. An autarkic, inward looking society that depends little on trade and international investment is less likely to respond positively to concerns raised by others.

The construction of an international system of binding rights, obligations and effective enforcement in which Canada takes its place as one of the more active and creative architects helps to ensure that the rule of law prevails over the rule of unrestrained power and discriminatory fixes. The making of trade rules fits this objective very well.

Despite the disputes that arise and the range of barriers that continue to impede people everywhere from reaching their true economic and social potential, internationally agreed rules governing trade relations can be the cement that binds together the international community.

[*Translation*]

Our government has focused mainly on economic recovery and job creation. Trade directly impacts on that area.

A large part of Canada's prosperity is due to the fact that we have access to foreign markets. Our exports of goods and services account for more than a quarter of our gross domestic product.

At the beginning of the nineties that proportion was slightly less than the one recorded in Germany, about the same as the one recorded in France and in Great Britain and more than double the one existing in the United States and in Japan. Directly and indirectly, exports sustain more than 2 million jobs in Canada, and international trade will become more significant for the conservation and the creation of jobs.

[*English*]

Against the background of Canada's trade record and the importance to Canada of exports as well as imports, the conduct of Canada's trade relations must rest on two pillars: first, the quest for greater international security through agreed rule

making and enforcement and, second, the creation of competitively sustained jobs for Canadians, whatever the product, wherever the market.

It is now generally acknowledged that the world economy has experienced fundamental changes over the last three decades and that these changes have been primarily structural in nature. The globalization of production, the growth of knowledge based industries and the shift in wealth and power to the Asia-Pacific region all point to the rise of a new international economic order.

It is also commonly accepted that attempts on the part of national governments to shield themselves from these changes are not only illusory but fraught with danger. Admittedly this has not stopped certain governments from attempting to do just that. In the United States in some quarters the current political obsession is Japan, which enjoys a sizeable trade surplus despite or perhaps because of its current recession. Behind such cryptic phrases as fairer trade and levelling the playing field often lurk notions of replacing open rules based competition with managed trade, restrictive quotas and regulated trade balances. Likewise in Europe there are some who support the idea of a closed, self-reliant bloc. Regional liberalization and policy harmonization are certainly laudable goals when aimed at deepening Europe's commitment to freer trade. However these objectives become rather less admirable when one additional goal is to shut out global competition, especially from low cost producers in Asia or Latin America.

(1240)

Fortunately or unfortunately there is no turning back the clock on globalization. Like the industrial revolution of the previous century, the kinds of changes produced by rapid technological change and by the liberalized trading system have permanently altered the economic landscape. As we saw with the former communist bloc, efforts to shut out these forces eventually collapsed, with the collapse of the Berlin wall itself, largely because these countries were being left behind in an accelerating, footloose technological race. Countries must either move rapidly to adapt to change or watch their productive capacities deteriorate and their living standards decline.

The central lesson of globalization for Canada is that we can only achieve economic growth through an open, outward looking trade policy. In the current domestic economic climate characterized by accumulating private and public sector debt, high rates of taxation and anaemic consumption, there is no wellspring of demand waiting to be unleashed by the right macroeconomic fix. Any meaningful domestic growth strategy must almost by definition be export led. Only by targeting new and additional markets, by assisting our firms to be competitive in those markets and by creating an open, outward oriented economic base both for domestic and foreign businesses, will

### *Government Orders*

the government have any realistic hope of securing long term growth and job creation.

At the same time we must focus not just on how much Canada exports but on what Canada exports, the type of markets we pursue, the delivery systems we provide and, perhaps most important, the productive climate we foster at home will in many ways shape the kind of Canadian economy which evolves in the years ahead.

We must also recognize that in a world of rapid and complex change where international institutions are struggling to keep up, where other countries are employing a wide range of instruments to gain advantage in the global marketplace and where Canada is but a middle power, we need to be more focused, more single minded in the pursuit of our policy objectives.

It has been suggested that political diplomacy is giving way to economic diplomacy. If Canada is to remain a significant player in an international arena characterized primarily by the interplay of economic forces, we must define a more strategic, less universal niche in the affairs of the international community. More than ever trade policy is about positioning Canada in the global economy so that we attract the high value added, high technology industries and jobs of the future.

The key to developing an effective trade strategy for Canada is to begin to identify more precisely our national priorities, both regionally and sectorally, based on a much clearer assessment of where our economic interests lie. In practical terms this means working directly with our key export sectors to develop a more focused, more agile policy agenda which is concerned less with trade instruments or the institutional frameworks than with trade objectives. It means using all the policy tools at our disposal, multilateral, regional and bilateral, to achieve clearly set out national priorities. In an ideal world, trade liberalization would occur multilaterally on the broadest possible range of fronts. Unfortunately we are dealing with an imperfect, changing world and we must be prepared to wield a whole array of trade policy instruments if we want to reach our market access goals.

(1245)

Although time does not allow me today to examine in detail the policy directions in the trade area for Canada in the decades ahead, I want to set forth what should be our three objectives.

First, we must define our priorities more clearly based on a rigorous assessment of where Canada's competitive advantages lie. It remains true that Europe is still central for many Canadian exports and an important source of investment capital.

We shall continue to attend to the trans-Atlantic market very carefully.

*Government Orders*

The United States market and the successful management of our trade relations with our neighbour remain fundamental to Canada's economic prosperity.

Nonetheless, the highest growth rate, the most exciting new market opportunities are in the western hemisphere, in Latin America and more especially westward across the Pacific to Asia.

Moreover, it is with many of these emerging markets that Canadian exports will enjoy a strong comparative advantage and major growth opportunities in the years ahead, much stronger than we enjoy in the markets of Europe or even in the United States.

How can we secure further access to traditional markets while actively expanding our economic links with high growth markets overseas? The central focus remains the multilateral trade framework which provides the foundation upon which our trade policy is constructed. For this reason we are committed to promoting an early start to the work of the new world trade organization. Called into being by the recent Uruguay round of the GATT, it is largely a Canadian proposal that completes the post war trade and payment system in the best traditions of Canadian foreign policy.

We shall actively encourage the international community to elaborate more fully a forward looking work program that reflects Canadian interests as well as the new trade issues, especially trade in the environment and the possibility of replacing anti-dumping regimes with competition policy, that have arisen through greater global integration.

We will also actively encourage means by which the new world trade organization, the World Bank and the IMF can co-ordinate their efforts to reach mutually reinforcing policy objectives. We shall actively encourage the prompt accession of China, Taiwan and Russia to the new world trade organization with all its rights and obligations.

The fact remains that Canada's most critical economic relationship is with the United States, the destination of over 70 per cent of our exports, and indeed with North America as a whole.

To manage this relationship Canada has a more comprehensive rules based framework in the recently proclaimed North American Free Trade Agreement.

The government's commitment to strengthening this framework is underscored by our successful efforts to establish NAFTA working groups that will strive to reform practices related to the inappropriate use of anti-dumping and countervailing duties.

NAFTA can provide a complementary tool for expanding opportunities for Canadian exports only if it remains fundamentally open to the world economy. What we do not want to see is a

NAFTA which turns inward on itself, devolving into a form of continentalist, protectionist block.

For this reason we must focus our attention on the accession issue and underscore its importance as a means of strengthening trade and investment relations not only within our hemisphere but indeed across the Pacific for those Asian countries ready for a comprehensive economic partnership.

The new world trade organization and NAFTA are not the only tools available to Canada to expand our trade relations beyond North America.

(1250)

Another approach can be to explore the prospects for negotiating a range of bilateral trade arrangements with selected high growth economies overseas. Such a policy would in no way compromise our existing and vital relationship with the United States. The goal is not to increase Canada's independence through a rekindled third option. Such independence even if it were economically desirable is largely illusory in an increasingly interdependent world.

On the contrary, Canada's role in the FTA and now in NAFTA should be translated into a competitive advantage by encouraging greater economies of scale, by facilitating mutual beneficial sourcing and networks and by helping Canadians to build globally competitive industries. It is essential that we view our North American base not as a buffer against international competition but as a springboard to a rapidly expanding global economy.

Trade agreements open doors. Our trade development activities help companies walk through them. In the emerging economies of the Asia-Pacific region or Latin America the goal of establishing an institutional foothold in those markets and constructing strong business links or alliances is at least as important as formalizing market access agreements.

As the second part of our strategic approach to trade policy we must also devise ways to target government programs and resources more effectively to assist Canadian companies to reach into key markets.

Of particular concern to the government is the role of small and medium sized enterprises which have the potential to be the growth engines of the future but often lack the critical mass, the financial resources or the technical expertise to penetrate foreign markets. Building stronger linkages with the private sector, improving the delivery of market information, better co-ordinating government programs, both federal and provincial and further leveraging domestic financial resources are issues now on the table.

*Government Orders*

The main objective is not to encourage government to be better at exporting but to encourage the business sector to be more aggressive, more outward looking global traders.

Are there ways of redesigning our trade development institutions and activities so that we bring a more co-ordinated approach to the design, the allocation and implementation of our limited resources? Should we consider working with the provinces and industry to be the linchpins of effective export strategies by adopting a more market driven approach to trade development, one which sees government as an export facilitator rather than an export leader? We can use market signals to set our real trade priorities.

Last, we must foster a domestic economic environment conducive to export led growth. It has become commonplace to observe that the boundary between national issues and international issues is becoming blurred in the same way the distinction between domestic policy instruments and trade policy instruments is in many instances meaningless. Regulatory and tax policies that unnecessarily inhibit export sectors must be revisited. Regimes and restrictions that block constructive international investment must also be re-examined. As the world economy becomes increasingly open, Canada will inevitably be exposed to greater and more fluid investments.

We need to ensure that Canada can attract the kind of high quality foreign investment that will allow us to take advantage of technology transfers to sources from global markets and to remain at the hub of international linkages and alliances. The basic objective of our policy is to further Canada's national economic interests at a time when these interests show a far greater constancy than the increasingly complex and competitive world with which we grapple. We can do a much better job of ensuring that these interests are translated into bold policy objectives and clear priorities.

(1255)

To that end we intend to ensure that the government's own house is in order with regard to international business development support. Upon entering office we found duplication, overlap and sometimes confused mandates that hindered the efforts of our exporters to compete abroad. We intend to correct this and to build a single integrated program that addresses issues such as the timeliness and dissemination of market intelligence, the need to reform the mechanisms now in place that provide export financing, and the promotion of mutually beneficial science and technology co-operation between Canadian and foreign companies.

We have to find ways of doing things better, both because good fiscal accountability demands it and because budgetary realities oblige us all to act responsibly as well as creatively.

Moreover, we intend to develop this program through a much closer and more active partnership with the provincial governments and with the private sector.

This process and the foreign policy consultations now launched will assist us in identifying the appropriate tools and strengthening program delivery. During the course of 1994 I shall announce the concrete results emerging from the consultations in which we are now engaged.

We must ensure that the greater co-ordination of all Canadian foreign policy tools to underpin our interests abroad are respecting the fact that these interests will always be varied. I want to reassure this House that the government will vigorously defend the market access achieved through negotiations and realized in practise through the efforts of our export community. We shall not hesitate to challenge other nations when they do not live up to their international trade and economic obligations, threatening Canadian interests and Canadian jobs as a result.

This is, after all, the whole point of international rule making. We shall be active bilaterally and we shall use the dispute settlement provisions in our international trade agreements to defend the interests of all Canadians.

Today's debate marks early in our mandate a period of reflection and discussion about the direction of Canada's foreign policy in a new and more competitive world in which trade and economic issues will be at the centre of the stage as never before. I am convinced that by working through these issues together we shall emerge with a clearer sense of purpose and a direction abroad that can only benefit the prosperity of all regions of Canada.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert):** Mr. Speaker, when we look at Canada's external relations in terms of development assistance and international trade with a somewhat critical eye, we have to recognize that by providing assistance, Canada is doing business and seeking business.

Does the minister believe it would be possible, without creating a gap, to make a better distinction between those two Canadian types of action in order to make it clear that business is business and assistance is assistance if we are going to try to eliminate the somewhat undue influences which clearly exist in that area?

*[English]*

**Mr. MacLaren:** Mr. Speaker, the member brings forward a valuable question in terms of the intended purposes of foreign aid. I am sure that others during the course of this debate will want to comment on that broad question as well.

With regard to the specific question the hon. member raises, the commercial relations of our aid program, commercial involvement in our CIDA program can often bring real benefit. I think in particular of how in a number of instances in which a sale of Canadian goods or services is envisaged in a recipient country, a Third World country, quite often CIDA can provide

*Government Orders*

the training element that can make a greater reality of the investment. I have in mind the instances where Canadian companies have entered into joint ventures or even direct investment in a Third World country where quite obviously a short term problem is going to be the absence of local people capable of working in that factory or industry. In those instances CIDA has often been able to provide the financing for the training which enables the local people to participate in the new industries involved.

(1300)

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister. I will preface it.

One of the criticisms in the past of our trade department is it has not had really strong links with the private investment community, private business, and it felt a little bit left out. I think I hear the minister saying that is something that is going to be corrected in this review that is taking place.

Could he just assure me that in fact that is actually what he said?

**Mr. MacLaren:** Mr. Speaker, I do not for one moment want to suggest that I have had misgivings about the abilities of officials in the department to develop and maintain close working relations with the Canadian private sector.

I think all of us would recognize, and I am sure the hon. member would do so, that the world is a rapidly changing place. Technology is evolving very rapidly in a way that suggests that new approaches to the relationship between the trade commissioner service on the one hand and the Ottawa based staff on the other with the business community needs to be under constant review.

One way in which we are giving current expression to that is to examine the ways in which financing is provided to Canadian companies for their export sales. Quite obviously there are limited total resources within the country, whether they come from government or the private sector, to bring about that support.

We are talking with the banks at the moment about how we might better co-operate together on export financing. We are looking in particular, as I noted in passing in my statement, at the possibility of more financing being available to small and medium sized businesses that are interested in getting into the export world, a world that often is bewildering to them and where they need some assistance from either federal or provincial governments and from the banks to participate actively in the export world.

Therein is an example of an area where we are actively looking at some initiatives to see whether we can tie the work of

the department and of the Export Development Corporation yet more closely to the private sector interests.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères):** Mr. Speaker, last February 17, the government invited this House to a third debate on national defence launching the process that would lead to the review of Canada's defence policy.

At that time, I mentioned the contradiction in the fact that the government was entering into such a debate before declaring what its own directions, its own intentions were on the subject of defence. Meanwhile, the government had already decided to authorise the United States to resume testing of cruise missiles over Canadian territory and, a few days later, it announced some drastic cuts in the defence budget, the closing of several bases and two military colleges, and the six-month extension of the Canadian peacekeepers' mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina. All those decisions have a direct impact on Canada's defence policy and they were made without the slightest announcement of the government's intentions and before the joint committee responsible for the review of the defence policy had even begun its proceedings.

(1305)

At the time of that debate, I said: "Moreover, the government assumes that a defence policy can be considered independently from foreign policy, which is not the case. There again, the government carefully avoided unveiling its intentions regarding the direction it will give to this new foreign policy".

That statement is still very valid today, some four weeks later. Today, the government is inviting us to participate in the launching of Canada's foreign policy review process, while once more keeping its own intentions rather vague and unclear. However, today, we had the opportunity to hear the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Trade outline the foreign policy guidelines the government intends to follow.

I must say that I find it totally deplorable that it is only this morning that we were given the working paper which is supposed to be the basis for the debate on Canada's foreign policy. Moreover, the government persists in seeing the foreign policy review process as totally separate from the defence policy review process, an approach which, in many respects, does not make any sense.

Foreign policy is closely connected to security and defence. It is particularly true in Canada where post-war foreign policy has been geared to the collective security system set up under the UN, NATO and NORAD.

The foreign policy review we are embarking upon follows two major reviews of this kind undertaken by the Canadian government during the last 25 years. The first one took place in 1969-70 under the Trudeau government and the second one was conducted in 1984 by the Mulroney government. Since then,

there has been a lot of water under the bridge and a lot of events caused much ink to flow; cases in point are the fall of the Berlin wall and German unification, as well as the breaking up the Soviet Union and the collapse of communism.

There is an urgent need to review defence and foreign policies in view of drastic changes in world order. Today, the notion of security takes on a meaning very different than was the case not that long ago.

However, several other major changes have also contributed to making the federal government feel the need to review Canada's foreign policy. I can think of the development of communications, the emergence of environmental concerns, as well as the globalization of markets.

It is important to point out that this globalization is an inescapable phenomenon. It is a tendency which affects the economy of all countries, whether they are G-7 members or developing nations. To try to escape this reality would be like ignoring the emergence of new means of communication and production; in other words, it would be tantamount to ignoring the changes which have occurred in our economic environment.

In a previous speech made in this House, I mentioned that the economies of Quebec and Canada are largely dependent on exports of goods and services, which account for close to 16 per cent of the country's gross domestic product. Obviously, the economic prosperity of a nation of seven million people or, for that matter, of a country with a population of 28 million, is contingent upon having access to major markets. This is why I wonder about the reluctance of English Canada to recognize the existence of a potentially beneficial pattern, assuming it is well managed.

However, even though market globalization implies a certain degree of integration in an economic structure which transcends national boundaries, it does not mean that small countries have to yield to the powerful economies of the world.

By standing up for themselves, these small nations ensure that their interests will be protected, since they will have been enshrined in duly negotiated agreements implemented by neutral international organizations. Moreover, they can enjoy the same benefits as their trading partners and competitors.

(1310)

Many smaller states, like Denmark and the Benelux countries, have done well against great economic powers such as Germany, France and the United Kingdom and have recognized the need to open up to the world.

### *Government Orders*

To protect ourselves against the almost unlimited high-handedness of the great powers, we need to embark upon some serious negotiations and to establish dispute settlement mechanisms capable of withstanding political pressure. Of course, laxness and obscure definitions would under no circumstances whatsoever be deemed acceptable.

There is much more to the benefits of free trade and market globalization. In fact, it is our hope that foreign companies gaining access to the United States and North America will increasingly choose Canada and Quebec as their entrance point to these markets.

As you may have guessed, the Bloc Québécois is not against reopening NAFTA to include new partners. Quite the opposite, it would welcome them. However, it greatly hopes that the government projects will include significant measures to help Quebec and Canadian businesses and workers to adjust to this new reality.

Various groups were opposed to the signing and implementation of the Free Trade Agreement and NAFTA, because these treaties did not include any adjustment measure.

Finally, I have one last word of advice about market globalization that comes from the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. At a round table on international trade, one of its officials said, and I quote: "GATT, NAFTA and other regional agreements help to create a more dynamic, foreseeable and stable trade environment. However, our members believe that globalization represents bigger and bigger challenges for Canada. They think that the capacity of Canadian businesses to take advantage of the opportunities provided by GATT and NAFTA and to keep their share of the domestic market directly depends on the capacity of Canada to put its finances on a healthy footing".

In fact, the leader of the opposition himself raised this issue earlier today, during his speech.

I have also mentioned that the Chamber of Commerce advocates improved co-operation between the private and the public sectors. As I have mentioned before in this House, this means, among other things, that the government must give access to all the information and expertise it has and create an environment conducive to investments in Quebec and in Canada.

Although Canada and Quebec are irremediably committed to freer trade with the free trade agreement, the North American Free Trade Agreement and GATT negotiated agreements, we must be careful and watchful of arbitrary decisions on the part of our trade partners, in particular the United States, to which our industries could fall victim.

The process leading to the gradual elimination of trade barriers between Canada and the United States is undoubtedly well under way and on schedule, but this does not prevent the

*Government Orders*

Americans from applying against some of our products and some of our industries protectionist measures which appear to be anachronisms given the current trend towards market globalization.

This total disregard for the international rules of the game on the part of the United States when it comes to trade is evident in a number of areas of economic activity in Canada. Take for example the conflicts between Canada and the United States on steel, softwood, beer, some farm products and uranium.

In those areas, the American authorities are systematically trying to deny Canadian products access to their market by using all kinds of cunning and harassing tactics such as constant red tape, countervailing duties, repeated use of the various dispute settlement mechanisms, etc.

The latest weapon the United States added to their arsenal of trade impediments is their super 301. This rather exceptional measure allows the American administration to penalize the countries deemed guilty of unfair trade practices against the United States.

Super 301, which is in total contradiction with the rules and the spirit of GATT and NAFTA, was strongly denounced all over the world, in particular by the Secretary General of GATT and by the European Commissioner for International Trade.

(1315)

Fortunately, Canada is not directly threatened, at least for now, with possible application of super 301. The United States are now threatening Japan with trade retaliation measures if it does not open its market wider to some American products. However, there are reasons for Canada to fear the potentially negative impact of the application of super 301 to Japan. The Prime Minister of Australia and some French parliamentarians already expressed their fear.

This strong hint of protectionism from another era shows the need to establish strong international institutions that can guarantee the continuation of the free trade movement and help countries to protect themselves against arbitrary and unilateral decisions by the great economic powers.

In this regard, the creation of the world trade organization as of January 1, 1995 seems to be a step in the right direction. Also, we will have to ensure that clear and functional dispute settlement mechanisms are included in NAFTA and that the discussions requested by the federal government regarding the definition of dumping and subsidies are successful.

As I said earlier, trade liberalization and market globalization seem to be a trend, an irreversible phenomenon. The prosperity of nations will depend more and more on international trade. It is a fact that will be part of Canada's economic reality from now on. So, as I mentioned in this House on February 1, the warm

reception given by both federalists and sovereignists in Quebec first to the free trade agreement with the United States and later to the North American Free Trade Agreement should surprise no one.

In the context of market globalization, it appears essential to me that the provinces be able to ensure the development of their economy, their culture and their society. This position, inspired by the Gérin-Lajoie doctrine, implies that provincial government institutions abroad deal with areas under exclusive provincial jurisdiction at the international level.

It is with that in mind that Quebec started, in the early 1960s, to establish a network ensuring its presence abroad. Today it has 27 offices abroad to promote Quebec exports, to seek out investment, to implement immigration agreements and to encourage exchanges in education, language and culture.

Other provinces also, including New Brunswick, Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario, have established a number of offices abroad. However, Ontario recently decided to close its offices outside Canada.

When a provincial government chooses to maintain a mission abroad in order to promote its interests and its culture, it should not expect the federal government to undertake obstructive action against it. If we want provinces to be able to attract investors and to help our businesses break into foreign markets, we should avoid these centralist offensives or pressures on provinces by the federal government.

I would like to take this opportunity to add a few words on the government project called Team Canada. This should not be confused of course with the hockey team of the same name. This project aims to encourage and develop a synergy, a co-operation between the various Canadian stakeholders in the area of exports. Team Canada, it is to be hoped, must remain a flexible organization promoting co-operation and collaboration between these various Canadian stakeholders in the area of exports.

Too often we have seen such initiatives become exercises in centralization which look like bureaucratic monsters. Moreover, consultation with the provinces is imperative if we are to avoid duplication, draw upon their expertise, and define their real needs.

At any rate, the whole process of reviewing our foreign policy, more particularly as it applies to international trade, should obviously take into consideration the views, expectations, and concerns of all interested parties.

At the very beginning of my remarks, I took great care to state my reservations and concerns about a foreign policy review that is totally divorced from the national defence policy review, a rather illogical decision. I would now like to deal with my concern about the process itself.

*Government Orders*

(1320)

The government's motion provides for the appointment of a joint committee of the House of Commons and Senate. I think that such a committee is utterly useless and inappropriate. Having a certain number of senators join the members who sit on the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade will only make for a heavier structure and lead to an inefficient and unproductive committee. It will also drive up the costs, since more people will be travelling with the committee.

In my opinion, the creation of working subcommittees that some see as a solution to the problems of effectiveness and cost related to the joint committee's size is in reality a proposal which will ultimately undermine the coherence and unity of all committee members in their work.

Some will say that creating a joint committee will help us avoid duplication between the House standing committee and Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, thus avoiding expenditures made by two committees working simultaneously on the same issue. This argument is pointless since both committees, like all committees of the House which have an equivalent in the Senate, are constantly overlapping anyway.

We agree with the principle which prompts the government to propose the creation of a joint committee of the House and the Senate, that is to eliminate costly and useless duplication between the two committees responsible for foreign affairs and international trade.

Obviously, we disagree on the means. While the Liberals propose a temporary solution to a real problem, which is due to the existence of the Senate itself, we respectfully suggest to our colleagues that the sole purpose of creating such a joint committee is to maintain this ancient and antiquated institution which is completely out of touch with Canadian reality. That is why we oppose the creation of this joint committee.

*[English]*

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, I have a short question. We certainly agree with the mention of the Senate item. I look at the difficulty that Canada has in becoming known in the international community.

The hon. member mentioned something about the efficiency that some smaller countries can have. He made reference to several countries. I would take a look at Norway which has a huge tax burden and a high debt level and point out that maybe it is not being as successful.

My question concerns the economy of size. Some of the hon. member's comments made reference to the fact that smaller

units can be successful in the international community. I wonder if he could elaborate on that a bit, please.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, I find interesting the specific reference made by my colleague from Red Deer to a Scandinavian country which, everyone knows, has experienced over the last few years a growth in public spending for which it now has to bear the consequences.

I think he has deliberately targeted a Scandinavian country to illustrate his point. He could just as well have chosen a country other than a Scandinavian one, such as Austria, Denmark or Switzerland. He preferred to choose Norway to argue that a small state is not necessarily more efficient than a large one.

In answer to that, I will only point out that while Canada is a large country, it is not really in a better financial shape than Norway.

*[English]*

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to address the House on the opening of our foreign policy review.

My remarks today are made in the context of our government's commitment to a foreign policy review. A foreign policy review commences with this opportunity in the House of Commons for elected members of Parliament to speak to issues which, although they may not seem as urgent as their constituents' well-being, are in fact just as relevant to our well-being as health, welfare and a social safety net. Many factors outside of Canada threaten the security of our daily lives and those of our children and grandchildren just as surely as unemployment, health and education programs and difficulties resulting from our debt and deficits at home.

(1325)

If world population growth rates continue and poverty world-wide is allowed to continue to ravage our global environment, if consumption levels continue without consideration of whether that consumption is sustainable, if women world-wide are not recognized as the critical determiners of health and education standards and economic well-being and yet are not supported adequately in these roles, then our very survival is threatened, not just our economic and social well-being.

Members of Parliament are elected to represent more than the immediate interests of their constituents, important as these interests are. Members of Parliament are obliged to balance the interests of their constituents with the broad and often conflicting interests of the regions of Canada and of our country as a whole. Federally elected members of Parliament must broaden the balance of all these interests to include a global perspective,

*Government Orders*

the best interests of humanity as a whole, our global family. Our vision cannot be blinkered by narrow interests. We must not be blind to critical issues in a rapidly changing world.

As I am sure all members have noticed since the commencement of the 35th Parliament, determining the future directions of our nation is a complex and often difficult balancing act. Canada has a longstanding reputation for leadership in addressing international problems and we intend to further strengthen this reputation over the years. However, no government has all the answers.

In the post cold war era, we are continually presented with rapidly changing situations, new challenges and many opportunities. That is the reason the government is launching today a broad consultative process with the Canadian people.

[*Translation*]

In the end, the government will have to make decisions based on principles, but we admit that Canadians, because of their culture, education, as well as their many travels and professional experience, are more than ever able to contribute to policy formulation. Such a combination of culture, education and international experience is unequalled in any other country.

The Liberal government is not starting from scratch in this foreign policy evaluation. Over the last four years, we consulted Canadians on a whole series of issues such as UN reform, foreign aid, human rights and sustainable development. Our principles were stated clearly and we want them to be the grounds for our review.

At the end of the process, I sincerely hope that we will be able to establish a more consistent foreign policy whose various components—assistance, trade, defence, environment, health, agriculture, immigration and politics—will be complementary.

[*English*]

In the past, elements of Canadian foreign policy have often operated without consideration of their effects on other policy areas. This resulted in policies which often worked at cross-purposes and which ran the risk of cancelling out each other's benefits. Our fragile planet cannot withstand the continuation of this short-sighted approach. Scarce resources, public and private, must be harmonized to maximize our limited capabilities. We need a full foreign policy review to help us better understand how to achieve coherent results.

My specific purpose in addressing this debate today is to highlight the relevant issues from the perspective of my areas of responsibility, Latin America, which includes the Caribbean and Africa.

I would like to begin with some reflection first on Africa. As a continent which is rich in culture, human and natural resources, I believe it cannot be marginalized. Africa currently has a population of 650 million people, a figure that could double by the year 2010.

(1330)

With such enormous population pressures, what can we do when the people of Africa are forced to eradicate their own natural resources for the purposes of survival? It is in those situations that environmental concerns become as much a security issue for Canada as terrorism.

The nature of Canadian aid to Africa has changed in recent years. More and more our dollars are spent in providing relief, not development assistance. This relief is augmented by peace-keeping and defence dollars dispensed in response to social, economic and political upheaval.

Ultimately Canada is forced to make huge contributions to refugee programs at home and abroad. We must recognize the immense costs of social, political and economic crises and their effect on our own well-being at home here in Canada.

The cost to Canada of emergency assistance, peacekeeping and refugee care and processing in war zones far outweighs the cost of building secure and stable societies through long term development. In recent years it has become clearly evident that we cannot afford not to promote international peace and security.

Aid or development assistance alone in whatever volume is insufficient to the task. Dollars spent by Canada for development should complement policies and programs of recipient country governments with the same ends in mind.

Sustainable development, good governance, respect for human rights, adherence to democratic principles, economic transparency and acceptable accountability standards are requisite. We cannot afford to squander too many development assistance dollars in countries that do not respect the principles and goals of our initiatives.

For that purpose, Canada has already started to relate our assistance to such principles as respect for human rights and competent economic management. This will surely be examined as part of the foreign policy review.

This is obviously an approach of utmost importance. Yet even a policy of providing development dollars to countries practising good governance policies will not alone achieve sustainable development in those countries. Economic opportunity must also be possible.

For many African countries debt burdens threaten to prevent the emergence of a viable economy. There is an additional need in developing countries for policies to encourage foreign investment and international policies which permit free and fair trade to occur with poorer nations.

Political will on all sides to bring about necessary reform is paramount. I am sure our foreign policy review process will assist the Canadian government in developing proactive, effective methods to achieve this goal.

[*Translation*]

Africa is going through a period of profound changes. The people of many African countries proved their determination to rid themselves of cyclical problems of corruption and abuse associated with their governments. Africans want governments that will be able to fulfil their basic needs, namely as regards health, education, peace, sustainable development and economic stability.

Africa is facing a tough challenge. The changes needed will not be possible without tremendous work and the commitment of its people. Canada is aware that the road to democracy will not be an easy one. Any political change inevitably comes with problems and unexpected detours. Nevertheless, it is important that the democratization process be anchored in the respect of African customs, traditions and values in order to take root deeply and provide hope for future generations of Africans.

In countries that are on their way to democracy, it is not enough to support the democratization process and principles of good public administration up to election day. Although decisive elections are but a first step. Canada must go on supporting the principle of good administration of public affairs.

[*English*]

We also should not underestimate the economic ties Canada has established with Africa. Our African trade involves every Canadian region and has allowed many companies to make more effective use of their knowledge in technology.

(1335)

This is of significant benefit to Canadians who not only gain market access but jobs and greater economic security for themselves. By applying our knowledge and supplying our products where the demand emerges, Canada maintains and increases its competitiveness.

It is worth recalling that the United Nations, the Commonwealth and la Francophonie are major multilateral organizations through which Canadians and Africans have been closely associated. Many hon. members may not be aware that African countries comprise 30 per cent of the United Nations membership, 27 per cent of the Commonwealth and 52 per cent of the countries in la Francophonie.

The linguistic, cultural and historical ties between our nations have existed far longer than our relationships through aid programs. Canada's bilingual and multicultural nature has been an important factor in building those long term relationships. That is the foundation upon which we can take the opportunity to build a long fruitful partnership well into the future. We only need the political will to do so. In my opinion, we cannot afford not to.

### *Government Orders*

Within our development assistance programs Canada has traditionally attached the highest priority to activities which attempt to reduce global poverty. It has been recognized that crime, violence and large scale conflict often result in situations where poverty is most prevalent.

The government has stated that its goal is to provide 25 per cent of official development assistance. This is to meet basic human needs and human resource development, to provide basic health and education, to work more closely to assist women who are the principal providers of health, nutrition and education, and to provide sustainable development so that future generations may also know peace and security.

The government was elected on the promise of fiscal responsibility. While we are not in a position at this time to increase funding to our development assistance program, our goal remains the same: to achieve a 0.7 per cent official development assistance to GNP ratio.

Despite this need for fiscal restraint I do not believe that limited financial resources necessitate a reduction in effectiveness. Through creative, proactive and well-managed programs our impact can even increase. Initiatives in terms of human rights for example often administered on a small scale can have a widespread impact. Our challenge is to administer all our programs more effectively.

We recognize the impact of necessary change can be felt unequally by different groups in society. Canada is trying to respond to this reality by working with international financial institutions and through local governments to protect existing adjustment programs, but mitigate the negative impacts by launching new social programs to benefit those most directly affected by adjustment. We hope the foreign policy review will address this issue.

Still, Africa's continuing debt burden severely handicaps its efforts at sustainable development. As a development partner we need to consider how best to alleviate this burden. Success will assist in the creation of healthier African economies.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, allow me to speak now about Latin America. Canada is part of the Americas. With globalization, Latin America and the Caribbean are more and more the focus of Canada's foreign policy. That region has already got involved in a process of fundamental change and modernization on the economic, political and social levels. With its positive co-operation, Canada has a unique opportunity to be able to take part in that development and help shaping it. In this hemisphere, we are considered as a responsible and increasingly involved partner, and I think we have a lot to gain from that partnership.

While recognizing the potential of that partnership, we must also admit that Canada has a lot to learn if it wants to avoid being marginalized in the development of its relationships with the other countries of the hemisphere. These countries have a very

*Government Orders*

different history, language and culture than ours, and our understanding of their circumstances will affect the scope and success of our relationships.

(1340)

Canada's foreign policy regarding that region is faced with many difficulties. Our attitudes towards Latin America and the Caribbean must be in tune with the general objectives of our foreign policy, that is the relief of poverty, the promotion of sound public management, of human rights, of social stability, of gender and racial equality, of a sustainable environment and of international peace and stability.

While that population is quite educated compared with other developing regions, they have serious social problems which must be addressed at the grass roots. It is essential that we solve these problems if we want to ensure their well-being in the future.

These last few years, there have been positive political tendencies in Latin America. In the early eighties, many countries had military regimes. Now, almost all governments in that region have been democratically elected in accordance with free constitutional procedures. As these countries get familiar with the democratic process, they bring their policies up to international standards.

[*English*]

Work is being done by Latin American and Caribbean citizens to consolidate and strengthen democratic judicial and human rights institutions. Canadian assistance has been and remains important in reinforcing these trends. The military in most countries now shows a greater respect for civilian authority and has retreated to a more limited proper role in society.

Canada supports and is encouraged by this process of democratization. Similar to our work in Africa it is imperative to remember that elections in themselves do not create democracy. It is incumbent on the donor countries to continue their support until a true democratic society is achieved. In fact we anticipate the day when we learn from each other in this regard.

In the Commonwealth Caribbean, Canada has longstanding strong ties with both governments and people. These ties have been based on shared parliamentary and democratic traditions, common values, close personal contact with government leaders, extensive tourism and major involvement by Canada's chartered banks. We expect these ties to endure and strengthen in the years ahead.

How should our relationship with the region be modified to reflect future and global interests? There has also been significant progress in the area of economic renewal in Latin America

and the Caribbean. This provides the foundation for sustainable growth and development.

Many countries in this region are making considerable progress in implementing market oriented economic reforms, privatization, deregulation, emphasis on export oriented production and are integrating into regional and global markets. Investor confidence is improving.

As a result this is a region which is expanding economically and in which Canada has an increasingly important trade and investment stake that can contribute to economic recovery and renewal in Canada. We must seize these opportunities in the most effective manner possible.

Canada's official development assistance plays an important role in our partnership throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. In this instance there are certain existing similarities to our relationship to Africa.

By supporting the economic reform process and encouraging governments to do more now to mitigate the associated social costs, Canada's aid program has promoted sustainable development, particularly in the management of natural resources. It has contributed to a reduction in poverty and has promoted respect for human rights, democratic development and good economic governance.

I know from firsthand experience with grassroots projects throughout Central America the good that can result from human scale community development initiatives supported by Canadians. Our larger scale official programs of development assistance have also had a positive impact in vital areas ranging from food production to human rights, from the development of clean water sources to economic reform. They have contributed to encouraging the economic and social improvements that are taking place.

(1345)

[*Translation*]

Since it became a member of the Organization of American States in 1989, Canada actively supported the OAS in its efforts to promote democracy and constitutional rule, as well as judicial reform and human rights protection. Its missions have given Canada an opportunity to strengthen human development in all regions.

I believe that Canada should continue to support regional initiatives in favour of human rights, environmental protection and trade development.

In this process, we should also make sure that poor countries are not marginalized. Marginalization of less developed countries can result in instability and massive movements of populations away from poor countries and into rich ones, and could also jeopardize emerging economies. Such situations have

*Government Orders*

repercussions all over the world. Therefore, there may be merit in trying to prevent them.

Recently, Canada launched a partnership with a country of this hemisphere, Haiti. As one of four friendly countries—with the United States, France and Venezuela—Canada will play a role in the OAS and the UN in the restoration of democratic and constitutional rule in Haiti. It will support President Aristide and protection of human rights.

[*English*]

Cuba poses another challenge. The Cuban economy has undergone serious deterioration. Economic reforms have been limited as have human rights improvements. However I believe we cannot afford to marginalize any country in this hemisphere. Careful evaluation is necessary to encourage the full reintegration of Cuba into the hemispheric family, a process that will require significant change.

Canada's relationship with the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean cannot be classified in general terms as each country of the region is so vastly different. For those in the initial stages of development simply providing education and poverty alleviation is not enough. We must also assist them in developing fairer trading relations with their trading partners throughout the world.

Latin America is on the brink of having a more significant impact in international policy areas, as it now has a chance to pursue its vision of becoming an important international player. The challenge for Canada will be the flexibility of our approach and the way in which we accept benefits which are offered through the maintenance and continuance of relationships with both Latin America and the Caribbean.

In closing, it is the vision of the future of Canadians that the Liberal Party is trying to capture in this review process. The result of the process should permit policies which not only respond to the domestic needs of Canadians but also project the international image which Canadians want their government and government initiatives to pursue.

In all of this we are working toward a better future, a future with considerably less poverty, positive sustainable development, social and political equity not only for ourselves but for all women, men and children throughout the world and for our partners in Latin America, the Caribbean and Africa. I hope everyone present will assist us in achieving that goal.

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I commend the hon. minister on her comments this afternoon that add to the very important debate taking place with regard to our foreign policy.

I heard the minister speak about the need for aid in the areas that she represents, Latin America and Africa. Would the

minister agree with the Auditor General and his comments that there is a need to downsize and reduce the number of countries we give aid to in order to better target our resources? Could the minister comment on that?

**Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to comment. Earlier today the Minister of Foreign Affairs said that we have to try to be more focused in our foreign aid policies. Being more focused in foreign aid policy does not refer only to aid. There has been an ongoing debate about whether or not we can concentrate on fewer countries having fewer bilateral relations with countries around the world. Through that debate we have produced a greater concentration of development assistance to regions of the world.

(1350)

The government and I support the development of regional initiatives in the world, but I personally believe that should not preclude our bilateral relations with any country in the world. There are many other instruments of foreign policy besides aid which we can use to enhance and promote bilateral relations with nations around the world.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for her comments. As we all enjoy the debate about foreign policy, hopefully we will come to the start of the process in which we are going to be involved to set policy going into the next century.

I would like a comment from the minister or at least her opinion on whether we should have enabling legislation for CIDA. I was surprised to find no legislation in place at this time that gives CIDA its legislative authority; it is just a creation of cabinet.

Would the minister comment on both the advisability of that because I realize it restricts CIDA's activities somewhat and, in view of that, whether or not it would help to control some of the costs the Auditor General mentioned that have been permanent sores in many Auditor Generals' reports over the past few years?

**Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure development assistance, foreign aid, and in particular the role of CIDA in providing development assistance and aid around the world, will be very large subjects in the foreign policy review process in general.

The government in its history has kept CIDA closer to its day to day operations of foreign policy. Through the instrument of CIDA and foreign aid there was the desire to supplement other political foreign policy initiatives by keeping them close to the government rather than legislating CIDA at arm's length from the government, as we have done for various other institutions such as the International Development Research Council and the International Institute on Democratic Development and Human Rights.

*S.O. 31*

At this point I would not like to conjecture on how CIDA should progress into the future. I know I want to see these issues discussed very fully in our foreign policy review so that we hear from Canadians how they feel the aid development assistance instrument can be best used in our whole foreign policy package.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I have taken notice of the member standing. Unless there has been a reassignment of seats he might seek to return to his seat while I am on my feet and I might recognize him.

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her excellent speech. I would ask for her opinion on whether or not she sees any role for Canada utilizing the United Nations and bringing together the international community to employ economic levers against countries that may be abusing the foreign aid they get, or even in the context of gross human rights abuses within their countries.

**Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to working very closely with the United Nations in trying to strengthen it, in order that the United Nations can be better able to meet all complex situations that exist in our global world. Right now the United Nations is dominated by a security council with a very limited membership which reflects in many ways a cold war era rather than the era we now exist in.

(1355)

It is very difficult for the United Nations because of its current structure to respond, as the member suggests, to some of the difficulties existing in the world today. As I said, Canada is very interested in not only continuing to support the United Nations but to help it to reform itself in many ways so that it better reflects the global needs of the world.

Certainly Canada as a nation in its bilateral relations with other countries of the world is very concerned about issues of corruption and misuse of funds provided for development purposes to other nations. We do everything we can. We use every bilateral instrument we have at hand to try to encourage governments that may be practising corrupt activities to stop.

I can say from my own experiences as a minister travelling throughout Latin America and Africa that our own country's initiatives in that regard have had some good effect. Countries are now coming forward voluntarily to tell me about measures they are taking to overcome problems. Many countries through regional approaches are beginning to police each other.

There is great hope about what we can do to face the difficulties the member raised which are serious for us. There are things we can do bilaterally as a nation, but there is more we can do through helping the United Nations to reform itself and

reform its institutions so that it can help in the process of addressing these issues.

**The Speaker:** There being no further questions and it being two o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 30(5), the House will now proceed to Statements by Members, pursuant to Standing Order 31.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[Translation]

### WORLD JUNIOR ALPINE CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis):** Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention Mélanie Turgeon's incredible performance at the World Junior Alpine Championships in Lake Placid, New York. This Canadian athlete, who is only 17 years old, dazzled the crowd of onlookers and journalists when she won her fifth medal yesterday.

[English]

During the entire week of competition Melanie has shown the world what extraordinary talent she possesses. She won a gold medal in the giant slalom, another in the combination, a silver medal in the Super G, a bronze medal in downhill, and another in the slalom.

This remarkable young athlete is the first skier to have won five medals at the World Junior Alpine Championships, a feat which no doubt foreshadows a brilliant career.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I join all Canadians in congratulating Mélanie Turgeon and telling her how proud we are of her and how much we admire her. She is truly a credit to our country. Well done, Mélanie!

\* \* \*

### REVENUE CANADA

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne):** Mr. Speaker, recently a constituent in my riding wrote to inform me that it was impossible to get through to a federal telephone service, Revenue Canada's 800 information number on child tax benefits.

Nearly three million people are affected by the failure of this service. These are the same people who are asked to pay their taxes without delay, while being deprived of a quality information service that could allow them to claim a deduction to which they are entitled.

This situation is intolerable and shows a total lack of respect for taxpayers. I do hope that corrective measures will be taken as soon as possible so that our fellow Canadians do not have to put up with such a frustrating situation any longer.

[English]

**EUTHANASIA**

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, media seekers have recently jumped on the euthanasia issue with little regard for the risks down the road.

In my riding the non-partisan public advisory group which has a direct say through me in all issues has overwhelmingly said no to legalizing euthanasia. The same response was expressed by a vast majority of people attending our recent town hall meeting in Aldergrove, British Columbia.

However sometimes we need to listen to children to bring us back to reality.

(1400)

In the words of nine-year old Dustin Chadsey of Clearbrook, B.C.: "I don't think people should be able to kill each other or themselves. Only God can decide if we live or die".

Before the media seekers do more damage, I urge all members to ask all their constituents their opinions on this important issue.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**COLLÈGE MILITAIRE ROYAL DE SAINT-JEAN**

**Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce):** Mr. Speaker, National Defence is making cuts. The government has no choice, and I support the difficult decisions it has to make. I sympathize with the communities in Saint-Jean, Victoria, Cornwall and Nova Scotia, but we sometimes have to sacrifice symbols and monuments in order to put our finances back on track.

It is possible to reach a compromise on the future of the Royal Military College in Saint-Jean. The Canadian government, in collaboration with the Government of Quebec, has offered to find another use for the college so that the local community will not suffer undue economic hardship. The present debate is emotional and almost irrational at times. It is being turned into a language war.

In the budget, none of our regions has been spared. We are here to make decisions, and I hope the government continues to act firmly. By the way, how about marching to Victoria in British Columbia with Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to try and save the Royal Roads Military College?

[English]

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton):** Mr. Speaker, human rights violations continue to plague the modern world.

Media reports of atrocities in Bosnia, Punjab, the Sudan, South Africa and elsewhere should shock every citizen around the world.

It is too simple to dismiss these atrocities because they take place so far away, but these horrific events do touch Canadians.

A crime committed against an individual is a crime against all of humanity.

For this reason I would like to voice my support of the recent appointment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights to the United Nations.

It is up to those of us who thrive on freedom to protest human rights violations wherever they occur.

**THE LATE DAVE MCCOMB**

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a very sad note on the passing of one of my councillors, Dave McComb.

I still call him my councillor even after being away from the mayor's chair for four months in this House.

Perhaps I can best sum up Dave's accomplishments and his contributions to my community by saying that he gave to politics, as he gave to play and to any other purpose he pursued, a warm integrity, a graciousness of spirit, a kindling touch which enriched all things he did for the lives of the people in our community.

He proved, and that proof is much needed, that all communities need vital individuals and all individuals are most vital when they serve their communities.

I am sure that members will join with me in offering his wife, Nancy, and his family our heartfelt condolences as they are bereaved by his death.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**LINGUISTIC MINORITIES**

**Mr. Jean Leroux (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, as you know, Quebec anglophones enjoy rights they are guaranteed under the British North America Act. Quebec has always respected the rights of its minorities.

For the benefit of the members of this House and Canadians who are watching, I would like to name some of the benefits

*S.O. 31*

enjoyed by the anglophone community in Quebec. First of all, Montreal, where most of the anglophone population lives, has a complete network of hospitals that function in English. They also have two major universities in Montreal—McGill and Concordia—and Bishop's University in the Eastern Townships. They have their own school system at the primary, secondary and college level, entirely subsidized by Quebec.

Quebec has always treated its minorities well, because we know what it means to be a minority, Mr. Speaker. I invite all members from the other provinces to come and visit Quebec to see for themselves.

\* \* \*

[English]

**BREAST CANCER**

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, it has come to light that a Montreal researcher fabricated information that has been used to shape treatment of breast cancer for the past decade. The same researcher also used patients who had not consented to participate in the study. We hear today that the Quebec Medical Association may have known about this for as much as three years.

(1405)

The research determined that lumpectomies save just as many lives as the removal of the entire breast, and that the drug Tamoxifen can in some cases prevent the return of breast cancer.

Can women be certain that the conclusions from this study are valid?

How could such a thing happen? Last November the government received the final report of the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies. The report emphatically stated that the unethical use of knowledge is not permitted. This applies equally to all areas of medicine.

I strongly urge the government to investigate this serious incident to ensure the medical safety of women all across this country.

\* \* \*

**PORT OF HALIFAX**

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the situation at the port of Halifax.

Atlantic Container Lines was ready to guarantee 8,000 new containers per year of cargo bound for Chicago, simply because the port of Halifax provides the most competitive entry location for midwestern U.S. cargo.

The Halifax Port Corporation and the longshoremen's union both agreed on major cuts in handling fees and surcharges to attract this business and keep it there. However, last week the Maritime Employers Association, a board dominated by interests competing with Halifax, voted to reject the union's offer to lower benefits. Only after public outcry did the board decide to accept a revised offer.

However, I remain astounded that any supposedly responsible employer's group could have considered rejecting an offer of concessions from its union, an offer of lowering operating costs and increased competitiveness.

For now, the port of Halifax may have escaped permanent damage, but this incident forces me to question the system through which the port of Halifax can be hampered in its drive for success by a board made up of its competitors.

\* \* \*

**WORLD CONSUMER RIGHTS DAY**

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, today is World Consumer Rights Day, declared by the International Organization of Consumer Unions.

Throughout the world consumers are marking this event by taking part in activities stressing their contributions to the marketplace in our society. Consumers have a vital role to play in maintaining the wealth and competitiveness of this country; over 60 per cent of Canada's GDP is attributed to consumer demand.

Consumers' voices should be heard and their rights recognized. The IOCU defines eight basic rights of consumers as given in the UN guidelines: the right to satisfaction of basic needs, the right to safety, the right to be informed, the right to choose, the right to be heard, the right to redress, the right to consumer education, and the right to a healthy environment.

We Canadians are fortunate that many of our basic rights as consumers are already acknowledged. We have good consumer protection legislation in place and businesses that for the most part are concerned with producing high quality goods and services using fair marketing practices.

Consumers in prosperous countries such as Canada are lucky to be able to choose from a wide variety of goods and services.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Tony Ianno (Trinity—Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, in the *Toronto Star* of Monday, March 14 I read about a visit by two members of the Reform Party to my riding of Trinity—Spadina. In their travels they visited Chinatown and Kensington Market where they felt they would encounter Canadians of origins other than English and French who would share with them their opinions of slashing immigration to Canada.

S. O. 31

In the process they discovered that the majority of those with whom they spoke looked favourably on the government's immigration policy. One respondent business person, Mr. Danny Tran, a recent immigrant who creates jobs himself, said that more immigrants meant more jobs.

Because of these responses the title of the article was "Reformers Get An Education". To no one's surprise, least of all my own, they discovered that the multicultural mix of Trinity—Spadina positively contributes to the dynamic nature of Toronto.

If the hon. members had ventured around the corner to the Alexander Park Community Housing complex, they would have also learned of how three years ago a determined group of residents, multicultural in character, led by Mr. Sonny Atkinson, banded together and drove out the drug problem.

In conclusion, I would like to extend an invitation to all Canadians to visit Trinity—Spadina to discover these well kept secrets of the success of multiculturalism. In particular, however, I would like to extend an invitation to more of the members of the Reform Party so that they too may benefit from these lessons.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### FORUM DE LA SOLIDARITÉ SOCIALE DU QUÉBEC

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, an unprecedented event took place Saturday in Montreal, namely the Forum de la solidarité sociale du Québec. For the first time ever, over one thousand representatives of citizen and community groups as diverse as the Assemblée des évêques and unions from all regions gathered together to embrace a common goal and to wage war on unemployment and poverty through joint social action.

After painting an alarming picture of poverty in Quebec, the forum levelled the blame squarely at the federal government's anti-inflation policy which has led to a 50 per cent increase in the federal debt, prompting governments to slash social programs every further.

Above all, forum participants agreed on the need to take action so that Quebec stands solidly behind a job creation policy that encompasses job sharing, a reaffirmation of the role of the state, taxation reform, maintenance of social programs and a broadening of democracy.

This approach represents hope for Quebec.

(1410)

[English]

#### CANADIAN CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP

**Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to congratulate Rick Folk and his B.C. rink for capturing Canada's highest prize in men's curling.

After a week of stiff competition from other provincial rinks, Folk duelled Ontario's Russ Howard to an eight to five win in the Briar in Red Deer, Alberta on Sunday. Not since Lyall Dagg 30 years ago in 1964 has British Columbia captured the Canadian Curling Championship.

I am sure that all of my colleagues from British Columbia will join with me in congratulating B.C. skip Rick Folk and his rink of Gerry Richard, Bert Gretzinger and Pat Ryan.

We wish them the best as they will now represent Canada at the World Curling Championships in Oberstdorf, Germany.

\* \* \*

#### CANADIAN MEDICAL HALL OF FAME

**Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the establishment of the Canadian Medical Hall of Fame.

The Canadian Medical Hall of Fame was announced in November 1993 in London, Ontario and the induction of the first laureates will take place May 27, 1994 in London.

Housed in London's new convention centre and sponsored by the Medical Research Council of Canada, the Canadian Medical Hall of Fame will provide an enduring tribute that will publicize the accomplishments of Canadian men and women who have made important contributions to the understanding of disease and the advancement of health everywhere.

Laureates inducted into the Canadian Medical Hall of Fame will be selected annually in the categories of clinical medicine, basic medical research and applied medical research.

Canadians should be proud of the establishment of the Canadian Medical Hall of Fame, an important national initiative celebrating discovery and innovation in medical science.

\* \* \*

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, a number of Vancouver East constituents have written to ask for the Canadian government's intervention in a very serious infringement of human rights.

*Oral Questions*

Twelve Buddhist nuns in Tibet have recently been sentenced to prison terms for participating in a demonstration to which there are no witnesses. A 15-year old girl is among those arrested. Those women are going to prison without proper trial and are in grave danger of torture and possibly death.

My constituents appeal to the Canadian government to use its authority and ask for the immediate and unconditional release of these women and for international monitoring of the situation in Tibet.

The situation is urgent and for the sake of such people human rights must be protected.

Could the Prime Minister tell the House whether his Minister of Finance was authorized by cabinet to make such a proposal at the G-7 Detroit summit? Was he speaking on his own behalf or on behalf of the government?

(1415)

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance discussed an idea. When the Minister of Finance or other of my colleagues have new ideas, they do not call me to ask if they can have new ideas.

I encourage my ministers to explore new ideas and make proposals to cabinet. At that time I will decide whether we can incorporate them into the budget, yes or no.

I certainly would not blame any of my ministers for going to a summit to discuss new ways of creating jobs. I would applaud that.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** The point is not to forbid the minister to have new ideas. Anyway, we know he does not have new ideas. He is only copying old Tory ideas.

The point is that yesterday in the House the Prime Minister told us in a very firm and clear way that his minister would not raise the idea of a tax credit in Detroit. Here he was at the same time doing the one thing he should not have been doing, if we rely on what the Prime Minister said yesterday.

Does the Prime Minister intend to support the proposal made by his minister yesterday? Also, when the minister comes back from Detroit, can we expect a statement announcing a tax credit in favour of businesses that create jobs?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we have voted on the budget. I do not expect the Minister of Finance to come with a new budget next week. He is there to explore new ideas. We on this side of the House can have new ideas.

In the case of the Leader of the Opposition, he changed parties five times in order to have new ideas. We can have them in one party.

[Translation]

**COLLÈGE MILITAIRE ROYAL DE SAINT-JEAN**

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the Minister of National Defence refused to confirm that negotiations were taking place with the Quebec government regarding the future of the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean. Also, yesterday the Prime Minister alluded to discussions with the Quebec government, while the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said that an agreement was imminent, this in the presence of his colleague the Minister of National Defence, who visibly disagreed.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[Translation]

**JOB CREATION**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Yesterday in this House, the Prime Minister denied the possibility that his Minister of Finance would propose at the Detroit summit a tax credit for businesses that create jobs, and I quote:

I do not think that the Minister of Finance will present in Detroit a proposal on Canadian taxation.

As soon as the G-7 summit opened yesterday in Detroit, about the same time that the Prime Minister said what I just quoted, the Minister of Finance made such a proposal to his G-7 partners.

How can the Prime Minister reconcile his statement with the proposal that his Minister of Finance presented to his G-7 partners at the same time yesterday?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is meeting with his counterparts from the other G-7 countries. They are looking at some mechanisms that could be used to create jobs.

Stimulating job creation through tax credits is an option that was discussed here but it was not specifically included in the budget. During discussions, the minister put the proposal before the assembly. He certainly heard the reaction of the other ministers and will take it into account in preparing his next budget. They are there to exchange ideas and to have intergovernmental discussions. Knowing the Minister of Finance, he is not afraid of exploring new avenues.

[English]

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, it gives a measure of the kind of co-ordination that exists in this cabinet.

*Oral Questions*

My question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Can the minister tell us if, according to the agreement which he saw, some military activities will be maintained, as requested by the Quebec government?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal):** Mr. Speaker, we are negotiating with officials from the Quebec government to determine the best possible use for the facilities in Saint-Jean.

When you are negotiating, it is somewhat like a poker game. It would be too easy to put all your cards on the table. What I indicated yesterday was that the federal government was prepared to negotiate on the basis of renting for \$1 per year the buildings and the property, which are valued at about \$42 million. This is the basis of our negotiating position. The details will be known later.

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the Prime Minister. Given the very contradictory statements made by officials of his government, could the Prime Minister tell us exactly what the situation is regarding negotiations with the Quebec government on the future of the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal):** Mr. Speaker, as I just said, we do not negotiate in public. We indicated to Quebec government officials what our terms are, and they, in turn, informed us of their preferences. There is no disagreement between ministers of this government, including the Prime Minister, because we looked at this issue together. It will take a few days or weeks before the outcome of the process is known.

\* \* \*

(1420)

[English]

### JOB CREATION

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Senior ministers of the government continue to send out contradictory signals on an old idea, namely the government's promise of job creation. The Minister of Human Resources Development says that this government will initiate job creation directly by spending more tax dollars. The Minister of Finance now refers to high taxes as a cancer on job creation and told Don Newman on *Capital Report*: "We are going to cut government spending and we are going to cut it severely".

These statements do not represent a balanced approach. They represent a contradictory approach to job creation. Can the Prime Minister tell us which of these senior ministers is

accurately representing the position of the government on job creation?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I say to the leader of the Reform Party that our program on job creation was tabled in the House of Commons a few weeks ago in the budget. He has only to read the budget and he will know the position of this government.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know how to put it more plainly. The government cannot spend more tax dollars and cut spending at the same time. We cannot have one minister with his foot on the gas, one with his foot on the brake and nobody with their hand on the wheel, even if they are driving around Detroit.

There is a deep, inherent, systemic contradiction in the government's job creation strategy. Will the Prime Minister tell Canadians how and when he proposes to resolve this contradiction?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we have cut expenditures and we are spending money on job creation with the municipalities and the provincial governments. It is a program that was approved by all first ministers and all mayors, including the mayor of Calgary. I have said that many, many times.

We have a very dimensional approach to this problem. It is the same situation as yesterday when two of his colleagues stood up to ask us to spend more money. Every time the leader of that party stands up, he tells us not to spend money. When will he put order in his little house and we can run our big house?

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, the statements made by members on this side are not in support of spending money.

Yesterday the Prime Minister acknowledged that public works spending only creates temporary jobs. His own Minister of Finance has said that debt and increased taxes kill long term private sector job creation.

Why does the Prime Minister not commit his government to long term private sector job creation? Why does he not resolve this difference by coming down hard and unequivocally on the side of deficit reduction and tax relief?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we did it when we reduced the level of contribution for unemployment benefits. We have cut \$300 million in this program which will permit small and medium sized businesses to create jobs. At the same time we said that we have to invest money in research and development. Just yesterday one of his colleagues was asking for even more money to be invested in that field.

Our approach is that we want jobs created by the private sector. In fact, there is no plan for increasing the public sector. Building roads and bridges is not wasting money. It is important and is adding to the productivity of the nation. Any nation that

*Oral Questions*

has a very good infrastructure can compete better than other nations that have to move around in a horse and buggy.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**COLLÈGE MILITAIRE ROYAL DE SAINT-JEAN**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, we have learned with dismay that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is playing with the future of the Collège militaire de Saint-Jean as if he were playing poker. He will certainly come out a loser. In any case, his partner, the Minister of National Defence is clearly not in agreement with him. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said: "According to the agreement I saw with my own eyes, all operating costs, including taxes, would be paid by the province since it would have access to the installations free of charge and would have the possibility of using the Collège for educational purposes." He further said: "The property is worth \$41 million, we are offering it for \$1 a year".

(1425)

Given this declaration of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, should we understand that the government is preparing not to give, but to lease the Collège militaire to the province and wants to keep a tight control over its installations while transferring all the costs to the government of Quebec?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal):** Mr. Speaker, at this time, the government intends to lease the facilities and the land of the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean for the amount of \$1 a year. That in itself constitutes an important contribution.

The provincial government will have the possibility of transforming the buildings in order to create a university or a post-graduate school of some kind. In such a case, evidently the provincial government will be the one using the facilities for activities of its choice and it will therefore have to pay the operating costs for the courses given there.

The federal government's contribution will be the facilities' value, the provincial government's contribution will be the operating costs for the courses that will be given there.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister agree that the compromise made by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs serves only one purpose, to help the government get rid of parts of its commitments to bilingualism just for one dollar?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the opposition is so concerned about bilingualism. I want to congratulate them. It is about time they address this issue.

We, on this side, are concerned with the whole situation. The only problem I have to deal with is an agreement with the province about the future use of the facilities at the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean.

Bilingualism and the use of French in the armed forces are commitments we fulfilled in the past and which we will continue to discharge, according to my colleague, the minister of National Defence.

\* \* \*

[English]

**SMALL BUSINESS**

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

As we heard earlier, the government is considering a human resources tax credit to subsidize hiring. As a small businessman I can assure the Prime Minister that business people do not want more government subsidies to stimulate employment and do not want to be told how to run their businesses.

The Prime Minister has stated repeatedly that he is counting on small business to create the majority of jobs so desperately needed by 1.5 million unemployed Canadians.

Why then does he not listen to what small business people are telling him about job creation: "Get out of our pockets, get off our backs and get out of our way so we can create the real jobs in the new economy".

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would look at the budget papers he would see that we have taken a lot of initiatives to help small and medium sized businesses. We talked not only about the reduction of unemployment insurance premiums, but about helping them to get more credit from the banks, to get credit for innovations to help them in exports, and they all welcomed that.

I say to everybody that the government is here to help, not to hurt. That is exactly what this government is trying to do with small and medium sized business at this time.

(1430)

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre):** Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister has been a politician for 25 years, I have been a businessman. While I can take lessons from him on how the MP pension plan works, perhaps he might listen to a word or two about people who have worked in the real world for 25 years.

*Oral Questions*

Government programs to help small business are more likely to impede rather than to help private sector job creation. Why then is the government considering another such impediment, a subsidy that will interfere with the business decisions, ultimately raise taxes and further impede private sector job creation?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why the member is taking that line. We have not announced anything like that. We are discussing better ways to help small and medium size businesses in Canada.

The president of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business said it was a good budget and that he liked our approach. Therefore, you should listen to what John Bulloch had to say about the budget.

**The Speaker:** Of course all the questions and all the answers should be directed to your Speaker.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs.

Yesterday, we learned that the Kahnawake band council had issued an eviction notice to about 143 families that had been living on that reserve for several years. Among the arguments used to justify that decision, there is the lack of space and even genetic purity.

As a trustee of aboriginal rights, does the federal government support this eviction notice, which is unacceptable and which totally contravenes the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms?

[English]

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I was advised about this problem early this morning. It is causing me a lot of concern.

The information I have is that in 1973 the Kahnawake band council used section 81(1)(h) of the Indian Act which governs the use of buildings on reserves to establish bylaws regarding the residency of band members and other persons on a reserve.

My understanding is there is a case before the courts relating to this matter and it would be inappropriate to comment further. Through this legal process I hope what the hon. member is concerned about can be defined exactly. That is whether or not this contravenes the charter of rights.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, is the minister telling us that he cannot give us an opinion on such a shameful decision that was taken yesterday? And does he

intend to intervene, as the minister responsible and also personally, to put an end to this disgraceful and discriminatory operation, instead of hiding behind legalistic rhetoric which in no way reflects the reality that some men and women are faced with on the Kahnawake territory, several of them being aboriginal people expelled by their peers?

[English]

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, in spite of the rhetoric and the volume I would be severely criticized if I commented on a case that is before the courts.

I have a certain faith in the jurisprudence of this country notwithstanding my friend's feeling and I am prepared to wait until the court has dealt with it.

\* \* \*

**INTEREST RATES**

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Finance.

**The Speaker:** I am sure the hon. member will remember that we do not mention when anyone is here or is not here. Perhaps he could just put his question.

**Mr. Harper (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from the Prime Minister regardless of who is in the House.

Last week the Minister of Finance said on page 2042 of *Hansard* that the interest rate assumptions in the budget are interest rates which at the present time are higher than those in existence. That statement was completely false. We know for example that long term rates today are over a point above what they were predicted to be in the budget.

The Prime Minister today has professed a great interest in private sector job creation. Will he admit that these errors in arithmetic will mean the loss of hundreds of thousands of private sector jobs and private sector job creation funds?

(1435)

[Translation]

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that the Minister of Finance has presented a budget which was well received by the Canadian people and by the financial community. There are always variations in interest rates and neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of Finance are in the habit of commenting on the financial market fluctuations.

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, we observed a very negative response to this budget in the private sector.

*Oral Questions**[English]*

For example, let us look at interest rates. Since the tabling of the budget, in the last six weeks interest rates have risen 35 basis points. The bank rate went up 9 points today. We have had a three-quarter per cent raise in six-month government bond rates and over a full percentage point in long term rates.

Will the Prime Minister admit that not only will this cost the country in terms of job creation it will also endanger the public debt charge cost to taxpayers. It is also important to note that already it is costing Canadians millions of dollars in higher mortgage payments.

**Mr. David Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** The hon. member knows this was discussed with officials last week in committee. The outlines in the budget were done very conservatively. These types of considerations were taken into account to ensure that our budget would in fact be a very successful document.

\* \* \*

**PUBLISHING INDUSTRY**

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Despite our repeated questions over the past week concerning Ginn Publishing the government refuses to cast any light on its reason for selling the Canadian interest in the publishing company to the American giant Paramount.

Why does the Prime Minister refuse to reveal the identity of that person who by a simple, verbal agreement consented to the takeover of Ginn Publishing by American interests?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)):** Mr. Speaker, there is no refusal to acknowledge who was responsible for that. It was a decision of the previous government. It was a legally binding decision that we were forced to finish up. It was left on our platter when we took over as the government.

There is no secret as to who is responsible. It is the previous government.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata):** Mr. Speaker, once again the Liberals, the so-called great defenders of the Canadian identity—

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mrs. Tremblay:** Mr. Speaker, they applaud to be called so. That is their problem. They are showing their true colours.

Could the Prime Minister not find the courage to act as he did in the case of Pearson International Airport in order to ensure that our cultural industries remain Canadian owned? Simply cancel the deal.

*[Translation]*

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the situation is as described by the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions. There was an agreement with the previous Conservative government, and it is our tradition and obligation as a government to respect agreements of this nature signed by our predecessors. At this time, there is nothing we can do.

If a similar document was submitted to us today, without the obligations we inherited from the other government, we might make a different decision. However, this is a private contract and because the previous government changed its mind, the American company took advantage of the situation, as provided by the contract, and as the government, we had to respect our obligations.

\* \* \*

(1440)

*[English]***UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mrs. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga West):** Mr. Speaker, it is becoming a common practice for school boards with up to 15 per cent of their employees voluntarily working 10 months per year to issue severance letters on June 30 and to rehire the same employees in September. They counsel those employees to use school breaks as qualifying time for UIC.

My question for the Minister of Human Resources Development is: Can the UIC rules be altered to make such abuse of the overburdened UIC system impossible by those who are gainfully and securely employed?

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member may know during difficult fiscal times and changing economies we have witnessed an increased use of contracting in many industries. This is creating some pressure on the UI system.

However I do want to make it perfectly clear in cases such as this one where people are using the UI system, the member can rest assured that in most cases they are the victims rather than the abusers.

We have already initiated measures in the federal budget to rectify this problem. For example it has been suggested that to foreshadow the treatment of repeat users we may want to consider means of more effectively regulating on and off workers.

Of course this is a complex issue and I look to members of Parliament to give us their input.

**MINISTERIAL REGIONAL OFFICES**

**Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

This government is in the process of opening three new lavishly furnished regional ministers offices. One of them is in Quebec City, even though there are no ministers from that area and there is an office already in Montreal.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister please tell this House why the government is not closing regional ministers offices instead of wasting another \$1.5 million on their proliferation?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Mr. Speaker, there has been a review and as a result there had been offices closed.

The office in Quebec City was opened. That is the capital of the province. It is an important part of relations with provincial ministers in terms of dialogue with our own ministers when they are in that city.

However the entire group of ministerial regional offices is constantly under review both in terms of cutting costs and also determining if there are any offices we could do without. We have conducted a review. We will continue to conduct a review because we are concerned about the efficiency and effectiveness of the use of taxpayers' dollars.

**Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear these offices are currently under review.

I am a little bit surprised at the answer because in this House on April 25, 1986 the Deputy Prime Minister asked in a question to the PC government why it was turning its back on pensioned workers and opening six ministerial regional offices. This government is now doing the same thing.

The people of Canada would like to know. Does this mean the Deputy Prime Minister has become a PC in Liberal clothing? Is this government following a PC agenda?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Simply put, the response is no.

Before the hon. member makes interventions on the floor of the House of Commons he should check his facts. Over nine ministerial regional offices have been closed by this government since it has taken power.

As the minister responsible for Treasury Board has indicated a constant review is being taken with regard to ministerial

*Oral Questions*

regional offices as well as all expenditures ministers make with regard to their exempt staff and offices across the country.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, we learned that only 56 per cent of the amount approved for phase 1 of the St. Lawrence action plan had actually been spent.

(1445)

Moreover, only 11 of the 23 projects accepted were directly related to the St. Lawrence River. Of the \$20 million initially budgeted, less than \$5 million was used to clean up the St. Lawrence.

How can the Minister of the Environment justify that so little of the money was actually invested in cleaning up the St. Lawrence River?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. Under the former government, when the Minister of the Environment was his colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, the Conservatives signed an agreement that did not respect the standards for cleaning up the St. Lawrence River.

I can assure the hon. member that Mr. Paradis, my counterpart in the province of Quebec, and I are about to sign an agreement on the second phase of the St. Lawrence Action Plan, which will ensure that all the funds are spent on cleaning up the St. Lawrence River, unlike what was done by my colleague, the former Minister of the Environment.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of the Environment prepared today, in this House, to make a formal commitment that 100 per cent of the funds will be spent on the St. Lawrence River?

[English]

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I absolutely and unequivocally give that 100 per cent guarantee.

I am happy the government is prepared to make a stronger commitment to cleaning up the environment than the current Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister of Environment.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Recent polls indicate that the vast majority of Canadians are compassionate to immigrants but retain the belief that immigration levels must be reduced.

*Oral Questions*

The minister has repeatedly defended his immigration quotas with references to the red book and the outdated Economic Council of Canada report. In this case it is clear that the red book is not consistent with the wishes of the Canadian people.

Could the minister explain why he continues to pursue this policy when it is clear Canadians do not support it?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the hon. member back from his educational journey through metropolitan Toronto. I find his statement today at variance with something he told residents of metropolitan Toronto. The *Toronto Star* quoted the hon. critic as saying: "I don't see our immigration policy as out of line with the opinions that I have heard in the last few days".

I caution the member to take one snapshot of a public opinion survey and therefore deduce that we ought to make policy on the fly. If he were to look at how Gallup has tracked unemployment and Canadians' feelings on immigration in the last 25 years, he would find that in 1982 almost the same kinds of levels were reported by Ekos Research. At the same time in 1988 and 1990 there was a record 65 to 70 per cent support for more immigration.

We cannot ask people about immigration like we ask them about their favourite flavour of ice cream. It is more complex than that.

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast):** There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that there is an education process involved here.

The Reform Party is not opposed to immigration. What we oppose is the idea of increasing immigration levels at this time. It would appear that a majority of Canadians support our position and would like to see the minister's policy reversed.

(1450)

In light of these facts, would the minister care to retract the statement he made to the press that anyone who disagrees with his policy is ignorant and uninformed?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I will not retract because that is exactly what I did not say. If any member ought to go around retracting statements it ought to be that member for the things he said in metropolitan Toronto.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Marchi:** Although the member did say that education ought to continue, in another quote from the *Toronto Star* the hon. critic concluded: "Immigrants seem to be just like anybody else".

That is what he ought to do. Rather than take one snapshot of one poll at one time in the history of our country, let us engage

fellow Canadians; let us go beyond the superficiality of simply one poll and understand the forces at play.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES**

**Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, March is the final month of the government's fiscal year. This usually means that last minute purchasing decisions are being made in most departments before the final date. Often the spending frenzy is not based on need. It is commonly felt that if there is money in the budget let us spend it.

What are the ministries doing to prevent unnecessary spending during this month?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure):** Mr. Speaker, as is usually said, I thank the hon. member for his question.

The Auditor General looked at this matter a number of years ago and found that there were some poor cash management practices. He was not saying that managers were wasteful in their spending at year end but that because the moneys were lapsing at year end, the end of March, if they did not spend them, they had a tendency to spend them perhaps prematurely, make purchases prematurely or spend money too quickly when it really was not due on the invoice.

To help prevent that, Treasury Board in the last fiscal year did an experiment that involved carrying forward some 2 per cent of departmental budgets into the following year so there would not be this year end frenzy as the member pointed out. That only involved a few departments.

This year we expanded it to all departments and have allowed them to carry over 5 per cent, which I think will help end that year end frenzy.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**OVERFISHING ON THE HIGH SEAS**

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans called upon the members of the United Nations to adopt by this coming fall very stringent rules in order to put an end to overfishing on the high seas. The minister said that failing such a move, concrete measures would be considered. He indicated that he would not sign another statement of principle since, in his opinion, the Law of the Sea Convention was no longer working.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Can he indicate to us what kind of concrete measures his minister had in mind to end foreign overfishing if an international agreement is not signed by the fall?

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, I can assure the hon. member that the Canadian government is very pleased with the outcome of the minister's visit. Moreover, it is prepared to work closely with its NAFO colleagues to ensure that an international strategy is in place to address this problem which affects not only the fishery, but conservation and the environment as well.

The ministers involved are working very closely to ensure that the good work of the United Nations is not being undermined by foreign vessels who fish illegally and who disregard their environmental responsibilities.

(1455)

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, judging from the response of the Deputy Prime Minister and the reference to concrete measures and NAFO, I see that we are right back where we started from.

Why is the government unable at the present time to convince its trading partners of the need to strengthen the provisions in the Law of the Sea Convention respecting fishing? Why is it unable to do so, since it must, in any case, bring this matter up again?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the North Atlantic Fisheries Organization comprises 14 members, not all of whom were present in Brussels when our minister of fisheries had a most unusual triumphant success in getting agreement. Not all were there and in fact three abstained.

The problem that we now face in particular with the nose and tail of the Grand Banks is with ships flying flags of convenience, ships that are not members and do not come from NAFO ports. It is therefore particularly important for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to make perfectly clear in New York that we are not interested any more in papering over the differences, in having statements of principle.

We are interested at this time in the type of concrete success in writing down clear prohibitions against fishing that the minister of fisheries, I have to admit, was enormously successful with in Brussels a few weeks ago. I can only hope, as I am sure the hon. member agrees, that the minister's success in Brussels will be matched by an equal success at the United Nations.

\* \* \*

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of agriculture.

Tariff protection for Canadian apple producers was dropped on February 7. Since then American producers have been dumping apples into Canada. This has devastated growers in Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt and across Canada. The

growers have made a submission to the government requesting that it ensure fair trade and enforce Canadian trade law.

When will the government take action to curtail this American dumping of apples?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and for the courtesy of some notice of the question.

As I am sure he will appreciate, since the decision of the CITT is in effect a decision of a quasi-judicial body, it would be inappropriate for me to comment in any way on the merits or demerits of the decision.

However I can confirm that I had the opportunity to meet with representatives of Canadian Apple Growers on Monday, March 7, when they were in Ottawa, in conjunction with the National Convention of the Canadian Horticulture Council. We discussed a variety of options in terms of how the decision of the CITT might be reacted to, including the various forms of appeal or other potential reactions.

I am now considering the input I received from apple growers about a week and a half ago. In due course we will see what an appropriate further response might be.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the answer from the minister.

The Canada-U.S. free trade agreement is supposed to contain mechanisms to resolve unfair trade practices. Is the minister taking action to use those mechanisms to help Canadian apple growers?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food):** Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the free trade agreement are one potential avenue that might be pursued. There is the potential of an appeal of the CITT ruling to the Federal Court. There is also the potential of commencing a brand new CITT inquiry.

The difficulty with all these avenues is that they take a long time. The time factor was of particular concern to apple growers when they met me. In terms of my consideration of what the government's response might be, I am bearing very much in mind the timing issue apple growers had uppermost in their minds.

\* \* \*

**INFORMATION HIGHWAY**

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister.

With the Rogers Communications takeover of Maclean Hunter we will have a virtual private monopoly of Canada's information highway. We know the CRTC and the competition bureau will have to approve the takeover, but surely we need first to determine what is in the long term public interest and how best this can be served.

*Tributes*

Will the government either instruct the standing committee on heritage or strike a special committee of Parliament to develop a position that would ensure the public interest is served in the ownership and development of the information highway?

(1500)

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

As we have stated in this House and in the speech from the throne, this is a very important issue. It is a priority of this government. We will be discussing this in committee and as time goes on.

\* \* \*

**GUARANTEED ANNUAL MINIMUM INCOME**

**Mrs. Jane Stewart (Brant):** Mr. Speaker, ever since I first raised the issue of a guaranteed annual minimum income in the House last month, I have received many letters from across Canada expressing support for the concept.

I would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for Human Resources Development if the government will actively consider integrating existing income support programs into a single guaranteed annual minimum income.

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question.

As the hon. member will recall, on January 31 of this year the Minister of Human Resources Development outlined a three stage process of consultation that would culminate with the establishment of a new social security act for this country. During this time we will be listening to Canadians from coast to coast to bring about the type of positive change that Canadians called for on October 25.

Of course one of the ideas that we will be examining will be a minimum income as perhaps presented by the Newfoundland economic recovery commission report.

I would like to take this opportunity to encourage all members of Parliament to participate in this important initiative by this government.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**Mr. Speaker:** My colleagues, I would like to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Sandy Jolly, the Minister of Municipal Affairs from the province of Nova Scotia.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[Translation]

**THE LATE GILBERT RONDEAU**

**The Speaker:** Dear colleagues, a few days ago, a former member of Parliament, Gilbert Rondeau, passed away. The hon. member for Shefford will say a few words about him.

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I was very sad to hear about the death of Gilbert Rondeau, who represented my riding of Shefford from 1962 to 1965 and from 1968 to 1979.

When I was a student at the University of Ottawa I had the pleasure of seeing him here in the House and of going to his office. He was always pleasant, colourful, and available to give me the documentation I needed for my assignments.

As you know, Gilbert Rondeau was the right-hand man of Réal Caouette from the Social Credit Party of Canada, as well as a worthy representative for the riding of Shefford. Let us not forget that it is the Creditistes who, when they arrived in this House, forced Parliament to provide simultaneous interpretation of House proceedings.

All his life Gilbert Rondeau was a man of action, a defender of the people, and a friend of the poor. On behalf of my colleagues from the Bloc Québécois and of my constituents in the riding of Shefford, I want to offer my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Rondeau, to his daughter Micheline Rondeau-Parent, who is a clerk in this House, and to his children and grandchildren.

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal Party of Canada and of the government, I wish to offer my sincere condolences to Gilbert Rondeau's family.

I had the opportunity to sit in this House when Mr. Rondeau was a member. He was a very active servant of the people and a member of the Social Credit Party, a political grassroots movement from Quebec.

As the hon. member for Shefford just said, he was a close colleague of the leader of the Social Credit Party of Canada, Réal Caouette. For many years he served the people of Shefford to the best of his knowledge and his abilities. He was cheerful. He was a good family man, and I think he tried to properly serve the people who placed their confidence in him on several occasions.

(1505)

I had the opportunity to appreciate the work of his daughter who, as you know, works here in the House of Commons and, in a certain way, carries on the work of her father who served the people. Serving the members of the House of Commons is a way of continuing the work started in Parliament by her father.

*Government Orders*

I know that another of his daughters, Nicole, also worked for the House of Commons and the Senate. Serving the Canadian Parliament is a little bit of a family tradition for the Rondeaus.

Again, I want to express to Micheline and to her siblings our deepest sympathy on the death of Gilbert Rondeau, a former member of Parliament.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The House resumed consideration of the motion and the amendment.

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River):** Madam Speaker, I welcome the review of Canada's foreign policy and international trade. I anticipate that we are going to have a great deal of interest in the review process and I encourage Canadians from coast to coast to be part of that greater debate.

The upcoming national policy forum is both timely and important. The cold war has ended. The foreign policy of many countries is drifting and needs to be reviewed. Most industrial countries are reviewing their policy on foreign affairs as a result of what has happened in a rapidly changing world.

I have concerns about the foreign policy, specifically CIDA. We will have speakers later today who will deal specifically with that so I will comment mainly in the area of international trade.

International trade perspective to me means opportunities to develop our trade with other countries. It means opportunities for our businesses to take advantage of these important trading deals that we have just concluded.

One such opportunity is the expanding trade with Mexico through NAFTA. I look forward to Canada participating in that very important trade pact as well as the discussion that is going to take place about the expansion of NAFTA. As we know, Chile is one of the countries that is looking to expand or to become part of the NAFTA arrangement. I would encourage our trading partners to accept Chile as part of this greater trading pact.

Currently 80 per cent of our exports are to the United States, our most important trading partner. I want to emphasize that we do not want to lose the United States as our most important trading partner. I think it is a natural relationship that is going to continue. But I do think we have to look for new opportunities as well.

New opportunities exist in southeast Asia where dynamic growth is being experienced. Growth forecasts for this area are in excess of 8 per cent annually. That compares with less than 3 per cent for OECD countries. Southeast Asia is the one place in the world where trade is booming.

Canada is well positioned to export to this area. Our western provinces, particularly British Columbia, have a natural advantage in water transportation, a very cheap method of transportation.

Canada has already had some success in selling into the Pacific area. Japan is our second most important trading partner and South Korea, of course, rates right up there as number six. Among the top 25 markets for Canadian goods are six nations from southeast Asia: Singapore, China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Indonesia and Thailand. However, our total merchandise exports to these six countries only amounts to 2.7 per cent of Canada's total trade. I see this as being a real area for growth opportunity for Canada. We can and should be doing better in this area.

(1510)

We have a large untapped resource. I am talking specifically about the one million Canadians of Asian origin who possess knowledge of the language and the culture. They know what the consumer habits are in these countries. They know the business norms, the conventions that need to take place. They often have family ties in that region. This invaluable knowledge is not found in a textbook, but it is very real and should be used.

We could be looking at encouraging Asian language training in our universities and encouraging our businesses to support that. We should also be looking at encouraging our trade department to hire more people with a background in that area to take advantage of these natural ties.

I want to speak specifically about some projections from Canadian business. The Canadian Cattle Commission is a good example of an organization that plans to take advantage of this very rich trading area. It estimates that by the year 2000, which is only six years away, exports will increase twelvefold to this area, from 6,000 tonnes to 75,000 tonnes of beef annually.

The Canadian Wheat Board is projecting steady growth in that area. South Korea now accounts for a significant amount of our feed grains.

Canada is a trading nation. Twenty-five per cent of our gross domestic product is accountable to our exports in goods and services and that sustains over two million jobs in Canada.

Our present recovery is being led by solid increases in our export trade. Canada has a very good reputation as a leader in the trade area. Our Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade has been doing an excellent job of developing markets

*Government Orders*

abroad. Canada gained a good reputation as a leader in helping to establish the GATT after World War II and now the new world trade organization.

I believe the trade component of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade should not be downsized. It should be streamlined to become more cost effective. We need a strong department promoting Canadian interests abroad. That is one way we are going to continue to grow.

We heard the minister speak this morning about the review that is under way in the department. I encourage him in that review. I would also like to encourage him to make our business community, our private sector, more a part of our trade organization. It should be taken into account in a lot higher degree.

New emphasis should be placed on putting in place people of Asian background specifically in our trade department, as I said, to promote trade in southeast Asia. Opening trade consulates in emerging countries such as southeast Asia should be examined. The joint ventures that were talked about earlier today I would certainly encourage in order to make it the most cost effective method of promoting our interests abroad.

Problems at home must be corrected before we can be effective traders. We cannot expect our businesses to operate with one hand tied behind their backs. If we cannot give our industries a fair chance to compete our efforts are really futile. Our companies, small, medium and large which have to break into and develop these foreign markets cannot do so effectively. They are hampered by disappointing results at home because our government will not act responsibly on fiscal management.

Taxes must be reduced. Deficits must be eliminated and government overspending must be stopped. A greater emphasis has to be placed on removing internal trade barriers. We have to create the proper climate in Canada to promote business. I believe that we must put into place realistic tariffs so that we do not invite challenges from our trading partners as a result of the very important negotiations concluded at GATT.

In closing, I would certainly welcome a review of our foreign policy, our defence policy and our trade policy. These are all happening at the same time.

(1515)

There is merit in having some joint meetings of defence and foreign affairs in order to dovetail these as much as possible. It is very important because the policies we are putting in place this year will determine where we stand as a nation when we reach the 21st century.

In my mind it is a very important review. I look forward to the process. I hope that as many Canadians as possible will participate in this review.

I also have some concerns, as does my colleague, as to the make-up of the joint committee. I look forward to travelling

across the country and taking this hearing process to the very people who have to make representations instead of having them come to Ottawa. That is a very important part of this process as well.

In closing this is a very important time in Canada's history, with the two reviews that are going on. It is not an easy time. All countries are facing some kind of a review as a result of what is happening internationally with globalization. I hope we can meet that challenge.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I want to take a minute to thank the hon. member for the support his party is giving to this whole policy review.

I know members of his party have some objections to the joint committee with the Senate, but I am wondering if he would not agree there are many senators who could be very helpful. I am thinking of former secretaries of state for foreign affairs such as Senator Allan MacEachen. Would he not agree that some of these senators could provide valuable input to our policy review?

**Mr. Penson:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the member for that very important question. I certainly see there is some expertise there.

My view is they should make representations to the committee in the same way as other witnesses do. The problem I have is that they are not elected officials. There certainly is merit in having their input because they do have a great amount of expertise and knowledge. Perhaps that is one way to accommodate that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Could I ask Reform Party members if they are dividing their time 10 minutes each?

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, our first two speakers will be using up the full 20 minute allotment. When we break from that mould we will give you the word.

**Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)):** Madam Speaker, as my colleagues, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of International Trade and the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa have all mentioned, the government believes it is time for a foreign policy review, for a review of Canada's international interests and our domestic capabilities and constraints in the pursuit of our interests.

I have listened carefully to each of their remarks. I would like to add my views on Canadian foreign policy and more specifically on how it relates to my portfolio as Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific.

First of all my role as Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific is to advise the Minister of Foreign Affairs on Asia-Pacific matters. My responsibilities therefore cover both geographic and sectoral issues such as political economic matters and social development assistance.

*Government Orders*

Canadians recognize the need for job creation in Canada as well as the restoration of faith of Canadians in our economy. These two goals can be achieved to a large degree through an export led recovery. Presently about one-quarter of Canadian jobs are directly related to exports.

(1520)

The Asian markets for pulp and paper, telecommunications and transport equipment, construction materials, agri-foods and petrochemicals present tremendous potential for economic growth in Canada. At the same time they meet the needs of many developing nations. Furthermore the Asia-Pacific region not only provides markets for our exports, but it is also an important source for the technology, investment capital and skills in which we can enhance Canadian competitiveness.

Growth rates in much of the Asia-Pacific region during the 1980s were more than twice as high as the rest of the world. Asia's share of world income could rise from 24 per cent in 1989 to 35 per cent by 2010 and to over 50 per cent by 2040.

Canadian businesses must prepare themselves to capitalize on the opportunities presented. If they fail to do so then we as a nation risk the erosion of those institutions that have made Canada the envy of the world.

Our success will depend on our ability to achieve greater access to these markets and to develop initiatives that will result in the provision of the greatest possible competitive advantage to Canadian exports. As part of this effort bilateral and multilateral economic and trade arrangements with countries in the Asia-Pacific region will need to be examined in light of the major economic changes taking place.

We must also recognize an increasingly important element is that Canada's trade and economic relations with the Asia-Pacific region will be the development of new institutions such as the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation forum. Within APEC are included five of Canada's top 10 export markets. As we can see, an active Canadian role within APEC is vital to our interests.

I was pleased that my first official function as Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific was to attend the APEC summit in November in Seattle with the Prime Minister and the Minister for International Trade.

APEC, like the region's explosive growth, is a relatively recent phenomenon. Since its creation five years ago it has become the region's main forum for discussions on regional growth, economic interdependence, strengthening the multilateral trading system and reducing barriers to trade in goods, services and investment. It has also become a major vehicle for co-operation on sectoral issues such as environmental problems.

During my first overseas trip in January to Hong Kong, south China, Thailand and Japan I was able to discuss many of these issues in more detail. These are some of the fastest growing and important markets for Canada. As I have already mentioned their needs correspond to many of our skills and expertise areas.

We need to devise ways to target government programs and resources effectively to assist Canadian companies to be even more successful international players. Of particular concern to this government is the role of small and medium size businesses. They have the potential to be the growth engines of the future but often lack the critical mass, the financial resources or the technical expertise to penetrate foreign markets.

The government must help to facilitate Canadian businesses to access the market in the Asia-Pacific region. We have some excellent examples of practical initiatives businesses and governments are undertaking together.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong is planning Canada-Hong Kong Trade and Investment Week. This event is appropriately being titled "Profiting from Partnership" and will take place in Hong Kong and Guangzhou in early May.

(1525)

This initiative, which has the full backing of government and industry, has been designed to create networks between business people in Canada, Hong Kong and China. It will educate Canadians about business opportunities in Asia.

As the Minister for International Trade outlined recently, in co-operation with the Minister of Industry he has instituted a full review of this matter. The aim is to ensure that our small and medium size firms have access to the tools and the environment needed to compete.

Exports and venture financing, delivery of market information, co-ordination of government programs and the pooling of private sector resources are all issues now on the table. By adopting a more market driven approach to trade development, one that sees government as an export facilitator rather than an export leader, we can use market signals to help set our real trade priorities. We need to develop a national strategy to tap into the Asia-Pacific market. In order to develop the proper strategy we need to hear from parliamentarians and Canadians.

However foreign affairs must not only be concerned with international trade issues but also with political, social and economic matters. During the election campaign the Prime Minister clearly enunciated his mission of creating a stronger, more independent role for Canada on the international scene.

The Prime Minister stated his belief in a government that reinforced Canada's reputation for tolerance and openness, one with a common sense approach to ensure our values are reflected in all aspects of our foreign policy. The Minister of Foreign

*Government Orders*

Affairs is working hard to make that mission a reality. I am very pleased to have the chance to assist him in this regard.

One important aspect of the relationship Canada has with many of the nations of the Asia-Pacific region is in the area of development. It was not too long ago that the relationship between trade, aid and development was viewed by many as non-existent. Yet there are many facets to Canada's development program.

First, assisting societies in meeting their citizen's basic human needs has been a pillar of Canada's international involvement. However development assistance is much more than that. The environment, building peace and security, good governance, the promotion of human rights and racial and gender equality are also development issues.

Development assistance has been particularly effective in fostering the development of countries in the Asia-Pacific region. In light of the progress achieved Canadian development priorities have shifted from isolated project planning to broader policy interventions intended to involve Canadians in co-operation for sustainable development in the region.

CIDA's strategy for the Asia-Pacific region has five broad priorities: strengthening the institutional capacity in support of sustainable development; co-operating in resolving national, regional and global environmental problems; promoting co-operation between private sectors in Canada and the Asia-Pacific region; fostering institutional linkages and networks; and encouraging respect for human rights and promoting good governance.

As these five priorities clearly demonstrate, the social, economic and political aspects of foreign policies are related. We as a nation will only benefit from an integrated approach.

Just last week I saw these five priorities in action during my visit to Bangladesh and Cambodia. Then I left the Canadian delegation to attend the ICORC meeting in Tokyo. ICORC stands for the International Committee on Reconstruction of Cambodia. My main interests were to promote our bilateral relations with Bangladesh and Cambodia and to observe first hand the effects of Canadian aid programs.

(1530)

I was deeply impressed by the commitment of Canada's efforts to date.

Bangladesh is our biggest aid recipient and despite serious ongoing problems caused by overpopulation and environmental stress, Bangladesh has made important progress in a number of areas including family planning, food self-sufficiency, and an economic growth rate of 4 per cent in 1993.

Bangladesh is also becoming less aid dependent with donors now required to fund just over 70 per cent of its development budget compared with 100 per cent some years ago.

Our commitment to Cambodia is also of several years duration. We were signatories to the Paris peace accord of 1991 and contributed substantially to the UN Transitional Administration Committee that ushered in the new government last year.

Now that Cambodia has a democratically elected government after years of war we are assisting in such crucial areas as demining, technical assistance and poverty alleviation in rural areas. It is hard to think of a more compelling environmental problem than demining. Canada's leading role in helping to solve this problem has been recognized by the international community.

The highlight of my trip was meeting the 13 Canadians who are training Cambodian soldiers to complete this most difficult task.

As Canadian Lieutenant-Colonel Focsaneanu explained to me, the Cambodian people cannot return to the fields to work the land until those fields are safe. Demining is the most important part in helping Cambodia to develop.

Canada's political relations with the Asia-Pacific region are complex and challenging. Since the end of the cold war the region has evolved into an area of greater stability, productivity and justice. Nevertheless, serious causes for concern remain and other potential sources of dispute and conflict also exist.

Despite outstanding overall growth, disparities continue. While east and southeast Asia are outpacing the rest of the world the majority of the world's poor are still in the Asia-Pacific region.

These uncertainties present major challenges in any review of Canada's political and security relations with the region.

Perhaps the most encouraging development in recent years in the Asia-Pacific region is the growing willingness to address security issues and potential problems multilaterally using institutions such as the ASEAN ministerial consultative process in which Canada is a dialogue partner.

The process of multilateral consultation among regional governments is still in the early stages and much more work needs to be done before the region will develop practical mechanisms for resolving conflicts and disagreements.

In the interim informal methods of consultation involving academics, businessmen and officials acting in their unofficial capacities have developed. Canadians have been playing leading roles in these activities, notably in creating the North Pacific Co-operative Security Dialogue in 1990.

*Government Orders*

Through funding provided by CIDA Canada has also been instrumental in fostering consultations on specific areas of potential conflict such as the workshops on the South China Sea.

In the Asia-Pacific region, as in elsewhere, co-operative security means more than just reducing armaments and creating barriers to military ambitions.

(1535)

There can be no real security if hunger, poverty, social injustice and environmental degradation continue. Our foreign policy has to be based on a comprehensive approach that involves trade developments, the respect for human rights, the support of social development and the institutionalization of good, open governments.

Recently the debate over social injustice in the Asia-Pacific region has acquired new dimensions. There are those who have argued that democratic development must necessarily take a back seat to economic development. However, I am one who maintains that in many instances the two are not mutually exclusive.

Certainly there is evidence that increased political flexibility is a by-product of economic liberalization, and governments that have opened their markets to international trade are more sensitive to the views and reactions of other countries. An inward looking society that depends little on trade and international investments is less likely to respond to concerns raised by foreigners.

Trade reduces isolationism. Trade also expands the scope of international law and generates the economic growth required to sustain social change and development. Economic liberalization also leads to a pluralization of interest groups in society. Nevertheless, all societies must resolve the tensions between individual and collective rights and we must all be vigilant to ensure that fundamental human rights are protected.

In this regard it is imperative that we as a government continue to raise the matter of human rights with those countries we believe to be in violation thereof at every opportunity. While we respect time honoured traditions and cultures, our position has always been that the best guarantee for stability and prosperity is a government that is responsive to its people.

The topics I have touched on today may serve as a preliminary indication of the kinds of issues that will need to be addressed as we consider Canada's relations with the Asia-Pacific region during the review of Canada's foreign policy. We are seeking views and guidance from Canadians in all walks of life to help provide directions in the development of our new policies and initiatives for the Asia-Pacific region.

While establishing strong and effective economic and trade relations with our Asia-Pacific partners is a primary focus, we shall continue to promote respect for human rights, the develop-

ment of truly democratic political institutions and the objectives of sustainable development in our relations with the region. Establishing strong and effective economic and trade relations with the region is an important goal for Canada. As I hope I have outlined, we have much more to offer each other than just commercial opportunities.

As part of the foreign policy review process I look forward to discussing with Canadians their views on expanding our engagement with the countries of the Asia-Pacific region across the entire spectrum of political, social, environmental and economic relations.

As a country bordering both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, Canada has the opportunity to expand in both directions. I believe the time is right for us to realize our full potential as a partner in the dynamic developments taking place in the Asia-Pacific region and I look forward to hearing the views of Canadians on how to best achieve this goal.

In the Asia-Pacific region, Canada is faced with a number of very important issues. We must continue to establish beneficial trading relationships and we must also work hard to promote our bilateral as well as multilateral linkages. We must continue to support economic and social development in the region, while being mindful of its cultural diversities, and we must capitalize on our natural human advantages to realize this tremendous potential.

(1540)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague for having described so well a huge market and an incredible population. For a number of years, very commendable efforts have been made between Canada and Asia-Pacific.

I come from a rural riding where we manufacture chopsticks. We are present on the market, but it is extremely difficult for us to break into that market. We have large quantities of wood. My colleague talked earlier about pulp and paper. In my area, we do have pulp and paper mills.

My question is this: Why can we not break into that market? What are the main problems? In my area, we know perfectly well that relations with the United States and Europe are easy. A lot of people who went to Asia did not come back disappointed, I would venture to say, but observed that things were a bit slow.

What are the main problems we have to deal with in order to get a share of that huge market, when we know that multinationals can afford to pay lobbyists and when we know that things are easier for them? How can a small business get a share of that market?

[*English*]

**Mr. Chan:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his question. I have heard the kind of complaint the

*Government Orders*

hon. member mentioned when travelling across Canada trying to investigate the problems facing Canadian industry right now.

I cannot agree with him more about the problems faced by small and medium sized businesses. However, the problem is multifaceted. In a lot of Asian countries the commercial laws are not in place. They have different cultures. They also have different ways of doing business. Also, because of language barriers and so on Canadian businessmen usually have a tough time making deals with Asia-Pacific countries in comparison with the way we can deal with our European counterparts and our North American counterparts. That is why for the past while only big business seems to have the ability to make deals with the region.

That also points to the reason why social development and a system of development to help those countries to institutionalize good open government are so important in our foreign relationships with them.

However, at this moment we still have to promote our trade for small and medium size businesses. What the department is doing now is investigating and looking for an institutionalized structure through which small and medium sized businesses could reach those markets. Sometimes they could afford one trip to the Asia-Pacific region but they might not be able to sustain the effort.

Through these trade commissions in our posts in those corresponding offices and with a more permanent structure in place we hope to help the small businessman facilitate them. At this moment we are trying to invite trade delegations from the Asia-Pacific region to Canada as well as to support our trade delegations going to various regions. By matching the businessmen on both sides of the ocean, by helping them to form partnerships and joint ventures we hope to help facilitate the trade effort.

(1545)

There is a lot more that needs to be done at the beginning of our exploration of that market. The business community has done quite a bit on its own. With the government's commitment to providing help we can achieve much more in the near future.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for his comments. I agree with the gist of the member's earlier comments noting that the key to future prosperity was going to be in both access to foreign markets and enticing foreign investment to come to Canada in the sense that the recent GATT negotiations enable us to ensure those markets. It is a good move. The approval of the NAFTA is also a positive move.

One of the ministers who reports to the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade has mentioned that he did not differentiate between foreign affairs and international

trade, that the two were almost inseparable in many ways. That is part of the process we will be going through in the next few months in our review.

Because the member has a longstanding tradition in the human rights movement, I would appreciate his comments on whether he believes there should be any linkage between human rights or human rights violations and international trade opportunities, open doors and so on.

**Mr. Chan:** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his concern about the relationship between human rights and trade development.

Because of the bilateral relationship between countries and the situation of particular countries, the method of dealing with the issue of human rights should not be a blanket approach. In some cases the government is not willing to have dialogue or even open up to trade and communications. We have to deal with them quite differently.

However in many instances in the Asia-Pacific area, for example China and Indonesia, the governments are willing to have dialogue on human rights and have been willing to adapt to a liberalization of their economies. Many cultural exchanges and social contacts through academics and other people are taking place. It is through those kinds of exchanges the people who are part of the leadership within the countries are responding to the concerns of international institutions.

In dealing with those cases, trade development with those countries is helping to move on to the international stage, to participate in international institutions and to respond to the international promotion of human rights. At the same time it encourages them to respond to international supervision of those issues.

Through trade we encourage them to participate. That is one issue. The other issue is that through trade we can help the government and the country to develop economically. If the country improves its economic position education centres can elevate their awareness of human rights and so on.

I always look at trade as part of helping developing countries. They are not mutually exclusive. We can pursue trade at the same time as helping to promote awareness of human rights in those countries. I hope I answered the hon. member's question.

(1550)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil):** Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity today to speak to the motion presented by the government. Today, the Minister of Foreign Affairs moved that the House of Commons and the Senate form a special joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate to consider

*Government Orders*

Canada's foreign policy, including international trade and international assistance.

(1555)

Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words about this committee. I have no objection to examining Canada's foreign policy, including international trade and international assistance. I would be delighted and proud to discuss these issues because this is a very important area, but I do object to the fact that the government is ordering us to form a special joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate.

In fact, I will have the honour and the privilege of seconding the Reform Party's motion that the Senate should not be part of this committee. Let me explain. Quebecers no longer believe in the relevance or credibility of the senators and the Senate. Quebecers feel they no longer represent what people really think, because they are out of touch.

Every day, I meet residents of Longueuil who say, when we talk about the budget: When are you going to get rid of that useless Senate? Between 85 and 90 per cent of the residents of Longueuil agree we should abolish the Senate, which is an indicator that the Senate's credibility is not that high. And that is why I hope the Senate will not be part of this committee.

Quebecers gave us a vast majority in Quebec. Fifty-four members of the Bloc Québécois, 20 Liberals and one Progressive Conservative were elected in Quebec. With this sweeping majority, Quebecers are saying that they want to get rid of the Senate, and as a result, it is my duty to say today that I object to the Senate being part of this committee.

This is the second joint committee the government has created, the first being the committee on national defence established a few weeks ago, and today the committee on foreign affairs. What is the purpose of all this? What is the government trying to do? I have come to the conclusion that the government wants to dilute the democratic rights of Quebecers. By diluting the number of elected members on this committee, since a number of senators is being added which reduces the proportion of representation by members from Quebec, which should be about 25 per cent and will now be only 10 per cent, the government is diluting the power of Quebecers on this committee. I think this is an insult to the people of Quebec and also to the people who elected the Reform Party.

I deplore this interference by the senators in our affairs. Is it not the role of the Senate to review bills and make recommendations for amendments? Quebecers will once again feel they have been deceived by authoritarian federalism. And that is why I intend to second the motion of the Reform Party that the Senate withdraw from this committee.

In my opinion, it is admirable that the government wants to review its foreign policy with respect to international trade and international assistance. There are many reasons why I consider this to be an excellent initiative. First, because the world around us is constantly changing.

Look at what is happening within the European Economic Community, the changes in the USSR, the new North American agreement, NAFTA, the reunification of Germany and East Asia. These changes put a new slant on international relations and create new economic realities. We must contend with market globalization, with new policies and with new democratic structures being set up in the world. Priorities have also emerged with respect to human rights, democratic values, the policy of life and environmental protection. We are faced with new challenges, new players and uncertainties and an ever more complex state of interdependence. As a member of Parliament representing Quebec and as a citizen of Canada, I find it especially important that we re-evaluate our position so that we can meet these challenges head on. Exactly what changes and challenges are we confronting?

Let me begin by speaking about the situation in Europe. For the past 30 years or so, Europeans have been trying to come together while remaining highly sovereign nations with their own language and culture. European nations have been trying to achieve economic integration through such means, for example, as the elimination of trade barriers, political co-operation and new infrastructures. Recently, to improve communication in Europe, a decision was made to dig a tunnel under the English Channel. This must be seen as a very serious attempt on the part of sovereign European nations to unite and work for a common purpose. However, as you can see, the process is by no means simple. They have been at it for 30 years. Nevertheless, as Canadians, we must take these facts into consideration.

Let us also consider briefly the unification of Germany. I had the pleasure and privilege of being in Germany about one week after the wall came down and I can assure you that it was quite something. Germans were proud and pleased to be reunited with their families after having been split up following the war in a rather cavalier manner. I was quite surprised when barely a few weeks after the wall came down, Germans decided to reunite their country. Today, we should be proud of the German people for reuniting to form a great nation and an important power in terms of Europe's economic development.

However, as Canadians, we have to understand that the Germans invested a great deal in Canada, particularly in Montreal, in real estate and in other areas. Where are they going to invest their money now? Probably they will invest more in the

*Government Orders*

former East Germany. We will have to take this fact into consideration, as will the committee.

In Eastern Europe, including the former East Germany, important changes have occurred. First of all, an economic turn-around has taken place. State-run economies have been abandoned in favour of market economies. We must also realize that all of these countries have become sovereign and that their system of government has changed. Democracy and the free-market system have taken hold.

(1600)

The most important of the sweeping changes of recent years, particularly in the nineties, was the dismantling of the U.S.S.R. First, because it signalled the end of the cold war.

For years, we were concerned day in and day out about what was going on between the two superpowers, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. This was the cause of conflicts here and there around the world. Now that the U.S.S.R. no longer exists, I guess one can say that major conflicts have practically been eliminated.

But we must not forget that these 300 million people were divided into some fifteen republics which have now become sovereign nations. National assertion movements in Russia, the Ukraine and the Baltic States have led these nations to sovereignty and having recognized one another, they can now flourish and prosper better. As Canadians and Quebecers, we will have to be well informed and prepared to adapt to these major changes.

All these changes, these major changes cannot be overemphasized. I think that most people wondered what on earth would happen when the U.S.S.R. decided to let these nations become independent and flourish within their culture. Such changes affect the economy. In the old days, the government had total control on the economy and the people were not used to taking initiatives, whereas today they are living in a free market.

For a hundred years or so, the economy was managed from the top. All of a sudden, the people found themselves in a free market context. Just imagine the changes and problems these people are facing. This causes adjustment problems and we can see the changes happening, particularly in Russia. The people living in these countries are concerned, and so are we as we try to co-operate with them.

In that sense, the situation becomes very tricky, economically and, of course, politically. It is not sure that the Russians will accept switching from a communist system to a free-enterprise or open trading system. There could be problems and instability for several decades to come. It makes it a little difficult for Canadians to know how to deal with them. It is in that context that the committee will have to take a very serious look at our relations with the former U.S.S.R. countries.

There is also the Asia-Pacific region. In that region, Japan in particular has become a world economic power and managed to position itself very successfully on all world markets. Today, it has to redefine its relations with its Occidental trading partners.

South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore, the four dragons of South East Asia as they are called, together with Japan are the driving force behind the region's economic development and fierce competitors on the international market. We will have to deal with these people and nations.

(1605)

Let us stop a moment and think about a country that we sometimes tend to overlook, but which has a population much greater than any other country in the world, namely China.

China is a complex country with a population of 1.2 billion. It is also undergoing major changes. For several years, it has been changing its economy significantly. Last year, China's economy grew nearly 15 per cent, compared to Canada, where the economy grew about 1.5 per cent.

With the development of a market economy, China is becoming an economic power. Some predict that China will be the world's leading economic power as early as the beginning of the next decade. This means that we Canadians will have to adjust our relations with China.

I had the privilege of going to Japan and the Philippines in January and I took note of certain things there. I attended the annual forum of Asia-Pacific parliamentarians, where about 14 countries were represented. The big topic of discussion of course was how these countries would unite and create a sort of free trade pact among Asian countries. They have trouble understanding or accepting that North America is a free-trade area. It frightens them. They also want their economic pact, like Europe, America and Asia, of course. The Asian countries, especially those on the Pacific and in eastern Asia, have started to hold discussions about creating their own economic pact.

We have also noted what is going on in Asia now. These are dynamic countries with intelligent, educated people who want to succeed. I can tell you that the economic growth of these countries is quite remarkable. Again, we will have to watch closely so that we can be in a good position to trade with them in future, to develop together and to benefit from their knowledge and know-how as much as they can benefit from ours.

Let us take North America for example. In North America, we have made giant strides to be able to deal with the globalization of the economy. The highlight is no doubt NAFTA, which gives us the opportunity of joining a North American market of about 350 million people, one of the largest markets in the world.

*Government Orders*

Especially for us in Quebec, I can tell you that North American free trade is very important because Montreal is within 1,000 kilometres of 100 million people, 100 million consumers, the best consumers in the world. We think that the line between the United States and Quebec should be eliminated as soon as possible so that we can sell our products and we very sincerely believe that the smaller countries always win in trade agreements, not the big ones, because the smaller countries often have smaller businesses and they can double their production without being noticed. That is how Quebec will benefit from it.

I was pleased to talk about the whole area of international affairs and I will be very active on this committee so that Quebec in particular is well positioned to face this global economy, these increasingly open markets, and I am convinced that we will succeed together, we intelligent members on this committee.

(1610)

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East):** Madam Speaker, I do not know whether we should be happy today to debate a government motion to appoint a joint committee to consider Canada's foreign policy. On the one hand, we are happy to have the opportunity at last to discuss Canada's foreign policy in this House. We believe an exchange of ideas is necessary so that parliamentarians can express their views on the relevance of the Canadian government's past and future actions abroad.

We must look at the Canadian government's goals and policies on diplomacy, foreign aid, security and international trade, to name but a few. The Bloc Quebecois thinks that the time has come for a comprehensive review of Canada's foreign policy.

On the other hand, we are puzzled by the government's proposal to create a special joint committee. The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade already seems to fulfil the role and mandate proposed for the new joint committee. The standing committee has the power to send for persons, papers and records, to retain the services of experts, to travel to gather the information it deems necessary, and to make recommendations on Canada's foreign policy.

Why create a joint committee with the same mandate as the standing committee? Does the government realize that it is hampering not only the decision-making process but also the implementation of its foreign policy, and that it might make the committee less efficient in the process?

As for the presence of senators in the foreign policy review committee, we believe, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, that major foreign policy directions must be defined by elected representatives. The members of the other place were not elected and do not represent anyone.

Of course, we could also talk about waste and duplication but I realize that one more committee will not shake the temple of bureaucracy and waste. No matter. In this period of budget restraints, the government could have avoided this duplication of committees.

Moreover, the Official Opposition wonders why the Canadian government has already undertaken a review of its national defence policy before even defining its policy of involvement on the international scene. The foreign and defence policies are too closely related to have committees work independently from one another. It is to be hoped that the two committees set up by the government will consult each other as soon as possible. But I am probably dreaming!

I could go on and on, but I will take this opportunity to discuss specific issues of Canadian foreign policy.

As I pointed out earlier, we feel that an in-depth review of that policy is in order. Over the years, Canada has made a reputation for itself which, we are told, is envied by many. We have to ask ourselves why this is the case and try to see if we can be as successful in the future by pursuing the same direction, or if we should change our way of doing things.

(1615)

Three activities have enabled Canada to gain this enviable reputation on the international scene: the participation of Canadian troops in peacekeeping missions, Canada's aid to development and, more recently, our efforts regarding human and democratic rights.

However, Canada's reputation in these sectors could be in jeopardy. For example, we were supposed to allocate 0.7 per cent of our gross domestic product to development assistance programs. The fact is that successive cuts were made by the government, so that this aid now represents only 0.4 per cent of the GDP. As soon as it took office, the Liberal government started implementing the same policy as the Conservatives, proposing an additional cut of 2 per cent in the budget for international assistance in the coming year.

At the rate things are going, Canada's reputation as a generous country with poorer nations could be a thing of the past, or at least somewhat tarnished. In spite of its enormous problem with public finances, Canada remains one the richest countries. The Bloc Quebecois does not believe that we will solve our current problems by penalizing the poorest people in the world. In the context of this review, the Canadian government should ensure that the money allocated to international assistance is really used to help the poorest.

As the Auditor General indicated in his recent report, Canadian assistance is neither very efficient, nor very effective. Canada must define its objectives and its priorities regarding

*Government Orders*

this aid, and it must ensure that these objectives are reached at the best possible cost.

We, on this side of the House, do not believe that the waste of public money is a justification for withdrawing our assistance. The process must be maintained and improved, and we should even increase aid to poor countries because their needs are as pressing as ever. Indeed, in spite of the efforts made, the situation of the poorest countries has not really improved.

As the Minister of Foreign Affairs mentioned this morning, the gap between rich countries of the North and poor countries of the South is even wider now. Excessive debt, overpopulation, poverty, abusive development of natural resources, inadequate education, high infant mortality rates, as well as reduced life expectancy, are all part of daily life in these countries.

For example, the World Bank has indicated that the external debt of all developing countries has increased from \$62 billion in 1970 to \$1,703 billion in 1992. Moguls and multinational corporations are often the ones to benefit the most from such a situation. These businesses can take advantage of the extremely difficult situation in the poorer countries by overusing human and natural resources. In the meantime, the poor countries are getting poorer and poorer.

One of the most dramatic problems caused by such extreme poverty is one of overpopulation. The annual rate of population growth reached 2.9 per cent in Africa, compared to 1.1 per cent in North America and 0.3 per cent in Europe. This means that the fertility rate is higher in Africa than in North America and Europe. Developing countries account for 95 per cent of the overall growth of the world's population.

There are 1.18 billion people living in the industrialized world, compared to 4.3 billion in developing countries.

(1620)

Estimates show that the population in developing countries will have increased by 3 billion to reach more than 7 billion by the year 2025, compared to an increase of 0.15 billion people in the rich countries which would then have a population of 1.35 billion.

Sub-Saharan Africa, already one of the poorest regions of the world, will have posted the highest growth rate. A demographic explosion is also expected in Islamic countries where it could intensify the problems linked to political and economic restructuring.

Too often, such rapid population growth in the poor countries leads to more poverty and overuse of natural resources. If projections prove to be accurate, and the world population doubles half-way through the 21st century to reach ten billion, economic development will need to increase anywhere from

fivefold to tenfold to satisfy needs. That would have tragic implications for the global environment.

Health conditions in poor countries are also disturbing. In spite of all efforts, a young North American can expect to live 23 years longer than a young African. In 1970, the difference in terms of life expectancy was 25 years.

Moreover, 14 million children die each year from poverty, sickness and malnutrition. AIDS could also affect development and cancel out the effects of several years of assistance. Of the estimated 10 million cases of HIV in the world, more than 65 per cent are in Africa. Without our assistance, developing countries will not be able to stop the spread of the virus, or deal with the consequences of this terrible sickness. Canada must be a leader in the strategy to solve the problem.

We should also mention that the development of poor countries is highly desirable, for the welfare of the countries of the South as well as our own. We benefit a great deal when these countries increase their revenues. The North-South Institute estimates that, during the 1980s, the sharp decline in the purchasing power of developing countries was responsible for the loss of 180,000 jobs in Canada. Development assistance cannot be viewed simply as an expenditure. It must also be seen as an investment.

Moreover, in 1986, the Winegard report reminded us that Canadian aid is too closely linked to diplomatic and trade interests and not concerned enough with the effective development of poor countries. This same report also indicated that the primary goal of public aid to development should be the development of human resources in poorer countries and that this aid must be concentrated in countries which need it the most. In fact, it recommended in particular that this goal be part of a legislative mandate.

The 1988 Canadian policy paper entitled *Sharing Our Future* attempted to answer the concerns expressed in the Winegard report, but without achieving the fundamental redirecting which had been recommended. The main reason for this failure, we were told, were the budget cuts that were applied at that time and the fact that CIDA was unable to truly become an organization dedicated to help the poor because it was too preoccupied with its political and bureaucratic influence.

(1625)

In spite of all the government's speeches and papers, public assistance still does not get to the poorest countries, regions and people. It is estimated that less than 10 per cent of the Canadian budget for development assistance is directed to priority areas like medical care, basic education, water systems and public health. Compare that with the 62 per cent of development aid money spent right here in Canada.

In tabling its last budget, the Liberal government which talked of greater openness in the development and implementation of the new Canadian foreign policy, presented us with a fait accompli. Indeed, on February 22, the Minister of Finance

*Government Orders*

announced that Canadian assistance would be reduced by \$400 million over the next three years.

Quebecers and Canadians will have to ask themselves an important question: "Do we want to continue enjoying our excellent reputation in the world? Have we become so obsessed with our problems that we have lost all compassion for the most deprived people in the world?"

The geocentrism that seems to appeal to some ignores the dependency existing between rich and poor nations. This interdependency is particularly noticeable in matters of peace, environment and population explosion. If today we stop showing human solidarity and gradually withdraw our aid, we might well have to face much more serious problems tomorrow.

I would like to elaborate further on the thorny issue of world environment. In 1972, environmental issues were raised on the world stage in Stockholm on the occasion of the United Nations Conference on Human Environment. In 1983, the UN General Assembly established the World Commission on Environment and Development to investigate major environmental and developmental problems and to formulate proposals for better international co-operation in that area.

The Brundtland Commission, as it is called, tabled its report entitled *Our Common Future* in 1987. This report emphasized how urgent it was to act on a global scale. It reminded us that desertification was increasing at the rate of 6 million acres a year, that 11 million acres of rain forest were destroyed annually, that global warming might have been as considerable during the last fifty years as it had been in the preceding 10,000 years, and that fuel consumption has increased more than 30-fold over the course of the last century.

This report came to the conclusion that human progress had to be promoted in a durable and sustainable way. That is where the concept of what we now call sustainable development comes from; it means meeting present needs without jeopardizing those of the future.

Since then, Canada signed five international environmental agreements, during the Earth Summit held in Rio in June 1992. Canada must continue its efforts to promote sustainable development internationally.

In closing, I would like to talk briefly on another subject which is closely related to all the previous ones. It is the protection of human rights in poor and developing countries where Canada is involved through aid or trade. Human rights are multi-faceted, the main ones being related to basic needs like food, housing, health and education. Several countries are way off the mark.

Canada is among the very active countries in the field of human rights, and we hope that it will remain so.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs this morning shared a beautiful dream with us. He dreamed of a world, and I quote him almost verbatim, "where there will be no more arsenals, no more famine, no more economic plundering, where children would go to school, have a roof over their heads and enough to eat".

(1630)

I would like to share the minister's dream, but unfortunately the means announced in the Main Estimates quickly brought me back down to earth.

[English]

**Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex):** Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleague's comments about Canada's reputation in the world and the fact that it might be threatened. She listed in her arguments what we might call a tripod of this recognition of Canada's contribution to the world being foreign aid, peacekeeping, and respect for human rights.

Then in her remarks she simply addressed herself to one of those three issues, making clear that on the basis of the fact we have fallen short of our .7 per cent target in foreign aid somehow our reputation is about to be greatly threatened and undermined.

Could I remind the hon. member that we are second to none in the world today in our efforts in peacekeeping. We ought to be very proud of that fact, and I am sure we all are. In the matter of human rights, again Canada has a loud voice and is a champion for better human rights both at home, as we have heard day after day in the responses of the minister of immigration to certain sentiments that we do not share on this side of the House about welcoming people to Canada, and in our efforts to encourage other governments to respect human rights where it is not the case in their own countries. Just a few days ago I raised in the House the matter of the situation in Chiapis, Mexico, and the concern of many Canadians about it.

The hon. member has made reference to these three points. She castigated the government in saying that we were only at .4 per cent and that somehow this was threatening our reputation in the world. She then went on to speak about interdependency among countries, what one might call supranationalism.

I applaud that and I certainly second her sentiment there. However it is amazing to hear that from a member of a party with a political agenda to return to the petty nationalism of the 19th century which preached that a nation must be based solely on the fact that those who speak a language must therefore in and of themselves become a nation and would seek to destroy the new experiment in nationalism represented in Confederation, a neo-nationalism that Macdonald and Cartier along with many

*Government Orders*

other Canadians had the vision to put forward in this great country.

I listened with interest to the hon. member and to the leader of her party earlier today. I was saddened to hear their arguments based on a type of nationalism that is at least a century and a half out of date. Indeed it was the dream of the 19th century and became the nightmare of the 20th century with some of the most destructive wars in the history of mankind. It is amazing to me to hear such sentiments of interdependency of nations, which I applaud, coming from someone who is a member of a party with such a destructive political agenda, at least very destructive for this country.

Does the hon. member not believe that if the Bloc's agenda was achieved and Quebec did tear itself apart from the rest of Canada, Canada without Quebec and Quebec without Canada would certainly fall far short of what we would achieve in the world by being together as a nation? Does she not see that as perhaps the greatest threat to our reputation in the world, and it comes from her own party?

(1635)

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Debien:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member touched on many of the points I just made. I am not sure he understood very well what I said. As a matter of fact, I praised Canadian foreign policy in many areas without making any reservation or omission in that regard. I think I was fair in my remarks because I am here to speak in good faith of our foreign policy and tell the government what I think that policy should be. I will keep this same attitude for as long as I sit in this House.

There is another point on which I would like to comment. The hon. member seemed to imply that, among the very few reservations I had, I criticized the government for spending only a small percentage of our GNP for official development assistance. I was referring to a Liberal commitment in the red book saying that Canada would renew its promise to allocate 0.7 per cent of its GNP for ODA. That was the gist of my criticism: I simply said an election promise was broken. As to the rest, I feel I was very kind in my assessment of Canadian foreign policy.

As to what the hon. member labelled as the narrow nationalism of the Bloc Québécois, I would say nationalism is not only a matter of language. He is the one who made a link between nationalism and language. I think nationalism is much more than that. It is a culture. The Leader of the Opposition was perfectly clear on that this morning. I will also point out to you that in his speech this morning, the minister of Foreign Affairs referred to nationalism, rather ultra-nationalism, which in my view is not consistent with the ideas of the Bloc.

If we look at globalization of trade and markets, despite this phenomenon of globalization, we still are confronted—the minister of Foreign Affairs said it this morning—by the nation-state, and you know that Quebec considers itself as a nation. It is in that sense that we talk about nationalism, because we consider ourselves as a nation, a nation with a culture, with a language, with a history which, from the outset, was different from that of English Canada.

It is in that sense that we feel that a nation-state may very well—and its has been clearly demonstrated recently—we feel, I repeat, that a nation-state, however small it may be, may very well survive among nations increasingly interdependent. This is, in my view, the idea that the Bloc has always been trying to defend. That does not mean a nation closed to the world, that does not mean that we are going to apply the geocentric theory which I mentioned earlier. On the contrary. In my view, Quebec has always been very open to the world, hoping to become a nation one day and to remain a nation.

(1640)

*[English]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry but the period for questions and comments has terminated.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That the vote on the budget scheduled for Wednesday, March 16, 1994 at 6.30 p.m. be deferred until Tuesday, March 22, 1994 at the conclusion of the time appointed for the consideration of Government Orders.

I have a second motion. I move:

That the ordinary hour of daily adjournment be suspended this day to permit continuation of the debate on a motion by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to establish a special joint committee and on any amendments thereto, and during such extended sitting no quorum calls shall be permitted, nor shall any dilatory motions be received by the Chair, and when no further member rises to speak, and in any case no later than eleven o'clock p.m., the Speaker shall put all questions necessary to dispose of the said motion forthwith and without further debate.

A recorded division shall be deemed demanded and the division shall be postponed to the end of the time appointed for the consideration of government business on Wednesday, March 16, 1994 and thereupon the Speaker shall adjourn the House until two o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, March 16, 1994.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The House has heard the terms of the motions. Does the House agree to adopt both motions?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motions moved and agreed to).

## CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The House resumed consideration of the motion and the amendment.

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, I listened to the last few moments of debate. I believe Canadians are proud of the country's role on the international stage. They see it as a role of an honest broker, as a role of a middle power, as a role of a force of goodwill and civility. It is also a symbol that has acted as a beacon of hope to those who unfortunately find themselves displaced. We are particularly proud of the role our immigration and refugee policies have played in helping to establish our international reputation along the way.

Canadians have historically had a humanitarian response to people fleeing persecution, whether it was the open arms that Canada extended to the United Empire Loyalists or Hungarians fleeing communism, whether it was the innocent families escaping a murderous dictator in Uganda or most recently the helpless Vietnamese boat people who were cast adrift.

In a world of dramatic change, however, we can no longer view immigration and refugee policies simply as a sporadic domestic response to occasional international crises. Migration and refugee issues must be at the forefront of our foreign policy concerns for Canada and on the foreign policy initiatives agenda of so-called developed countries.

In addition, I believe we need to come to grips with and create a coherent international population policy to address the important issues and challenges raised on the floor of the House of Commons today.

(1645)

I believe this foreign policy review is a very welcome initiative. It coincides with a national consultation on the future of our immigration program which we had occasion to launch on March 6 and 7. I believe that these two initiatives should not run on a parallel playing field, but rather at some point converge into one through the many inextricably linked issues.

It is very true that immigration programs must be developed with an eye to both domestic priorities and domestic concerns. That goes without saying. It must take stock of world conditions, world pressures and world changes. We cannot isolate our national programs from our hope for a saner, more gentle international community.

We also need a wide breadth of vision in recognizing that whenever we try to extend help to humanity in some corner of this globe, we are at the same time putting in the first footings of the foundations of bridges that will one day transport more than

## *Government Orders*

just goodwill, but be transformed into social and cultural and economic advantages for both countries.

I believe that in eastern Europe where the Berlin wall has come down that immigration can be one of those bridges, not to try to have a brain drain when those countries are trying to find a footing and develop a dynamic and exciting new society, but rather to try to meet some of the aspirations of those people who wish to immigrate to Canada where there is already a history and a proud tradition of that. I believe that it goes beyond just immigration.

With respect to eastern Europe and some of the countries therein, we need to show our support now during this difficult transition time and not later on in the next generation when obviously we will be seen to be trying to reap the rewards of a consuming society.

What steps then must a democratic, pragmatic, fair-minded country like Canada take to help find new answers in a new world? Recent years have seen a sharp rise in the number of global migrants. There are as many as 100 million migrants on the move around this globe. There are almost 19 million refugees, double the number in 10 years. There are almost 20 million individuals displaced in their own countries, including some four million individuals from the former Republic of Yugoslavia. Therefore, there are many root causes for all the migration. We need to understand and analyse the forces at play that mobilize this colossal movement of humanity.

My hon. friend from the other side touched on some of these: civil wars, deep and persistent poverty, mass violation of human rights, environmental degradation, lack of solid, viable long term economic opportunities, globalization, uncontrollable urbanization, better communication and easier transportation and, of course, the global recession that has touched both developed and developing countries.

There are some who would close their eyes and others who would want to close their borders. I suggest that neither of those actions will stop the problems nor the solutions from coming forward. As a modern society we cannot afford to have an international corridor of locked doors. We know that to be the case. An international corridor of locked doors will only reroute the traffic through our back doors and through our side windows.

Of course Canada cannot solve the problems alone. However, by working in co-operation with other countries, clearly we can help to find international solutions to what is an international phenomenon, that of migration. We as a country can offer that leadership because we are truly an international country if we stop to think about the kinds of exciting characteristics that define Canada.

*Government Orders*

(1650)

We are an international country. Canadians have roots in every corner of the world. Therefore we should take heart about that dynamism and ask ourselves what country is better poised in this new global village to try to seek to mobilize the leadership for such an international consensus. We should not sell ourselves short. One of the criticisms that we sometimes hear is that we are too meek on the international stage. Yet, on this issue of global migration, we have offered leadership. It is there, it is documented and it is a source of pride.

In my few remarks I do not wish to try to predetermine the outcome of the foreign policy review as it deals with migration pressures. Rather, I would like to raise some serious questions and issues which I hope will receive the careful reflection of this joint committee and of the speakers subsequent to my deliberations.

For instance, while Canada has been a forceful advocate of individuals' "right to leave oppressive regimes", can we go one step further and become a forceful advocate of people's right to stay in their homelands? What can we do to make emigration a matter of choice and not simply a matter of desperation and lack of options? How can Canada help strengthen the role of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees that is looking for assistance to strengthen its resolve?

When most refugees selected by our western world happen to be men, what can we do to recognize and balance the reality that most refugees in the world overwhelmingly are women and young children? How can we encourage international co-operation to address the root causes of involuntary migration? Can we find new means of fostering economic development, human rights, conflict prevention, population planning and environmental sustainability?

What role can international fora such as the Commonwealth, la Francophonie, the OECD, or the G-7 play in developing a much needed integrated population policy which currently has gone by the wayside and which leaves a large, large vacuum?

What role can and should our trade policy play in the reduction of migration pressures? What role can Canada's immigration program play in helping developing nations strengthen their own countries and develop their own human resources to the fullest of their potential?

What is the role that technology can play in this equation of migratory pressures? Have we reached the point where we must consider migration impact like environmental impact questions in the development of our foreign and aid policies?

These are some of the questions and issues that I would like to put on the table for further discussion because in the red book in the last election campaign we pledged as a party to adopt a more comprehensive strategy toward national and international security, including sustainable development, global economic pros-

perity, support for democracy and solving problems through multilateralism.

As Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, I increasingly see how critical our success in developing such a comprehensive strategy will be to the future manageability and success of our own domestic immigration programs.

I believe and I urge that migration issues and migration pressures must be a central focus of Canada's foreign policy agenda as we move together toward the next century. They will be on the agenda, for instance, at an important United Nations conference which will take place this September in Cairo, entitled the United Nations Conference on Population and Development.

At this particular forum, and at gatherings subsequent to this forum, we need to search and find new kinds of world-wide co-operation to ensure that migration is a positive force, not a destructive force, and an engine of development serving the interests of migrants as well as the aspirations of both the sending and the receiving countries alike.

(1655)

We must seek co-operation to establish stronger international regimes and strengthen an international resolve to address the force of world migration, to encourage conditions to permit people to remain in their homelands and to ensure that when people are forced to seek refuge that there is an international community that is not oblivious or indifferent, but receptive to their plight.

It is through this working partnership to achieve this objective that Canada's foreign and immigration policies can indeed find common cause and common ground.

If one looks at public opinion surveys, and I think a few minutes ago my colleague touched on this nerve, Canadians are looking for symbols, institutions and initiatives that give a sense of pride, meaning and purpose to our country called Canada. I think the element of this debate is such a useful exercise because an exercise such as this, that goes beyond our own domestic borders and looks internationally abroad and talks about the dreams that the Minister of Foreign Affairs spoke about earlier, is the vacuum that Canadians want us to fill. It is a unifying force.

We may have differences in how we approach these individual international problems, but it is a force that unites us as opposed to a force that divides. It is a reputation that not only would give us a sense of pride but would reinforce the reputation that we have developed as a caring and compassionate country. Those are not empty words or empty rhetoric when one tries to fashion a domestic policy that is in keeping with an international dream

*Government Orders*

or a more gentle version of a world that sometimes is more filled with disorder than order.

Every time we make a ripple in the world it sends out a signal and an example to other countries. That is what multilateralism is all about. What we seem to be doing on this issue is not only important domestically, but given that we have had a track record and a leadership role it becomes doubly important. What we do in this area, speaking quite modestly, can have an impact on how other countries view the problem.

It is not a question of trying to preach or lecture to other countries or try to say that we preach from a pulpit of perfection where we have a monopoly on virtue. Not at all. Some Canadians would say that we have our challenges from within. The poor, ravaged by the recession, would argue: "Why are you spending a day in Parliament talking about problems that seem so far away? Why do we not take care of the problems here at home first?" Other voices would suggest: "Why are we allowing the doors to still remain open for those seeking refuge when there are individuals here who are not meeting their own dreams and never mind the dreams of a very complex, confused world?"

We hear those voices. Those are tough questions. Those tough questions do not always have easy, ready made answers do they? I think we feel and we sense as members of Parliament that on the one hand we need to listen to those concerns because without being rooted in that reality we are lost in this place. This place means nothing unless this debate becomes realistic and people out there connect with us and through us.

In the other sense, we also feel that when we come together as members of Parliament in the institution of democracy in Canada and where our constituency all of a sudden becomes national, we have a responsibility to go beyond our riding boundaries and also consider the international plight of our fellow brothers and sisters. Do we not? Our work as members of Parliament would be less if we simply thought of what could be good parochially speaking for each of us or each of our ridings.

(1700)

We have to go beyond that. We have to try to broaden and elevate the debate to see that the world's problems are really problems for us indirectly. We can reach out and build those bridges and seek those solutions. If we stop to think selfishly for a moment it is beneficial for this country as well.

Linkages in the world today are absolutely vital. McLuhan talked about the global village and it is certainly here. The rapidity of technological and communications change links us whether we like it or not.

The global marketplace will belong to countries that are forward thinking, that are creative in trying to come to grips

with old problems. It will belong to countries that seek the pioneering work which is very difficult but reaps benefits.

As fellow human beings we owe it to the world to try to make it a better place. Most of those people on the move would rather not be. Most immigrants to Canada, including my parents, would rather have stayed where they were. However they were compelled and forced to pack their bags and move without really knowing where the train would take them.

However ask those individuals today what the best decision was in their lifetime. Nine out of ten will say it was packing those bags. As painful as it was then, the best decision was to pack their bags and to adopt a new country, Canada. Those individuals are prepared to line up to defend and to stand on guard for thee.

We should not forget that because those movements still exist. Individuals look to Canada, look to the United States, look to Australia, look to New Zealand and other countries that ought to be in this group for a beacon of hope.

I hope this foreign policy debate will view immigration and refugee policies as an extension of that foreign policy, in how we deal with those people on the move and how we position our country for the future.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly):** Madam Speaker, I was most interested to hear what the minister of immigration had to say. I am sure that the people of Chambly and the people of Quebec and Canada are thinking along lines that are not too far removed from the points the minister is trying to make.

In this House and elsewhere, unfortunately, the minister is asking questions and I hope he is willing to hear the answers or at least our attempts at providing answers because in our society, there are some subjects that are taboo. Today, we cannot talk about capital punishment or immigration or other topics that are not considered politically correct in our society, even if we just want to obtain information and perhaps come up with the same solutions or objectives as the minister.

(1705)

The minister asked us some questions. He said: "Canadians", and this includes Quebecers until further notice, "must take a position and do some serious thinking". However, when we do that, we are not always politically correct.

The minister approached this subject by tugging at our heart strings. Of course there are some sad situations in the world and there are people who really have a lot of problems. However, I would have appreciated it if, for once, the minister had not played on our emotions, because at times we have let our emotions go beyond what we could afford. I wish that, for once, the minister would show us some figures and prove his point this way, and I am sure he would succeed, but I wish he would stop playing on our emotions and use scientific and economic data to

*Government Orders*

give us some hard facts that prove what he thinks and what I think, namely that these are issues that will benefit Canada. There is no doubt that immigration benefits Canada. Our country is where it is today thanks to immigration.

However, to satisfy people who sometimes argue on the basis of false premises, I would have liked the minister to explain from the mathematical point of view how he reached this conclusion.

[English]

**Mr. Marchi:** Madam Speaker, the member raises an interesting point. The whole matter of immigration and refugee migration is a very emotional subject to start with. Some members have accused me of being over-emotional at times. I suppose I am at times but that is the nature of this federal public policy area.

I would go out on a limb and suggest it is probably the most emotional area of federal public policy. It deals with people wanting to come here. It deals with people being denied the chance. It means there is only room for so many individuals and family reunification individuals feel that very emotionally.

On the one hand the issue is emotionally charged. On the other hand the hon. member is right. Our challenge as government and as a Parliament when dealing with immigration and refugee migration movements whether it is to Canada or internationally is to divest ourselves as much as we can of our emotionalism and to talk about it rationally. That is very much the object of the exercise I launched on March 6 and 7.

What did I say when we announced the immigration levels for 1994 back in February? In addition to the numbers, we talked about a new way of consulting and engaging Canadians. It was not an attempt to superficially massage the issue. Rather it was to go beyond that and to engage Canadians on the facts and numbers and on what the member referred to as the mathematical or scientific equation of immigration refugee and migration. I welcome that thinking because that is what those consultations are about.

I was accused today for example during Question Period of calling people ignorant when they perhaps had a thought that did not agree with mine or with government policy. I made no such categorization of individuals. I repeat what I have said in this place before. It would be too easy to dismiss individuals who have concerns and we should not because those concerns are genuine.

I am not suggesting that we assume and accept any perception people have about immigration or refugee or migration movement. There is a middle ground. In a sense we can try to get to that common ground and try to learn from each other and allow the facts to be distilled. Let us put emotion, perceptions, myths and fiction to one side and let us talk hard numbers. I do not fear that kind of debate. That kind of debate brings to the fore the true

values which have shaped immigration in the past. I am confident of that.

(1710)

If I have one negative criticism of my predecessors in the last 10 years of Tory administration it is that they legislated on fiction rather than fact. They led with the negative only. They did not talk about the positive.

Sure there are problems and of course there are concerns. For example, it drives Canadians up the wall when a convicted murderer makes a refugee application at a Kingston penitentiary. It drives this minister up the wall too. There is due process. I am trying to make the system fairer but I am also determined to close the loopholes which make our tolerance the object of ridicule and undermines those who seek to come here legitimately.

I welcome a discussion based on fact and not fiction, one that is rational and not emotional. We would be doing honour to the subject matter at hand.

[Translation]

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane):** Madam Speaker, when I listened to the hon. minister earlier, I was reminded of Martin Luther King many years ago. He spoke with a great deal of magnanimity and emotion, except that while Mr. King was a preacher, the minister holds a position of power. Yet, when a very honourable family asks to stay in Quebec, we see that even with all the power he wields, he has to tap dance around the issue. Clearly this is unacceptable, because he certainly has ways to get results.

Nevertheless, I do have a question for him. My constituency of Matapédia—Matane is as vast as an entire country. My question is this: Why is it that new immigrants to Canada usually settle in the large cities rather than in the regions? Is it because the unemployment rate is higher in our regions, or is there some other reason?

[English]

**Mr. Marchi:** Madam Speaker, it is rather unfair that the hon. member tried to categorize this government as being unfair with this case or another.

One of the realities of this portfolio I am trying to correct is I am trying to improve the system by pulling back the system from the hands of government and the minister. Right now all negative refugee claims whether they are through members of Parliament, NGOs, church groups or the media, land on the desk of the minister. I do not subscribe to the policy that the minister knows best.

When we get thousands of cases, how do we begin to intervene and make it rational and fair across the board? Do I react because an issue was simply in the pages of *Le Devoir* or the *Toronto Star*? Keep in mind there are 700 other cases that could not get on the front pages of *Le Devoir* or the *Star*. Do I react when someone goes on a hunger strike? Do I move when

*Government Orders*

someone seeks refuge in a church? Or do we try to have a policy that is fair for one and all and that provides adjudication more by the system rather than the minister? I have the commitment from my caucus and cabinet colleagues to do just that.

The member touches on another issue. Largely speaking Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver are seen as our chief magnets for immigrants and refugees. One of the challenges we can address is that if immigration is positive, then it flows logically that some of the economically depressed regions could certainly use the advantage immigrants bring. The challenge is how to encourage immigration to those parts of the country and balance that with the mobility rights they obviously enjoy under our charter. It is a challenge I hope we come to grips with.

(1715)

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East):** Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that I did not get an opportunity to question the minister following his comments. It was a dynamic question. The minister is going to have to wait until another day.

Before I start into my main point, I believe no one party has a monopoly on love for Canada, for patriotism, for a concern for the improvement of the system. When we on this side of the House ask questions I hope the minister takes them in the spirit they are intended. We may not be as slick as some in the way we can present questions and we may not have the years and years of experience. However, the love for Canada and a belief that the system may need to be improved are part of what we hope to have in all our questions, comments and speeches in these debates and reviews.

There have been a few surprises since I came to Ottawa. I am surprised that it can be this cold. I have come during the coldest winter in living memory. I guess I could expect that. I am surprised that the salt stains on my shoes never come out. I am surprised at the cost of an apartment and I am surprised at the workload of an MP.

I am also surprised in some ways to find that there are many fine MPs on all sides of the House and I commend them for their concern in debates such as this as we review important policy and try to set the policy that will lead us into the 21st century.

I have also experienced one of my greatest surprises during the last few days while sitting as a member of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade. I want to pass on some of this astonishment to the House and to anyone else who listens today. Hon. members will be more than a little

surprised to hear some of the things that have come up in the last few days in this important committee.

Our committee is undertaking a sweeping foreign policy review. Part of that is happening here today. Over the next few months we will begin comments on foreign policy from this side of the House, talking about an agency I would like to focus on today, integral to Canada's foreign policy.

This agency is responsible for delivering 80 per cent of Canada's foreign aid and dozens of other nations shape their concepts of Canada through their contact with this agency. Its budget is huge and the very lives of thousands and sometimes hundreds of thousands of people depend directly upon it. CIDA, the Canadian International Development Agency, is a very important agency, an organization in our foreign policy.

Let me say a little bit about CIDA. It falls under the authority of the Department of Foreign Affairs. It began in 1968 with a budget of \$279 million. Today its budget is over \$1 billion. It has 1,300 employees and is involved in 115 countries around the world. These facts do not surprise me.

What I find truly incredible are the very basic things that we do not know about CIDA. What is the mandate of this organization? We do not know. How many and what kind of countries is it supposed to work in? We do not know. What kind of aid is it supposed to deliver? We do not know. Is it doing a good job? We do not know that either, we have no idea.

The few answers we do have are just as surprising. What legislation brought CIDA into existence? There never has been any legislation. CIDA is a creation of cabinet. Is it directly accountable to Parliament for the billion dollars it spends every year? Not at all. Is there the political will to make it accountable? The answer is a simple no. I found that out from the minister last Thursday.

The minister appeared before the foreign affairs standing committee to present the estimates and I asked him if he felt it was a problem that there was no legislation spelling out CIDA's mandate. With some characteristic, political caution he said that laws are useful but not necessary. Then he added that laws could become an impediment.

I could read between the lines of these statements. I think he meant the government may not want to bring CIDA under the direct control of Parliament because legislation by its very nature is restrictive. It says that there are some activities that we cannot do or that we cannot take part in. Or it could mean if we create legislation that gives CIDA a humanitarian mandate, for instance, we will not be able to use the organization as a political tool of foreign policy or an economic tool of Canadian commercial interests. We would restrict our freedom to manipulate CIDA by introducing legislation.

*Government Orders*

(1720)

This would be a bit more acceptable if there were not grave problems with CIDA, problems that can only be solved by legislation. The Auditor General included an entire chapter on this organization in his last report and he exposed fundamental shortcomings which could be mitigated by enacting appropriate legislation.

The Auditor General says that the first problem is one of conflicting objectives. Some see CIDA as an instrument of Canadian business, others as an agent of humanitarian aid. CIDA does not know what it is supposed to do. It stumbles along trying to please both sides but pleasing neither very effectively.

CIDA, very simply, is overextended. Its activities are spread too thin, we are in too many countries doing too many things to be much help in any one place. We need to have a sharper focus to our foreign aid.

The Auditor General says that CIDA is also too bureaucratic; is it any wonder when we realize that it has 1,300 employees but only 125 actually work overseas? I was astonished to learn this. That is an average of only one CIDA representative per country that we are represented in.

CIDA's management style is also inappropriate. In the past it undertook more physical projects like building bridges or building roads. Its project managers knew a lot about how to build bridges and how to build roads. Today CIDA is involved in a far wider range of activities such as policy advice and human resource development. Its managerial expertise, though, has not changed to match its new activities and the result is that CIDA has not been able to properly dovetail its current staff to the new and evolving tasks which it has been asked to accomplish.

The Auditor General says that CIDA needs to be more accountable. I could hardly believe it when I read that when CIDA signs an agreement with a foreign government to complete a project there are no required results set out in the agreement. There is no independent on site monitoring of the project and there are no clear budgetary limits. There is no legislative requirement to evaluate CIDA's involvement and report those results directly to Parliament.

These are all very theoretical. In a practical sense what kind of problems result from these types of inadequacies? I will cite just one example.

The Auditor General took pains to tell us about Bangladesh where Canada has spent approximately \$2 billion over the last 25 years. In one village officials counted more than 80 separate international aid groups and the Auditor General said: "That country could not possibly absorb and use in a cost-effective way all the development assistance it was already getting from the multiple donors".

Bangladesh still receives 40 per cent of all CIDA funding. It is no closer to being self-sufficient than it was 25 years ago, and there seems to be no process for deciding if it should remain Canada's top priority.

These are very significant problems. If they were ever to be resolved we as Canadians should consider a deeper, more philosophical question about CIDA, one that goes to the heart of our national character. Before we enact legislation to enable CIDA to solve its own problems we must answer this basic question or it will be impossible for CIDA to become effective.

For a quarter of a century CIDA has been the arena of a great struggle within Canada, a struggle about Canada's motives for giving foreign aid. The problems exposed today earlier in my speech are just symptoms of this greater struggle. Should our motive be to help poor people, with no strings attached, or should our motivation be to profit commercially in some way through aid for trade arrangements?

If our motives are to help the poor, we must realize that we will not be repaid in an economic sense. If we want to benefit Canada's economy through foreign aid, we will likely turn away from the poor and divert those resources to richer nations with potential for increased trade with Canada, thereby increasing our own wealth.

In 1987 the standing committee on external affairs authored a very popular report called the Winegard report which recounted many of the administrative problems that I have already discussed and also tackled this deeper question about CIDA's role. The report was entitled "For Whose Benefit?", which implies the question who are we helping. Do we really want to help others, or is giving aid just another way of helping ourselves?

(1725)

That same committee in 1987 made it clear where it stood on the humanitarian versus the market orientation question. Its very first recommendation was that the government adopt a development assistance charter as part of a legislative mandate for Canada's development assistance program.

It recommended legislation and stated as the first principle of that legislative charter that the primary purpose of Canadian official development assistance is to help the poorest countries and the people in the world. The committee acknowledged and upheld that humanitarian concept of foreign aid and the government of the day, the Conservatives, paid lip service to 98 of the 115 recommendations found in the Winegard report.

During the last election the Liberal Party also spelled out a continuing commitment to humanitarianism. Government seemed to be consistent in its support of humanitarian goals and, to that end, consistent in its desire to reform CIDA. Nothing is

ever actually accomplished because the underlying question has never been resolved through legislation.

The continuing struggle was echoed just one week ago and addressed to our standing committee by the president of CIDA. I sympathize with her. She is trying hard to please two masters here. On the one hand she attempts to please the humanitarians in the crowd by telling about CIDA's accomplishments with the poorest of the poor, and there are some very positive accomplishments and achievements there. On the other hand she also tries to please the more market oriented people by noting with some pride that 60 per cent of CIDA's foreign aid is actually spent right here in Canada to support Canadian businesses. That is a direct contradiction and that is where this needs to be settled.

It is no wonder that members of the global aid community shake their heads in disbelief. Obviously there are internal pressures to make CIDA an instrument of Canadian commercial interests.

The so-called Carin paper leaked from the Department of Foreign Affairs in late 1992 saw CIDA as a means to promote Canadian interests and values abroad. It advised the government to shift aid toward richer nations like Russia where we might have the chance to develop stronger economic ties. This report was never implemented but the trend is clear.

This problem and the administrative ones I have highlighted are obvious and long standing. The problems and many of the solutions were clearly laid out in the Winegard report nearly a decade ago. When one reads the latest Auditor General's report much of it sounds like the reiteration or the reinvention of that same Winegard report.

There is a continuing lack of political will in the government, as revealed by my conversation with the minister last week, because of the competing philosophies about CIDA's most basic role, aid or trade. I have heard that two successive ministers, the past two, have tried to change CIDA and have failed. I have also heard that numerous, well intentioned and influential people have run into a brick wall trying to reform the system for the sake of the Canadian taxpayer and the sake of hungry people abroad. We need leadership or the problems will continue.

The Reform Party of Canada is willing to offer leadership in this respect. I want to clarify the Reform position. The Reform Party of Canada, as members know, has called for a reduction in foreign aid funding simply because Canada no longer has the money to spend like it once did. Reformers are concerned about the poor but they are unwilling to ignore the larger context of our ability to pay and they are unwilling to overlook the reforms that CIDA so urgently needs.

The Reform Party is well aware of the plight of a full third of the world's nations. In them, 34,000 children die of hunger or illness each day; 800 million people are malnourished. On the opposite pole, we are all well aware that on the United Nations

### *Private Members' Business*

index of human development Canada sits second out of 172 nations. This position of privilege carries with it a unique weight of responsibility and we as Canadians must not close our eyes to the grim realities faced by others.

It is therefore our recommendation that CIDA be clearly mandated to assist—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. We will proceed with his debate once the House resumes its business.

It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### CRIMINAL CODE

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell)** moved that Bill C-214, an act to amend the Criminal Code (hate propaganda—age group), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am honoured and privileged to have the opportunity today to present to my colleagues in Parliament and to commend Bill C-214, the purpose of which is to amend the Criminal Code of Canada to render it impossible to import a product known as the serial killer board game.

[Translation]

I would like to start by describing the serial killer board game for all hon. members. This is a Monopoly-type game that comes in a child-size body bag. It contains 25 baby figures and four killer figures. The purpose of the game is, of course, to commit as many murders as possible to tally up the largest number of baby corpses and win the game. The winner is the best killer.

The game also includes a map of the United States where the states without capital punishment are in a different colour. For a big murder, the killer gets three baby corpses and, for a smaller murder, only one corpse.

Here are some of the cards a player can get in this game.

[English]

“Hitch-hiking is dangerous. Someone should have told this girl”. Here is another quote from one of these little Monopoly-style cards: “The quiet dorm could turn into a house of horrors when you visit. This campus is crawling with cops though. Beware”.

*Private Members' Business*

[Translation]

This game is based on the actions of John Wayne Gacey, who was found guilty of 35 murders in the United States.

I would like to say a few words about public opinion on this game. I humbly submit to this House that Canadians do not want this product. Most Canadians are reasonable people and want to ban this game. I have presented over 105,000 petitions in this House in recent days. Several other members have also presented such petitions. In Quebec, in particular, many teachers and school boards are passing around the petition I drafted myself two years ago.

I have several more petitions in my office and I intend to table them as soon as the Clerk of Petitions has had a chance to review and approve them for presentation in this House.

At this time, there is nothing preventing the importation of this game into Canada. In 1992, after complaints in this House and demonstrations by many Canadians, Diamond Comic Distributors, the company that distributes the serial killer board game in Canada, decided to stop distributing this game or to give up its distribution rights. I think the reason for this is obvious. After all, it would be unwise for a distributor of comic strips to antagonize parents. So, in the face of controversy, the company decided to give up all rights to distribute this product. But you just wait and see. If there is a profit to be made, sooner or later another distributor will show up to ensure the large-scale distribution of this product here in Canada.

The former Minister of National Revenue, Otto Jelinek, even admitted in a letter—as I told the hon. member of the Official Opposition—that nothing in the Criminal Code now prevents the importation of this product into Canada.

(1735)

Customs officials have no law that would allow them to stop the game from crossing the Canadian border. Therefore I humbly submit to this House that there is an urgent need for a law to stop imports of this game.

[English]

On February 11 I tabled in the House Bill C-214, an act to amend the Criminal Code of Canada. That is the bill we are debating this afternoon. It is through that bill I propose to ask my colleagues to take the necessary measures to prevent the importation of the serial killer board game.

The bill that I offer to the House is very simple. Basically it adds one word to the Criminal Code. I will explain that in greater detail. Bill C-214 proposes to amend the hate propaganda provisions of the Criminal Code. Presently—and this is no

surprise to anyone—if the serial killer board game advocated to destroy, physically harm or murder people on the basis of race, colour of skin, religion and so on, obviously it would not be allowed to enter our borders.

However, because babies by definition come in all races, colours and everything else, that particular criterion does not work to stop the importation of the serial killer board game. By definition right now the hate propaganda provision says that hatred cannot be promoted against an identifiable group. Identifiable group is then further defined as a group that can be distinguished by sex, colour of skin, ethnic group, religion and so on. Obviously there appears to be no way at the present time to stop the importation of the serial killer board game.

My bill would add another category. It would add an age group as an identifiable group. The word age would be added. In other words babies by definition are relatively the same age. Otherwise they would not be babies. This age group would then become identifiable and jurisprudence would develop when a baby is a baby for the purpose of the bill. Nevertheless, jurisprudence would determine when this criterion could be used.

In any case advocating violence, promoting violence or glorifying violence against babies would be prohibited under the measure I am proposing to the House this afternoon.

[Translation]

Now, as I said, section 318 of the Criminal Code forbids anyone to promote genocide, and that is what we are talking about. If hon. members have a copy of the Criminal Code in front of them, they will see that subsection 318(2) reads:

— “genocide” means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part any identifiable group, namely, (a) killing members of the group; or (b) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction.

“Identifiable group” means any section of the public distinguished by colour, race, religion or ethnic origin. Of course, as I just said, I propose adding another category to this section of the Criminal Code, namely age group.

In conclusion, because I would like to make my comments a little shorter than the 20 minutes allotted to me so that more members can speak, this is not a partisan issue today but an important social issue and I think that as many parliamentarians as possible should be able to speak on this subject.

Madam Speaker, I would like to say to you and to my colleagues that on many occasions I have told the House of Commons my opinion on importing the serial killer board game. I say and I repeat that I find the idea of this game, which is to collect the largest number of baby corpses, repugnant.

*Private Members' Business*

(1740)

Not only I, but all parliamentarians and all Canadians are disgusted by this game.

Finally, I want to leave you something to think about. Madam Speaker, imagine that you are a parent of a newborn child and your next-door neighbours are having fun playing the serial killer board game and collecting baby corpses. Would you not want the government to ban this game!

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** Madam Speaker, hate propaganda is one of the most despicable forms of human foolishness. Those who use it without thinking have not learned anything from history, while those who spread it wilfully commit a crime against humanity.

Hate propaganda can easily be concealed in the most seemingly harmless comments; it goes against the constitutional protection afforded to freedom of expression, and those who use it do not care about public opinion, which disapproves of its use.

In fact, you cannot define hate propaganda; you see it, you hear it, and you measure it by the provocative effect of the words and actions of those who use it. It defies definition under our democratic law. Every time we legislate to combat hate propaganda, it resurfaces in a new, unsuspected, active form.

Our Criminal Code has included a few minor provisions on hate propaganda since 1970. Sections 318 and 319 deal with advocating genocide and with public incitement to hatred against groups which the law calls "identifiable". The Code currently defines the offence based on the group to which the victim belongs. This does not take into account historical and social realities.

Any form of hate propaganda against any social group, by anyone, should be strenuously opposed. The current Criminal Code only includes acts against certain groups, distinguished by colour, race, religion or ethnic origin.

For example, the age, language, sex, sexual orientation, social environment and condition, political convictions, profession, marital status or lifestyle of individuals forming a social group are not elements of identification of victims of hate propaganda.

I think that restricting potential victims to a few groups is not justified when we are dealing with a crime against humanity as a whole. Instead of designating a few "identifiable" groups, the law should prohibit any form of hate propaganda against any group. Public incitement to kill women, welfare recipients or homosexuals is no different than inciting people to kill Jews, Catholics or Muslims. Social hatred, in its expression and in its effects, is akin to universal hatred.

Consequently, I agree with the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell on the spirit of his proposed amendment to Bill C-214. However, I cannot support the bill itself, because it implicitly recognizes that the law would only protect certain groups of people, when it should include everyone.

This bill is similar to Bill C-204 tabled on December 18, 1988, and Bill C-207 tabled on April 7, 1990, which also provided for the inclusion of age as a distinguishing factor. Bill C-326, tabled on June 27, 1990, also added sex and sexual orientation to the list of factors.

The bill tabled by the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell adds age as a distinguishing factor for a group of victims, but what we have to do is abolish these restrictive designations of "identifiable groups", in order to extend the protection of the law to society as a whole. Again, this bill confirms the restrictive nature of the current legislation.

(1745)

On the other hand, this bill gives us an opportunity to debate in this House the effect our legislation really has on hate propaganda in light of the decision rendered by the Supreme Court in the Zundel case, last year, and the Keegstra case, in 1990. As we know, the Alberta Court of Appeal was scheduled to hear another appeal from Keegstra on February 2, 1994, and has not yet issued a ruling.

While Keegstra was charged under the hate propaganda provisions, Zundel was charged under old section 181 on spreading false news. As we all recall, Zundel denied the Jewish holocaust ever happened and his comments were tinged with racism.

Zundel's motives could have been examined as part of mens rea determination. However, in the majority judgement of the Supreme Court, section 181 was invalidated by the Charter and, whatever his motives, Zundel had to be acquitted. In its ruling, the court mentioned it had ruled a few years earlier, in the Keegstra case that hate propaganda was protected under section 2(b) of the Charter, and added that all communications that convey or intend to convey a message fall under section 2(b) of the Charter, with the only proviso that the material transmission of the message be otherwise acceptable.

Unfortunately our Charter of Rights and Freedoms is protecting fanatics and eccentrics like Zundel who can spew out their insanities with complete impunity. As the law now stands, how would the Supreme Court react to section 318 which has not yet been tested, as we know?

I also know that this bill is premised upon the alleged impending importation in Canada of a game I prefer not to mention. No one has seen this game yet. I think that the panic stirred up by certain watch groups is actually playing into the hands of the game's promoters who are benefitting from an incredible amount of publicity. If there is such a game, it is shameful and should be stopped at the border or seized by the

*Private Members' Business*

police. I think that other provisions of the Criminal Code, if amended, could in fact allow such action.

Without getting into a legal debate on notions which elude the public, I want to call the attention of the hon. member and of this House to the fact that the Code contains provisions which prohibit the distribution of crime comics under offences tending to corrupt morals.

Pursuant to section 163(1)(b) of the Criminal Code, a person who circulates a crime comic commits an offence. However, I would agree with the hon. member that the definition of the scope of the offence is far from perfect and that customs officers and the police would not be able to act easily.

The game targeted by this bill depicts through drawings or photographs the serial killings of children. I would propose, as an alternative, that the definition in section 163(7) be amended to include any material that depicts pictorially the commission of criminal acts. I think that, from a constitutional standpoint, these provisions would be more effective and more valid in terms of stopping the distribution of this kind of game than the addition to the restricted categories of clauses respecting hate propaganda messages, as these categories are already protected under the Charter.

Finally, I am by no means convinced that even with the amendment put forward by my colleague, this type of game would fall under the definition of hate propaganda covered in section 318 or section 319.

For these reasons, and although I agree completely with the spirit of what the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is trying to do, I cannot support the amendments he is proposing and I fail to see how they would be useful from a practical standpoint. Since the legislator cannot pass legislation for no reason, I think that Bill C-214 should, quite simply, be deferred.

(1750)

[*English*]

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of private member's Bill C-214. My hon. colleague who just spoke may be accurate in that there are some deficiencies in this bill. At the same time we cannot amend the total Criminal Code and rectify the problems within the criminal justice system in one fell swoop.

I support the private member's bill. However I do so with a degree of regret. It saddens me to think that we would have to debate such an issue, whether or not we should amend the Criminal Code to stop the proliferation of what I consider to be obscene and immoral.

I would like to briefly describe what I know about the serial killer board game. It was invented by Tobias Allen of Seattle, Washington, and inspired by John Wayne Gacey, a serial killer on death row for the murder of I understand 33 children in the United States. The object of the game is to kill as many children as possible. The game comes in a body bag and the pawns to play the board are in the shape of dead babies.

In my mind there is no debate. The answer is a given. I believe from the volume of mail and petitions received by past and present members of this House that there is no debate in the minds of Canadians on this issue. We should stop the serial killer board game from reaching Canadian stores and the impressionable minds of our children.

I will never understand what kind of sick mind devises such a despicable and horrifying game, one that glorifies the killing of babies, the most vulnerable and precious treasure we have in this world, innocent victims of some of the most heinous crimes committed in this and other countries.

Are we not here to protect our children from the senseless hate and violence that exists throughout the world and which is increasing in our own country? How anyone finds entertainment in playing a game that depicts the slaughtering of babies is beyond me and everything I have ever held dear in my life. How anyone could condone the importation and sale of such an outrageously immoral game is beyond comprehension.

I stand here today to support an amendment that demonstrates to the U.S. originator and manufacturer of this game that there is no place for it in a country whose standards in regard to morality will not tolerate the exploitation of children and to reinforce the commitment I have made to my constituents to help put some sanity back in the justice system that no longer protects our most valuable possession, our children.

The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell has tabled private member's Bill C-214 to amend the Criminal Code to include age which appears to be the only effective means to stop the importation of the serial killer board game as it would constitute importing hate propaganda.

Currently under subsection 318(4) of the Criminal Code regarding hate propaganda, children or seniors are not protected because they do not constitute an identifiable group. Within this section the application of the Criminal Code only applies to hate propaganda that advocates or promotes the physical destruction of persons distinguished by colour, race, religion or ethnic origin.

This serial killer board game which establishes the winner as the person who collects the most dead babies would not be permitted in Canada if the babies were of a particular race or colour. Obviously white Anglo-Saxon is not included in the definition of race under subsection 318(4) of the Criminal Code

and has an awful lot to say about the state of our Criminal Code. Otherwise Revenue Canada officials could have prohibited entry of this game into our country.

I would like to point out that similarly women would not be protected under this section of the Criminal Code as gender does not fall within the confines defining what constitutes hate propaganda.

Therefore if the dead bodies were that of white Canadian women the game would also be acceptable to pass through our borders under subsection 318(4) of the Criminal Code. How have we regressed to the point where we have no equality before the law? It is no wonder this country cannot eradicate the problem of violence against women and children when sections of the Criminal Code such as 318(4) provide no protection for them.

(1755)

I understand that under tariff code 9956 of schedule 7 to the Customs Tariff, Revenue Canada can prohibit the importation of certain material into Canada. Material suspected of being treasonable, seditious, obscene or hate propaganda is inspected by Revenue Canada officials and if it is determined to come within the terms of tariff code 9956, its importation is prohibited.

According to the Minister of National Revenue, his officials have reviewed a version of the serial killer board game and determined it did not fall within the confines of tariff code 9956 which has necessitated private member's Bill C-214.

I do not know what obscene means to revenue officials but to me and as is defined in the dictionary it means highly offensive. If the game depicting the murder of babies is not highly offensive, I do not know what is. Anything that glorifies killing and depicts serial murders as victorious is very offensive to me and the people I represent. I really do not understand what is happening in our country, what is happening to the sense of decency and morality that was once so indicative of a country whose values were second to none.

What kind of a message are we sending people when we allow a game of this nature to enter our country? It is the same message we send when we allow a murderer serving a life sentence to be eligible for parole after 15 years, when we give a convict a day pass to rape and kill again, when we pay a serial killer handsomely to provide law authorities with information regarding the location of his victim's bodies or when we permit a person in prison who was a partner of one of the most horrific sexual slayings in this country to own a microwave, a television set, take university courses and to decorate her cell with whimsical cartoon characters when law-abiding Canadians struggle to obtain similar assets.

Another major area of concern, of course, is the Young Offenders Act which is currently ineffective in stopping the growing number of youth engaged in criminal and violent activities. There has been considerable discussion regarding this

### *Private Members' Business*

area of law and private member's Bill C-217 is currently before the House. The purpose of this bill is threefold. To lower the age limits that define who is a young person for purposes of the Young Offenders Act, to allow the publication of the name of a young offender who has been convicted of an indictable offence on two previous occasions and to increase the maximum penalty in the Young Offenders Act for first and second degree murder to 10 years.

I commend the hon. member for York South—Weston for his initiative in this area. I cannot say at this time that I agree 100 per cent with the suggested amendments, however I do believe they warrant discussion and analysis.

Stopping the importation of material such as the serial killer board game or serial killer cards is a necessary component in providing the proper environment for our children to grow up in. How can we expect them to adhere to a prescribed set of rules and moral conduct if we have games or literature that are contradictory? How will they ever understand wrong from right if we say one thing and our store shelves are filled with games or literature that defies what we have told them?

We know a world of corruption lies beyond our front doors. Every day in this country Canadians are warned of the unspeakable things that can happen to their children and they are urged to make their children street smart.

Allowing the serial killer board game into this country goes against the moral conscience of Canadians and everything we as parents are trying to do to raise our children to be morally correct human beings.

Our job as legislators is to provide leadership and direction through our laws. If we do not amend the Criminal Code we will be telling our children that we believe killing babies, killing innocent and defenceless members of society, is all right even if it is only in a game.

In conclusion, when we do this we are allowing violent and immoral behaviour to further proliferate in this country. I stand in support of this bill.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity this evening to speak to Bill C-214 introduced by the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

This bill proposes to amend the existing Criminal Code definition of identifiable group which is found in that part of the code dealing with hate propaganda so as to include the term age. The new definition would apply to all of the hate propaganda offences.

(1800)

The search for the proper role of the law in respect to hate propaganda is especially difficult because it forces us to review

*Private Members' Business*

the conflict between freedom of speech and the interest of the state in criminalizing speech injurious to the public.

Before proceeding to speak to the bill it is important to say a bit about the current law. At the present time the Criminal Code prohibits, first, advocating or promoting genocide against any section of the public distinguished by colour, race, religion or ethnic origin. That is section 318.

Second, it prohibits inciting hatred against a protected group by communicating in a public place statements which are likely to lead to a breach of the peace. That is subsection 319(1).

Third, it prohibits communicating statements, other than in private conversation, which wilfully promote hatred against a protected group. That is subsection 319(2).

Fourth, the Criminal Code provides for the seizure and forfeiture of hate propaganda kept on the premises for sale or distribution. Those are subsections 320(1) and (4).

Fifth, it provides that a person charged with advocating genocide is liable to five years imprisonment if charged with the offence of public incitement, or hatred, or the offence of communicating statements which wilfully promote hatred. A person is liable to two years imprisonment if prosecuted by way of indictment or to six months and/or a \$2,000 fine if prosecuted by way of summary proceedings.

The Criminal Code also provides for four special statutory defences which an accused may raise if prosecuted for wilfully promoting hatred: if the statements communicated were true; if the statements expressed or attempted to establish by argument in good faith an opinion upon a religious subject; if the statements made were on a subject of public interest which on reasonable grounds were believed to be true; and pointing out in good faith for the purpose of removal matters producing or tending to produce feelings of hatred.

Except for the offence of public incitement to hatred, the consent of the provincial attorney general is required to obtain a seizure or to initiate a prosecution under the Criminal Code's hate propaganda provisions. The hate propaganda provisions of the Criminal Code were examined by the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of *Regina v. Keegstra*. The judgment was rendered in December 1990.

The Supreme Court of Canada determined that communications which wilfully promote hatred against an identifiable group conveyed a meaning and were thus an expression within the meaning of paragraph 2(b) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The court further noted that the prohibition set out in subsection 319(2) of the Criminal Code was directed at words that have as their content and objective the promotion of racial or religious hatred.

Inasmuch as the purpose of the provision was to restrict the content of expression "by singling out particular meanings that are not to be conveyed", the Supreme Court of Canada determined that subsection 319(2) infringed the guarantee of the freedom of expression in paragraph 2(b) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The court ruled that the presence of hate propaganda in Canada was sufficiently substantial to warrant concern. The court recognized that hate propaganda could cause two types of injuries: first, harm done to the target group by for example provoking a retaliatory response or causing the target group to avoid activities and withdraw from participation in activities with non-group members and, second, influence upon society at large by attracting individuals to hold these views and to create discord and disharmony among these groups in society at large.

(1805)

The court upheld subsection 319(2) of the Criminal Code which deals with wilfully promoting hatred. It upheld it as a reasonable limit on the guarantee to the freedom of expression within the meaning of section 1 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Subsection 318(4) defines the expression identifiable group as meaning "any section of the public distinguished by colour, race, religion or ethnic origin". Expanding the definition would broaden the type of speech that would be caught by the hate law and therefore could potentially put the hate propaganda provisions at risk. This is very significant.

The Supreme Court of Canada noted in the *Keegstra* case that subsection 319(2) was designed to extend a measure of protection to visible and religious minorities so as to prevent their being exposed to hate messages and to promote racial and religious tolerance.

Expanding the definition of identifiable group to include another characteristic such as the one proposed in Bill C-214 would undoubtedly broaden the narrow purpose of protecting visible and religious minorities approved by the Supreme Court of Canada in the *Keegstra* case. It is not clear to me whether adding what is proposed in Bill C-214 would have the effect of protecting children from killer cards and board games as there must be shown an incitement to hatred or promotion of hatred.

The proposed change here would broaden the definition of identifiable group without succeeding in its attempt to protect children from nefarious materials. As a result, the hate propaganda provisions as amended by Bill C-214 could be more

vulnerable to a finding by courts that they constitute an infringement of the charter guarantee of freedom of speech and that they are not a reasonable limit prescribed by law in a free and democratic society.

The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is attempting to do something which should be supported. We all support his aim. The problem is how best to do it. Is it with Bill C-214? We have to be careful, as I have stated, that we do not weaken the law as it exists at the present time and that we perhaps find another way of dealing with it.

The Department of Justice at the present time is looking into the matter. Hopefully it will have something to recommend. I say this with all deep appreciation to the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. With the co-operation and work of all members of the House, we will find the best way possible to deal with this despicable practice, which certain people are using to make considerable sums of money at the expense of our young people.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** There being no further members rising for debate, the time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The House will stand suspended until 6.30 p.m.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 6.10 p.m.)

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6.30 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—THE BUDGET

The House resumed, from March 14, 1994, consideration of the motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** It being 6.30 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the recorded division on the supply proceedings.

Call in the members.

Supply

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 12)

YEAS

Members

Abbott  
Benoit  
Brown (Calgary Southeast)  
Epp  
Frazer  
Grey (Beaver River)  
Hanger  
Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
Hart  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hoepfner  
Manning  
Mayfield  
Meredith  
Morrison  
Ramsay  
Silye  
Speaker  
Strahl  
White (Fraser Valley West)  
Williams—41

Ablonczy  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Chatters  
Forseth  
Gouk  
Grubel  
Harper (Calgary West)  
Harris  
Hermanson  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Johnston  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Penson  
Ringma  
Solberg  
Stinson  
Thompson  
White (North Vancouver)

NAYS

Members

Althouse  
Arseneault  
Augustine  
Bachand  
Bakopanos  
Beaumur  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Bertrand  
Bevilacqua  
Bodnar  
Bouchard  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Caccia  
Campbell  
Canuel  
Catterall  
Chan  
Collenette  
Comuzzi  
Cowling  
Culbert  
Davialt  
Deshaies  
Dingwall  
Dromisky  
Duceppe  
Dumas  
Easter  
English  
Fillion  
Flis  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guarnieri  
Harb

Anderson  
Asselin  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Baker  
Barnes  
Bellehumeur  
Berger  
Bernier (Beauce)  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Bethel  
Blondin—Andrew  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brushett  
Bélisle  
Calder  
Cannis  
Caron  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Collins  
Copp  
Crête  
Dalphond—Guiral  
Debien  
DeVillers  
Discepola  
Dubé  
Duhamel  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Galloway  
Gauthier (Roberval)  
Godin  
Graham  
Grose  
Guimond  
Harper (Churchill)

*Government Orders*

Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Ouellet
Parrish	Paré
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Péloquin
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringueite—Maltais	Robichaud
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York Sudbury)	Serré
Shepherd	Skoke
Solomon	Speller
St-Laurent	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Young
Zed—193	

(1900)

**CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY**

The House resumed consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to see that after the short break to reconsider their position members are coming in droves to hear the end of my speech.

Before the break I had been talking about an important part of our foreign policy review. That is the position we should take as we study and review the position the Canadian International Development Agency should have in this foreign policy review.

I have heard that numerous well-intentioned and influential people have run into a brick wall trying to reform CIDA's system for the sake of the Canadian taxpayer and the sake of hungry people abroad. We need leadership or the problems will continue. The Reform Party of Canada is willing to offer leadership in this respect. I want to clarify the Reform position.

The Reform Party of Canada has called for a reduction in foreign aid funding simply because Canada no longer has that money to spend. Reformers are concerned about the poor, but they are unwilling to ignore the larger context of our ability to pay. They are also unwilling to overlook the reforms that CIDA so urgently requires.

The Reform Party is well aware of the plight of one-third of the world's nations. In them 34,000 children die of hunger or illness each day. Eight hundred million people are malnourished.

On the opposite side we are well aware that on the United Nations index of human development, Canada sits second from the top out of 172 nations. This position of privilege carries with it a unique weight of responsibility. We as Canadians must not close our eyes to the grim realities facing others.

It is our recommendation that CIDA be clearly mandated to assist the poorest of the poor to become self-sufficient. We recommend that this mandate be enshrined in legislation. This would be legislation that protects CIDA from the political pressures that divert its energies toward other tasks. It would be legislation that includes a project by project evaluation mechanism and budgetary sunset clauses. It would be legislation that controls CIDA by requiring it to justify its actions to Parliament on a regular basis.

A scaled down CIDA should concentrate on working at the grassroots level with the poorest of the poor. It should give less bilateral or government to government assistance, because that is where the corruption and the greed too often frustrate our

**PAIRED—MEMBERS**

## Members

Alcock	Allmand
Brien	Finestone
Guay	Irwin
Nunez	de Savoye

(1855)

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion lost.

efforts. It should concentrate instead on its efforts to forge more partnerships with community based non-governmental organizations where help goes directly to needy people. Currently only 9 per cent of our foreign aid budget is used in that way.

CIDA should follow, as an example perhaps, Sweden's lead and reduce its focus from 115 countries to just a handful, making a significant impact on poverty and health in each one of them. An example of this can be found in the latest years for which figures are available.

The statistics show that Indonesia which is classed by the UN as a middle income developing country received \$40 million in aid under CIDA. Haiti, sitting at the bottom rung of the world's ladder, received just \$6 million. By shifting priorities we could have a real impact on a country that is the poorest of the poor through our non-governmental organizations.

(1905)

CIDA must take a long term view by making the poor self-sustaining rather than allowing them to become dependent on continuing foreign aid.

Canada enjoys an unprecedented position of respect in the world today. Other rich nations do not enjoy the same level of international esteem. Why is this? In large measure it is because Canada has reached out with benevolence. We have given generously to nations like Bangladesh and Pakistan knowing they may never be able to repay us.

The world has recognized that our motives for giving are generally altruistic and for that we are rewarded with global goodwill. At the world table we have substantial bargaining power for a nation of our size. This is possible because we back up our words with tangible assistance.

The vehicles for enhancing Canada's trade already exist. The industry and international trade departments are well suited to serve Canada's commercial interests. However we ought to separate our economic interests from our humanitarian motives. The overt promotion of Canadian trade is a worthy and necessary endeavour best left to the departments of industry and international trade. I believe our integrity is somehow diminished in the eyes of the world when we quietly couple commerce with humanitarian relief.

It is impossible to estimate the value of our good international reputation in monetary terms. The good seeds we have sown in the fields of the poor may well bear the future harvest of increased trade. Whether this happens or not let us move now to enact legislation recreating CIDA as a vehicle that can deliver aid with efficiency and purpose.

In case the government is not contemplating such legislation at this time, I intend to introduce a private member's bill in the coming weeks that will incorporate the principles I have ad-

### *Government Orders*

dressed. It can serve as a starting point for a non-partisan effort that I believe all members could support.

Within our ability let us give freely to the poorest of the poor without ulterior motives but in the spirit of generosity and compassion that marks each member in this House as truly Canadian.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Madam Speaker, I compliment the hon. gentleman on the tenor of the latter part of his intervention which I heard. It certainly exemplifies some very commendable views about Canada and its role in the international sphere.

I am a trifle confused however by his reluctance to see the relationship of both objectives. The commercial side reflects Canadian interests as they might develop anywhere in the world. That might reflect positively on the more humanitarian or altruistic—if he would accept that term—side of the equation as it more appropriately relates to Canada's political and humanitarian objectives everywhere in the world. I do not understand why one must preclude the existence of the other.

I accept that we should renew and continue to reinforce those initiatives which have made Canada stand out for its humanitarian or relief work, which is the term I think the member used. However Canadian interests are served on both the philosophical side and the strictly pragmatic business side when the two interests are married under one administration.

I am wondering whether the hon. member would clarify that for me. I have difficulty understanding why we would have to separate the administration of two departments under one roof when the objectives of both give us the results Canadians seem to want.

(1910)

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, the problem is twofold. One is the idea of separating the mandate or giving CIDA a mandate. What is the purpose of CIDA? The management of CIDA has been flipping every 18 months. It is in a total state of turmoil not knowing what its mandate is, which should be to protect the purpose of our humanitarian aid and to help the poorest of the poor.

That was the mandate suggested by the Winegard report. We need to focus in on what is the role of CIDA. That role should be brought under the authority of Parliament through enabling legislation.

I also have budgetary concerns. CIDA's budget is too large. There are too many tentacles, too many countries, too many purposes. It needs to be restricted and that is another reason to focus our attention on a few countries.

On the other question of whether commerce and humanitarian aid would be looked after together, I believe that may be possible. As one parliamentary secretary mentioned earlier today it is almost impossible to dissociate international trade,

*Government Orders*

foreign policy and defence policy. All of them go together often under trade policy which is really the commerce aspect of what the member was talking about.

Trade must be left to the international trade people. We need that commercial process to develop arrangements, agreements, free trade agreements and so on with other countries. It would allow them to pursue trade opportunities in Canada and would allow Canadian businesses to pursue trade agreements with those countries. It is a trade issue.

Our humanitarian efforts need to be focused without expecting commercial return. In that sense we target our money and say that whatever the amount is, the money is given without strings attached. It is done as a humanitarian gesture because we want to help that country so that in the coming years it is not dependent on foreign aid.

One of the critiques in the Auditor General's report is that countries that have received \$1 billion or \$2 billion from Canada over the last 20 years are as dependent or more dependent on international aid now than they were when we started what we thought was going to be short term assistance.

We need to focus our humanitarian aid for that reason. International trade is a separate issue. Although sometimes it will overlap and it is a good thing if it does that should not be the focus of CIDA. It should be a foreign aid and humanitarian gesture.

**Mr. Volpe:** Madam Speaker, I want to clarify one further item with the hon. member.

We do not differ on the philosophy but I think the member is aware when he speaks on the question of giving aid especially through CIDA we are not talking ultimately of a cash transfer. We are talking about providing a service. We are talking about providing goods. We are talking essentially about purchasing the same for the benefit of a third party. That does not necessarily mean we are taking a large budget item and transferring it in cash to a recipient country.

Because of that I do not see why we would want to separate from the philosophical objectives of any of our activity the possible consequences which can all be positive.

(1915)

The fact that we would be giving aid does not necessarily mean that there are no commercial benefits or that there are commercial benefits that we should eschew. The fact that we would be providing or stimulating trade does not necessarily mean that we would not be disposed to providing further assistance because it is not a question, unless the member's understanding of the Auditor General's report is different from

mine, of taking dollars out of our pocket and handing them over to somebody else whom we have defined as needy.

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

I realize that often it is not just money that is being transferred in our bilateral systems. Often money is part of it. There was a budgetary figure not this year but last year or two years ago where we spent tens of millions of dollars in direct transfers to help other countries with their national debt problems, for example.

To me that is not a purpose for CIDA. That is not something that Canada should be doing at this time, giving other countries direct assistance to help with their national debt problems when we have the biggest national debt problem we have ever had in our history. There are times when direct money is transferred. In those cases we have to restrict the mandate of CIDA through legislation to eliminate that abuse.

Second, there are times when instead of thinking of strictly humanitarian reasons, we start to think of Canada's commercial interests. Madam Labelle mentioned the other day that 60 per cent of our money is spent here in Canada, sometimes for buying foodstuffs and so on but sometimes for reasons that are more commercial in nature and not particularly geared for the poorest of the poor whom we should be helping.

In those cases, I am concerned. The Auditor General this year did not specifically identify any horror stories. He tried to zero in on the process and the problem within CIDA that he identified by a lack of legislation and some other things but tried to avoid the horror stories as I have tried to avoid them today in my presentation. However those horror stories still exist. We can go back through the last 10 years of Auditor Generals' reports to see them in their fullness.

That is why we need to restrict it to humanitarian aid. I realize that sometimes it is goods and services that are also exchanged but by and large we need to restrict it to the poor, make the mandate strict in legislation and we will not only enhance CIDA's reputation within Canada, which is very important at this time as it is flagging, but improve our opinion abroad as well.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I enjoyed that last exchange between the hon. member for Eglinton—Lawrence and the hon. member for Fraser Valley East because both members are on the foreign affairs committee and in developing an independent Canadian policy on foreign affairs.

This is the kind of interchange we need on the floor of this House. Therefore I congratulate the two gentlemen for contributing to the debate and to helping us develop an independent Canadian foreign policy.

*Government Orders*

Canadians have seen the world change dramatically in recent years. In many ways change has been the defining characteristic of this decade. Nowhere has this been more true than in central and eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

The fall of the Berlin wall, which I witnessed personally, the collapse of communism and the Soviet military threat and the emergence of the new independent states have reshaped Europe. We are faced with challenges and opportunities unparalleled since the end of World War II.

The last five years have shown that the first dramatic steps are sometimes the easiest to take. The hard work begins when ideas must be transformed into reality. Democracy cannot simply be proclaimed. Free markets cannot just be willed into existence. Fundamental reform requires courage and patience. Canada has an important role to play in central and eastern Europe. We must seize this tremendous opportunity.

I would like to focus my statement today on Canada's foreign policy challenges in that part of the world. It is obviously in Canada's best interests that reform in the region succeed. The opportunity to build a more stable world order based on democratic governments and free market economies cannot be squandered.

(1920)

Central and eastern Europe is a new economic frontier. Trade is the lifeblood of the Canadian economy. The region's largely untapped markets represent an exciting opportunity to generate exports and create new jobs and prosperity in Canada.

Canada's historic, cultural and human links to eastern Europe are an advantage that few of our so-called competitors, European or otherwise, possess. We must use our advantage wisely.

Almost 20 per cent of the constituents in my constituency of Parkdale—High Park and 10 per cent of Canadians generally across Canada can trace their roots to central and eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. This is an unparalleled bond. We have tried to foster relationships with these countries. A number of Canadian entrepreneurs or academics have gone there to offer their expertise and knowledge, to offer training and assistance. It is a difficult task where progress is measured in little steps, but whose rewards for Canada are great.

The linguistic skills and the cultural ties of Canada's ethno-cultural communities enable us to support a number of people to people initiatives, to bridge cultural barriers and to deliver training and assistance. The impact of this direct contact cannot be overestimated. I know from years of personal experience working with the Canadian Polish community, with travel study programs for Canadian students in Poland, how personal links can bring countries together.

The countries of central and eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union are trying to create in months and years institutions and systems which have in some cases developed over centuries in the west.

While we should seize the opportunities presented by change, we must recognize that there will be setbacks and avoid impatience and unrealistic expectations. Political and economic reform take time.

Last week the President of Georgia was in Ottawa, Mr. Shevardnadze. I had the honour of greeting him at the airport and bringing him to meet the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs. I asked Mr. Shevardnadze if he had an opportunity to relive his life would he again push the economic, political and democratic reforms as he did with Mr. Gorbachev. He thought about it for a while and said: "Yes, but I would do it much more slowly". His argument was that the problems they were having in many of the east European countries today were because they were not ready for such rapid change.

Therefore, if we want Canada to have a prosperous and beneficial relationship with central and eastern Europe then we must start today and patiently wait for the results. In countries like Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, the memory of democracy and market economies have survived 45 years of political repression and state control. But in what shape? There is enough intact to provide the basis for a successful transformation but the task remains daunting. With strong support and investment from the west we are seeing encouraging signs.

Poland became the first country in the region to record growth in gross domestic product with an increase of 4 per cent last year. It was Europe's fastest growing economy in 1993. Who would have predicted that 10 years ago?

In Hungary the private sector generates close to 45 per cent of the country's GDP. The Czech Republic has low inflation and unemployment rates and has launched a second phase of a successful privatization program.

In the former Soviet Union the first steps have been taken, but with virtually no history of democracy and free markets to draw on we should not be surprised that change is slow and difficult. The challenge is large but it is not insurmountable. Countries such as Russia and Ukraine are central to the historic transformation of Europe. Canada must make a commitment for the long term.

We are encouraging Russia's president, government and parliament to work together to develop a new reform consensus. Canadian assistance remains contingent on a continuing commitment to democracy and economic reform. I should draw to the attention of newer members that the foreign affairs com-

*Government Orders*

mittee was in the former Soviet Union, Russia and Ukraine twice. Maybe it is time to revisit that region.

(1925)

Yesterday I had a lengthy meeting with the new ambassador of Ukraine, Ambassador Batyuk, to discuss Canada's special relationship with Ukraine. About two hours ago the Minister of Foreign Affairs met with the Ukrainian Canadian Congress under the presidency of Oleh Romaniw to discuss such matters as political issues, technical assistance, trade and economic issues, consultations with the Minister of Foreign Affairs and immigration issues as they pertain to Ukraine.

This is the kind of input that we welcome, not only input through parliamentary standing committees but meetings such as the minister had just prior to my speaking here.

Government commitment to enhancing this relationship is in every spirit political, economic and social. We will be at the forefront of helping Ukraine in its democratic and economic transformation. A stable, secure and prosperous Ukraine is vital for European security.

We are encouraged by President Kravchuk's desire to submit the non-proliferation treaty to his Parliament for ratification.

Since 1989 Canada has provided substantial support to central and eastern Europe in the form of technical and humanitarian assistance. It is important that we continue to do so. The people of the region must clearly see that the west is supporting them in practical and direct ways during the difficult period of transition.

That is why one of the major components of Canadian assistance to the region is an ongoing program designed to promote democratic development, to support the transition to market economies and to increase Canadian trade and investment links with the region.

In pursuing these objectives we have adopted a partnership approach both with recipient countries and Canadian partners. This is partly a reflection of limited resources. It is also a recognition that government does not have all of the answers. The program draws on the expertise to be found in all sectors of Canadian society.

The assistance program matches Canadian skills and technology with the priority needs of partner countries. We have done this successfully in fields such as energy, agriculture, private sector development and the environment. Our sophisticated financial and legal systems and our respected public service have also provided unrivalled expertise.

This approach not only ensures that Canadian assistance is of high quality but also helps to develop long term commercial opportunities for Canadian companies.

Canadian assistance is having a practical impact on the process of reform. It supports the transfer of critical knowledge and technology and fosters the emergence of small and medium sized enterprises. Western economic practices are being adopted and democratic institutions are being strengthened.

The assistance program also increases the capacity in Canadian firms to compete effectively in central and eastern European markets. Two examples of projects in my parents' homeland of Poland illustrate the range of our involvement and give us a good reason why we should continue to be involved in the region.

One, a Canadian company advised the Polish Ministry of Health on health care reform in 1992. It subsequently won a World Bank contract to manage a \$200 million U.S. health sector loan in Poland. Another example, more than 100 Polish dairy farmers and veterinarians have so far upgraded their skills and received management training in an ongoing program at the international livestock management school in Kemptville.

There are those who think that Canada spends too much on foreign aid, as we heard from some of the Reform Party speakers, and that it is a waste of money. As we embark on this foreign policy review process we will have to look at our aid programs, but aid is not simply money. It is also expertise, knowledge and skills that we can share with those who are seeking to build in modern society.

(1930)

Let me cite a few examples of where Canada has taken the lead in setting up successful programs with very little money. The Federal Business Development Bank took the lead in establishing an independent Romanian loan guarantee fund for small and medium enterprises in 1993. A contribution of \$775,000 will provide on site staff and management training until June 1995. Canada without providing capital in the fund has provided much more: a credible reputation and confidence in the abilities of its managers. Thanks to this the fund has attracted a \$5 million contribution from Germany.

In Hungary we are establishing regional vocational and labour retraining centres. Our involvement in the project started in 1991 with a \$400,000 contribution to the Association of Canadian Community Colleges for one pilot project. The association and an Irish partner then secured a \$1.5 million World Bank contract to establish close to 20 such centres in Hungary.

Just yesterday Ambassador Gedai of Hungary was in my office expressing appreciation for the co-operation and assistance from Canada.

Russian oilfield workers and managers are benefiting from training in Russia and Canada. A \$10 million Yeltsin democracy fellowship program managed by the University of Saskatchewan in my province brings Russian officials to Canada to work in ministries at all levels of government.

*Government Orders*

In Ukraine Canadian support for a professional public service training institute is helping to build the institutions that modern independent states require.

Canada is contributing its expertise in agricultural economics, social policy planning and communications. Already 21 deputy and assistant deputy ministers from Ukraine have participated in Canada in a two week executive management program at the Canadian Centre for Management Development.

Canada's assistance program also provides funding to Canadian business on a cost shared basis to develop joint ventures in trade and investment opportunities. As a result Canadian companies have established a strong presence in Russia, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Ukraine. Trade and investment are key to the long term growth of these fledgling market economies.

As I said earlier, and my colleagues have also pointed out, trade is also essential to Canada's continued growth in the next century. Canada is encouraging collective, decisive action on the part of the west. The government supports stronger links between NATO and central and eastern Europe through the partnership for peace program. Canada has encouraged the CSCE to play a more active role in central and eastern Europe, particularly in the area of conflict prevention and crisis management.

We are proposing to focus high level G-7 attention on Ukraine. Already Canada is playing a leading international role in assisting Ukraine in its upcoming elections through technical assistance and election monitoring.

I am pleased to announce that the Minister of Foreign Affairs has asked me to lead a delegation to Ukraine on its request to monitor the elections there.

Canadian soldiers are serving as peacekeepers with the United Nation protection force in the former Yugoslavia and the government increased Canada's contribution to relief operations there with the announcement of a \$10 million package of humanitarian assistance in November 1993. This brings Canadian contributions of humanitarian assistance for the war affected populations of former Yugoslavia to \$50 million since 1991. We will continue to monitor humanitarian needs throughout the region and to respond generously and compassionately.

Had the former Yugoslavian conflict been resolved in an institutionalized way through compromise, tolerance and agreement, as recommended by Lester B. Pearson, billions of dollars could be used today for development rather than for humanitarian assistance. Again, in response to the people who say we should focus on only giving assistance to the poorest of the poor, if we only give humanitarian aid when do the countries get assistance to develop so that they can stand on their own feet?

Our ideology should be to help the people in those countries to help themselves.

(1935)

The course of reform in central and eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union may continue to be unpredictable and fraught with danger but we cannot withdraw. Canada must play a role in turning this period of turbulent change into an opportunity to create a more stable and prosperous world. The government is committed to providing creative international leadership to ensure that we achieve this vital goal.

I am very impressed with the work of the parliamentary standing committee represented by the three parties sitting in this House and I am looking forward to criss-crossing Canada, hearing views from grassroots Canadians in helping us develop a unique, independent Canadian foreign policy.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville):** Madam Speaker, I have one question for the hon. member.

During the election campaign I heard from people in my constituency, and I think others did across Canada, that Canadians want this country to take care of Canadians first. They said we have to cut down substantially on the amount of money spent on foreign aid. That is what recent polls have shown as well.

I want to know how the member would answer these people when they ask if that is what this government will do.

**Mr. Flis:** Madam Speaker, this is a question that we as parliamentarians get. I get it in my own riding and it is a very fair and honest question, knowing the deficit and the public debt we have. The comments I get are that charity begins at home.

We have to point out to Canadians that we are all brothers and sisters on the same planet. When someone says charity begins at home, Somalia, Ethiopia, Cambodia are also home for Canadians.

I was in Cambodia observing its elections. I learned that only one in five children reaches the age of five and the lifespan is only around 50 for adults. How can we say no?

Those are our neighbours. When we hear charity begins at home I have to remind myself that is part of my home as well and I have to help those children so that they can live past the age of five.

The other answer that we can give our constituents is that if we had global security we would spend less money on defence, we would spend less money in humanitarian aid. That money could go toward helping these countries develop their economies rather than looking for handouts.

I concentrated on central and eastern Europe because I believe very strongly that with a little help there it is more an investment for the entire world. These countries that I have mentioned will and some are already helping the developing countries. Poland,

*Government Orders*

Hungary, the republics of Czechoslovakia and others are already helping third world countries.

That will ease the burden on Canadians. Canada cannot do it alone, whether it is in peacekeeping, whether it is in humanitarian aid. That is why we have to look for partners around the globe.

It is a tough question. We will get this as the committee travels across Canada. We have to look at it as investment for the future. We have to look at it as global security.

When I was in Honduras recently with our overseas assistance, we brought in a water system to a rural community fed by gravitational force, no motors, no engines.

(1940)

I was there talking to the barefoot children and to the local inhabitants surrounding me and I said that we were pleased that Canada could help in a small way. I said I was sure that if disaster struck Canada those people would be the first to come to our help and they all applauded.

I saw the coffee and the bananas growing in the fields. I am sure these same countries we are helping, should a disaster strike Canada tomorrow, we do not know, would be the first to come to our assistance.

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot):** Madam Speaker, I have two questions for the hon. member.

He has made comments that I find very inspiring and uplifting. At lunch we have a meal served here and we do not pay for it as members of Parliament. At supper I understand there is a meal out there and we do not pay for it although we are being paid to work through these hours.

I would like to ask the hon. member if he would be willing to pay a small fee for the food we eat here and have that given to countries that are in need.

My second question to the hon. member is what does he feel will be the impact on our foreign aid program as a result of the addition of \$100 billion to our national debt over the next three years?

**Mr. Flis:** Madam Speaker, in answer to the first question, I was on duty all day today. I paid \$76 for my lunch today. How much did the hon. member pay?

I think these are piddly little things that we bring in as red herrings to take us off the real issue. The real issue here is developing an independent Canadian foreign policy, not whether we are spending \$2 or \$5 on our lunch. I do not want a free lunch. I happened to take some of my constituents out for lunch today to the tune of \$76.

As I say, let us not waste taxpayers' money by pulling in these little red herrings to deflect us from the real issue.

The second question is the real issue and if he would look at our budget we are trying to reduce the deficit. We are trying to reduce the public debt but gradually so not to hurt Canadians too much.

If he looks closely at the budget over the next three years we will be reducing the deficit by over \$3 billion just in the way we are operating the government.

In the PMO and in the ministers' offices, et cetera, I feel the pinch now. I was parliamentary secretary in the 1980s and when I became parliamentary secretary I received additional staff and resources. Right now I am not receiving anything extra.

When the Prime Minister told me to go to Hungary to represent Canada at a state funeral because its Prime Minister suddenly passed away, I was a one person delegation. Normally there would be three people representing each party. I was a one person delegation. We cannot run government any leaner than that.

A month later the minister asked me to go to Norway for another state funeral. I was a one person delegation.

I went to the inauguration in Honduras. I could not even take my wife. It was embarrassing because representatives from all the countries were there with their spouses being presented to the president. I was there all alone, a one person delegation.

If the Reform Party cannot accept that I would say it is at the wrong level. It had better go to municipal politics because it does not know what international politics is all about.

(1945)

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the hon. member. I would like to fill him in a bit in that I know something about Russian history too. Those are my roots. My great-grandfather fourth removed negotiated the land deal with Catherine the Great for the Mennonites to move to the Soviet Union. I know what a prosperous country can look like. That country was the land of milk and honey as far as the Mennonite people were concerned at that time. They prospered tremendously but corruption and mismanagement set into the Czarist regime and finally some of the people started immigrating to the United States.

In 1874, when the first Mennonite people came to the United States, they brought new strains of wheat along with them which were used pretty well until the 1930s. That was a prosperous country but now it has turned around. Through mismanagement they have lost everything. This is what Reform is really worried about, that this not happen to our country. That is why we are concerned that we have decent management, that we look after the wealth, and that we share it with other people.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Flis:** Madam Speaker, I am glad the hon. gentleman shared his experience and his roots because it is members like him who understand.

We are not here to throw money around. My parents came from Poland in 1930, right into the Depression. They had no handouts. Because they had no relatives they had to work for two years on a farm in Saskatchewan and they ended up working for 22 years. They know what it is like to save for the future, to tighten the belt. Our party knows it too, but we also have to think of the over one million people who are looking for jobs.

I am sure for that member like myself the hardest thing is when someone comes to his constituency office and asks for help in finding a job and there are not any around. I see a lot of members nodding their heads. I thank the hon. member for sharing that with us.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I would like to advise the House that prior to the vote I recognized two members of the Official Opposition.

I am now going to recognize the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for International Trade and revert to the government for this part.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade):** Madam Speaker, I am honoured to be speaking in the debate on foreign policy. I want to congratulate all the men and women who are serving our country abroad in different capacities, whether in peacekeeping or in a foreign post trying to represent our great country.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the government, the Prime Minister, the Minister for International Trade, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of National Defence for undertaking this initiative to conduct both a foreign policy review as well as a national defence review. I am delighted to see that at some point in time both the foreign affairs policy and the national defence policy would go hand in hand. A number of groups have made presentation to me and to many of my colleagues. One issue they have raised with us is that they want some sort of connection between the review of foreign policy and that of national defence.

I quote the National Forum on Canada's International Relations in the second part wherein it is indicated that the government is committed to reviewing the two hand in hand. There will be public hearings across Canada by parliamentary committees on Canada's foreign and defence policies. This is excellent. It is extremely timely in many ways.

(1950)

We are approaching the 50th anniversary of the United Nations. It is timely for a country such as Canada that has always been on the leading edge internationally to be reviewing its policy in terms of national defence and its foreign policy at the

same time. It will coincide with the review of the United Nations policy on its 50th anniversary.

I am confident that once again Canada will play a leadership role on that front and will be on the leading edge when it comes to the international scene in trying to ensure, as the parliamentary secretary for foreign affairs has indicated, that the global village lives in peace and harmony and that humankind never sees the suffering we have seen in past decades.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, I will take a few minutes to address another issue in this area, and I am referring to trade and the review of our foreign policy. As you know, Madam Speaker, we are all aware of the extent to which trade, and especially international trade, contributes to Canada's economic prosperity. Nearly one-quarter of Canada's GDP is generated by our exports of goods and services. One out of five Canadian jobs is directly or indirectly linked to international trade. Each billion dollars in Canadian exports creates between 12,000 to 15,000 jobs in Canada. This means that exports are extremely important to us as a country.

We have every reason to be proud of our export record, because our exports have continued to post good results despite a slowdown in the world economy in the early 1990s. Finally, in 1993, our monthly exports to the United States, for instance, reached new highs. The latest figures are expected to show that in 1993, exports to our principal trading partners rose 15 per cent over 1992 levels. Canada's exports to the United States are worth \$268 billion annually, which means that in 1993, our exports to the United States were worth \$4 billion more than in 1992.

However, in an increasingly competitive market, we cannot afford to merely repeat our past results. We have been successful, but we must do better. Intensifying our efforts in this area will create jobs in Canada and stimulate domestic growth.

If we are to maintain our competitive position on international markets, we must act quickly to take advantage of opportunities offered by trade agreements like GATT and NAFTA. We have a chance to strengthen our service sectors, which represent more than two-thirds of our national economic activity, and also to improve our service exports.

As we know, about 75 per cent of our trade is with the United States, and five groups of products represent more than 70 per cent of all exports of goods. We must continue to develop these exports while increasing our market share in other areas as well.

*Government Orders*

(1955)

Asia, for instance, has become our second largest market after the United States. It has strong potential and poses a big challenge to Canada's competitiveness.

We must also work with small and medium-sized business to develop an export mentality. As you know, only 15 to 16 per cent of our manufacturing industries export their products, and that is what happened if we look at the large number of businesses here in Canada.

I cannot overstate the importance of exports for Canada, but I would be wrong to suggest that we should concentrate solely on exports. The international business climate changes rapidly, as you know. Businesses must now also consider international investments, capital flow, technology, research and development in developing their international marketing strategies.

We are facing some challenges. We have a \$9 billion to \$12 billion trade deficit in high-tech products, and our research and development results are less than those of the other G-7 countries and OECD members.

In addition, international business investments greatly help to create jobs and improve the competitiveness of Canadian-based companies. In this regard, we are fiercely competing with other countries to attract scarce investment capital.

I see that I am almost out of time and I would like to know whether I have 10 or 20 minutes. Ten minutes?

So, with all these issues, we must see if we have partners. We have banks, various businesses and manufacturers, and our role as a government is to work together, as a team, to develop the economy for the benefit of Canada.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question to the hon. member for Ottawa—Centre.

He had started discussing the importance of international trade and I wonder if he could, in the few minutes at his disposal, elaborate a little more on Canada's important role on the international scene, as well as on the usefulness of trade to stimulate employment, support foreign aid and all those other issues raised by the hon. member this afternoon.

**Mr. Harb:** Madam Speaker, this is a very important issue. Unfortunately, given the time left, I cannot provide a fully satisfactory answer to the hon. member. I will simply tell him that, as I indicated earlier, each billion spent on foreign trade results in the creation of at least 12,000 to 15,000 jobs.

Every time we talk about job creation in Canada, we have to take into account the fact that we must do our best to encourage companies to do business abroad, not only because of the better opportunities, but also because only 10 to 15 per cent of Canadian companies are currently doing business abroad. Con-

sequently, our government should continue to encourage more and more Canadian companies to do business abroad.

(2000)

Unfortunately, as you know, we have a problem in Canada with private sector investments in the field of research and development. If we compare Canada to other countries, we see that our government invests a lot, or at least enough, in R and D, but that the problem is the inadequate contribution of the private sector.

This is very important, and our government is sending a signal to the private sector. If we want to gain a reasonable momentum, the private sector must invest more in research and development.

As you know, over 80 per cent of new jobs created in Canada are created by small business. So, our government took that into account and developed a policy to support small business.

In response to my hon. colleague's question, when we talk about government policy in the area of job creation, it is very important to bear in mind that we believe in import. It is one of the best ways not only to create employment here, in Canada, but also to generate additional revenue in Canada. To fight a \$38 to \$40 million deficit and a debt now totalling over \$500 billion, funds must be generated. And there are two main sources of funds. One source is taxation, and as my hon. colleagues know, Canadian taxpayers have had it up to here with taxes. So, other means of generating revenue must be sought.

In the end, these means of generating revenue will be provided by small and medium-sized businesses which will create jobs for Canadians here, in Canada, and export their products in other countries.

I hope to have answered the question of the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I find it rather telling that today's debate is the fourth major debate on Canada's international relations in the first two months of this new Parliament.

I am no stranger to this House. Having taken part in debates for the past 20 years, I can attest to the fact that I have never before had or been given so many opportunities to debate these issues.

Therefore, the government is taking a new, very important approach at a critical point in our country's history. Against what backdrop is this debate taking place? In my view, there are many great reasons why we have to have this debate.

*[English]*

First, to state the obvious, we live in a very different period of world affairs from the rather more predictable one of almost a

*Government Orders*

decade ago. That was when the last comprehensive updating of Canada's foreign relations policies was undertaken.

Then we wondered whether Mikhail Gorbachev was for real. Almost no one would have believed or predicted the German reunification at that time, or for that matter the swift collapse of the Soviet power. As Mr. Gorbachev, the last President of the Soviet Union observed rather wistfully during the final throes of that momentous upheaval: "Once again history has accelerated its pace".

In retrospect it is clear that the international community was not prepared for so much unprecedented change so soon. There was hardly time to rejoice at the fall of the Berlin wall and to embrace the prospect of the so-called peace dividend when the rhetoric of the gulf war and the new world order took over.

(2005)

That too proved to be ephemeral. As sober second thoughts set in other conflicts flared. Foreign policy analysts and pundits turned their attention to the new security risks of the post cold war era.

Most hopes of the 1990s had been pinned on developing new multilateral arrangements and on strengthening forms of economic and political co-operation. However even at this level as we approach the midpoint of this decade there are still many questions awaiting answers.

The United Nations for example will mark its first half century next year as a financially strapped organization that is in demand in a positive sense and more embattled and in need of reform than ever.

[*Translation*]

Canadians understand that difficult choices are needed in order to formulate a rational plan for managing our common future which is at risk. This brings us to a second important reason for reviewing Canadian policy.

Before the government proceeds to make these choices, as it will have to do sooner or later, Canadians will have to reflect on this issue and share with members of Parliament their views on our country's foreign policy.

Before decisions are made on important aspects of the management of public affairs, Canadians are entitled to be heard in an open and democratic consultation. When institutions responsible for foreign affairs spend Canadians' money, the members of this House, elected to represent their interests and their values, have a responsibility to demand results in return.

We in the Liberal Party were aware of this attitude of Canadians when we began a consultation process several years ago to develop a renewed, more democratic and more independent foreign policy. I hope that such dialogue will enable us to find a consensus among all Canadians on the nature of Canada's key international interests, on what Canada can afford as a

nation and on the best way to meet the challenges of the 1990s and of the next millennium.

[*English*]

I only have a few minutes but I would like to elaborate on what in my view is a balance of caution and inspiration in this populist approach this government has taken in terms of consultations with Canadians. There is caution because we have to be careful not to give the impression of doing all things in all places.

This morning the minister responsible for foreign affairs commented that we must learn to do better with less. Canada as we all know has been spending about \$12 billion a year on defence matters and about \$4 on foreign affairs and trade programs. Given the constraints on those budgets in the foreseeable future it becomes even more important to me to look closely at where and how the dollars are allocated and to get the best value for that in terms of clearly defined, clearly identified priorities and objectives.

Inspiration will be needed. In doing this we will need to look at how key trade-offs should be made and how the different strands of foreign policy can be tied together. How for example should aid, trade, human rights and environmental policies be interrelated? It will be an interesting debate and one that I hope will give us some direction. However it is going to be a tough debate.

Do we have the right structures and institutions for implementing these policies? It may be time to rethink how we organize our foreign policy machinery and processes to meet the new challenges.

[*Translation*]

The Minister of Foreign Affairs told us that he wanted public consultation to be as broad and as thorough as possible.

I am sure that I speak for all hon. members when I say that we approach this review with an open mind and the desire to hear as many Canadians as time and resources will allow.

(2010)

As Chairman of this committee responsible for consulting and listening to Canadians, I personally undertake, along with most of the members of the committee I think, to do my best to understand where we are going and to explain in a report to be tabled in this House by the end of October what we will have heard and understood from testimonies and how we see things.

Let Canadians be warned however that we will not be able to meet all expectations. That is impossible. We will do our best however to meet as many as possible and to take as much time as possible to look for a fair and equitable solution. As I said earlier, we cannot please everybody. When all is said and done, we are the ones who will have to set priorities.

*Government Orders*

When I say we, I mean all of us Canadian parliamentarians. We will be the ones who will have to take into account the representations made to us, the values, the special interests, the day-to-day concerns of Canadians about employment, security, well-being, all of this within the framework of a fair and equitable foreign policy.

That is the challenge facing the members of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade if we want to lead the way for Canada's international relations at a time when world events not only happen much faster but are sometimes very troubling.

[English]

To quote an ancient Chinese curse, we live in interesting times. In this high risk, multi-choice world decisions will have to be taken. That is why it is so important to use this review to prepare ourselves well. We are counting on the knowledge, experience, common sense and the goodwill of Canadians to help us as their elected representatives to carry out this task.

I hope we are successful. I pray we will be successful. I will give it my best.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade):** Madam Speaker, I first want to congratulate the committee chairman, the member for Ottawa—Vanier, on an excellent speech. I commend him for his commitment to the cause of Canada here and abroad.

The committee will be travelling from one end of the country to the other. Representations will be made by groups interested in the issues of foreign aid, foreign policy and so on. At what point in time will the committee which is dealing with defence policy issues and other international and foreign affairs issues present its report to the House of Commons? Will the members of the committee be the same members who are now sitting on the foreign affairs committee or will others be joining it?

**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, some of the answers I will be giving are my own. The steering committee of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade has not yet set its agenda for work and consultation.

I hope we will be ready to go by the end of this month. We will be consulting with Canadians as individuals but also as groups. There will be interest groups and people with a special message to give us. The schedule of meetings has not been established as yet. I wish I could give that schedule tonight. It would save some money on advertising.

The second question was on the work of the defence committee which is presently holding its meetings. It has started work on its order of reference. I believe there are areas which overlap.

Foreign policy first and foremost is the why issue of this exercise. Why Canadians would like to participate in peace-keeping rather than peacemaking is a debate; why Canadians tie environmental issues to the questions of aid and human rights and so on.

(2015)

Defence is more or less the how we do things and that is a special study that defence will be doing as to how best to put into effect the why decision, the policy issues, decided by government and proposed by parliamentarians. I see foreign affairs as the committee that decides why we should be doing these things and defence on matters of defence telling us how best to do that.

I see all the other agencies such as CIDA telling us also as professionals in the field how best to put into action the why decision, the policy issues, that this House will recommend in its report.

I do not know if I answered the member in a satisfactory manner but I tried to address some of his points.

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for the confidence he places in the committee and the members on that committee.

I have one question. How are we going to prevent as a committee the dominance by special interest groups, the sort of overwhelming influx of special interest groups in many areas and how are we going to actually get down to the grassroots of this thing?

I wonder if the member could address that question.

**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, it is a very hard question to answer.

I believe there are two aspects to our study. One of them is the collective aspect of interest groups that have a particular message to put to the committee. We would invite those people to send us their written presentations and we could go through them. I expect the committee will get many of those.

The other aspect is the individual approach, the grassroots approach, the individual Canadian who has ideas and who wants to put them to the committee. We will have to hear those persons.

I am going to propose that we hive off smaller subcommittees of this large committee of 22 people. I do not know yet and I may be doing this in anticipation of the decision but the proposal before us today is that there be 15 members of the House and seven senators. I take it if that happens then we could hive off

smaller groups of say five or six parliamentarians and really go into the grassroots areas of this country, the communities, and hear how they see our direction in the coming few years and possibly into the next century.

Having said that, it will be up to us to give them a fair chance to be heard but as far as the groups are concerned I see them presenting us briefs, as we call them, memoirs—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry, the member's time has expired.

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan):** Madam Speaker, I will be splitting this 20 minutes segment with my colleague, the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

[*Translation*]

I want first of all to urge the people of Canada to accept the offer made by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier, who chairs the committee, to listen to what you have to say because it is essentially the point of my speech today.

[*English*]

I do welcome the opportunity of addressing the House on the topic of Canada's foreign affairs policy.

My feeling is that the more our foreign policy is reviewed publicly, such as in this discussion, the more the policy will be understood and supported by the public. To go a step further, if the discussion is carried outside the House in communities across the country the more accurately will our foreign policy reflect the majority opinion of the electorate. This is particularly important, in my opinion, when it comes to revising or formulating defence policy, which should be a subset of foreign policy.

(2020)

The Canadian public is very supportive of its armed forces in time of war, but it is less interested in time of peace. However, what Canada has experienced in the nearly 50 years since the end of World War II cannot properly be called peace. We have had relative peace within our boundaries but that was so, in large part, because Canadian troops were engaged overseas in smaller wars such as in Korea and in the cold war.

Throughout this half century as well Canadian forces were engaged, as they are at the moment, in peacekeeping operations around the world. The public must realize, therefore, that the terms war and peace are subject to redefinition. It should also accept the responsibility for engaging in this debate on foreign policy including defence and peacekeeping.

In asking for public consideration and input, it might be helpful to do several things. We should probably define peacekeeping, then examine what we have been doing in that field. We should also postulate our ideals of foreign policy. What should Canada's policies be and why? It might then be instructive to

### *Government Orders*

compare the ideal with current policy to see if there are anomalies or gaps in our policy.

Finally, we should zero in on defence policy and the specifics of peacekeeping.

Concerning definitions, the Canadian public should at least be aware of the difference between peacekeeping and peacemaking. Peacekeeping implies that there is an agreement in place, as is the case between Serbians and Croats in parts of the former Yugoslavia. Peacemaking implies an action to bring hostile parties to agreement, which is the case in Bosnia.

In reviewing our foreign and defence policies, the public should decide if it supports both activities and under what circumstances.

If we examine Canada's participation in peacekeeping and peacemaking operations over the years, we find that changes in operations and our commitments have taken place without our necessarily having changed policy. Through an apparent zeal to participate in all peacekeeping operations, we have gradually become immersed beyond the intent of our policy and almost beyond our resources.

We have also learned some lessons over the years. I cite as an example our experience in Indo-China. Canada was part of a moribund commission there for many years. It was a wasted effort. However, when it came time to help the Americans extricate themselves with their prisoners of war from Vietnam in 1973, Canada wisely joined the new commission with much revised terms of reference but pulled out after six months when the main part of the job was over. It made good sense.

We said that we should postulate our foreign policy ideals. What do we believe in as Canadians and therefore what should our foreign policy be?

I believe that we are a generous people who believe in democracy and the rule of law. We do not believe in imperialism and we do have strong humanitarian feelings.

(2025 )

We are also pragmatic enough to believe in collective security. All of these beliefs shape our foreign affairs and defence policies. I do encourage the public to think about these basics and to add its own ideas.

A comparison of our ideals with what we have been doing as a country in peacekeeping should tell us how far off our policies are. My personal conclusion would be that we are fairly close but that a review is very necessary. As said earlier, the public should participate to the maximum extent in that review.

In addition to encouraging public participation in the review process, I would like to leave the House with these thoughts. First, the Canadian forces, through years of efforts overseas, have created for Canada an international reputation of real value. We should do more as a country to capitalize on our

*Government Orders*

standing by taking a greater leadership role in the shaping of international peacekeeping policy and procedures.

Second, in reviewing our foreign and defence policies we should take full account of the work of previous House standing committees. Some of the reports I have read have been excellent and should not be wasted.

Third, if as expected the review reaffirms the role of aid of the civil power for the Canadian forces, it must be confirmed that the forces are of sufficient strength to meet that commitment as well as their other obligations.

In a similar manner, the equipment state of the forces should be checked after the forthcoming review to ensure that it is adequate to perform the given tasks.

Finally, policy review of foreign affairs and defence, including peacekeeping, should be an ongoing process by the departments concerned, by Parliament and by the public.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member on his comments, many of which this government subscribes to in the sense that from time to time we have to revisit any policies in order to ensure they truly reflect the modern age and the needs and aspirations of all those who are affected.

My question to the member is quite specific. Could he tell the House and all Canadians what percentage of assistance his side of the House would support in terms of gross domestic product, in terms of foreign aid that Canada should give to other countries around the world, taking into consideration Canada's position internationally as a member of the United Nations where we have a commitment to fulfil when it comes to the international scene? Also, would his party support the continuation of that level of aid?

**Mr. Ringma:** Mr. Speaker, in responding to the question, my address was specifically on peacekeeping. The question directs itself to foreign aid as well as peacekeeping and so I will try to respond to those two issues.

First, consideration of foreign aid should not be done in isolation of the fact that Canada is spending a great amount on peacekeeping. That should be part of balancing the ledger for us.

(2030)

On foreign aid, I will not give it as a measure of percentage of the gross domestic product but my reckoning is that \$2.5 billion per year at this moment with Canada's vulnerable economic state is too high.

We must continue to give foreign aid, there is no question, particularly for some of the things that we have heard of today such as pure water systems and the like. That is good. That is direct aid to people and we need that.

What we must get away from is some of the government to government aid which finds its way into bottomless ratholes. That we do not need. My response in summary is keep up the peacekeeping. Bill it as part of foreign aid. Cut foreign aid by a measure below \$2.5 billion a year and direct it in the right channels.

**Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I too want to address the foreign affairs review from the standpoint of its relationship with and to defence considerations.

As we have heard before in this place, the end of the cold war and the reduction of the antagonism it engendered between the two superpowers has unhappily not resulted in a world that could look forward to an extended peaceful coexistence.

The world today is probably more volatile and unstable than it was when the Warsaw pact and the iron curtain were alive and well. As a result there continues to be a need for effective defence forces and co-operation in defence matters between like minded people.

There are those who would disagree with this assessment, those who think that Canada should show the world the way by dramatically reducing the Canadian Armed Forces and concentrating those that are left on peacekeeping and community assistance projects.

As idealistic as I am, I cannot agree with this philosophy. Canadians enjoy an excellent way of life and an excellent standard of living. One of the reasons this is so is that over the years we have been willing to commit Canadian support to assist in maintaining democracy and freedom not just at home but in almost every part of the world.

As my colleague pointed out earlier, we are involved in several such endeavours at this moment. Unhappily there are those who mistakenly think that the people in the armed forces tend to be war minded and supportive of belligerent or strong arm policies.

I am here to assure members that while they may be many things, Canadian service men and women are not stupid. They are fully aware that if as a result of deliberate escalation or inadvertent error, a shooting war should develop they as trained members of the armed forces will be first in the line of fire.

No, the men and women of the Canadian forces are very much in favour of keeping the world at peace. They also know that the awareness developed between people in co-operative defence forces often spills over into many other aspects of international relationships.

Thus defence considerations can have considerable impact on foreign relations. As evidence let us examine some of the relationships that have come about as a result of our participation in two world wars, the Korean war, NATO, NORAD, the gulf war and other co-operative military efforts.

*Government Orders*

In so doing, we find that these affiliations have enabled or helped to enable a level of trust and comradeship which has led to a better relationship between our countries, to increased interest in our problems, to more understanding and willingness to accept our position even on matters totally unrelated to things military and finally to increase trade and co-operation between the nations concerned.

For instance, although it is now 50 years since Canadian forces liberated Holland toward the end of the second world war, there is still a special place and warmth in the minds of Netherlanders when they think of, relate to and deal with Canadians today. This special relationship extends beyond those who were physically there during the liberation. It has been taught in school and passed down, so that no matter the age that good feeling is there.

(2035)

This does not mean that the hard-nosed Dutch businessman or woman will not attempt to drive the hardest bargain and extract the best deal when dealing with his or her Canadian counterpart. It does mean that there will be an underlying warmth and some assurance of fair play in the negotiations.

Moving north, our relationship with Norway is favourably affected and influenced by the many Norwegians who took their flying training in Canada during World War II. Not only did they take their flying here, many of them took Canadian wives back to Norway with them after the war.

Unquestionably, these experiences have resulted in a far better relationship between our two countries than would have prevailed had they not occurred. These relationships have been further deepened and strengthened by our mutual participation in NATO. In fact, it would be fair to say that Canadian defence forces operating with or in some cases against other countries have substantially enhanced Canada's stature in the world.

While we are examining how we should shape and conduct our foreign affairs, it would be an expensive and ill-advised oversight to overlook the lucrative opportunities and benefits to be achieved through military co-operation.

Ideally this foreign policy review should have been completed prior to the commencement of any defence policy review. After all, defence policy should be a logical and supportive extension of foreign policy.

Because it has been necessary to convene and conduct these two studies concurrently, it is vitally important that the two committees work closely and co-operatively with each other, exchanging information and keeping updated as the reviews progress.

Moving away from North America and Europe for a moment, I am certain that in their considerations the joint standing committee on foreign affairs and international trade will appreciate that not all democracies are the same and that unlike Canada, in many countries the military is an integral part of government. For example, this is so in Tanzania.

When Tanzania was first establishing independence and requested assistance, Canada dispatched a Canadian forces training team to Tanzania to carry out in-country training there and brought the Tanzanian peoples defence force members to Canada to attend Canadian military training schools here.

Many of those Tanzanian trainees are now experienced senior officers who have considerable influence in their government and who still harbour feelings of warmth and respect toward Canada as a result of their experience with our military personnel. Although now on a much smaller scale, this co-operation continues today.

Make no mistake. These people are Tanzanians first and foremost but a good relationship has been established which can positively influence any negotiations between our two countries.

Considering our interest in and increasing trade with the Pacific rim, it would seem appropriate for the committee to look carefully at the utility of establishing mutually advantageous defence relationships with the countries there. The same rationale applies to our relations with Central and South America.

Whether it be an exchange of military attachés, making training teams available, or opening Canadian forces training schools to their use, good military contracts are an excellent way to improve understanding and co-operation between countries.

One of the often overlooked benefits Canada reaps from Canadian forces involvement overseas is the ambassadorial role that our personnel play. They and in turn our country are liked, respected and in many cases emulated by those they encounter. Also, because these military interrelationships occur across the rank spectrum and thus involve all social walks of life rather than just the relatively high diplomatic level, the effects are far more broadly based.

The results, advantages and benefits of such programs can often far exceed the costs of participation.

To a large extent Canada's prosperity and way of life depends upon international trade and thus on world stability. No one can say that world stability is totally dependent on military defence or assistance pacts. But history has shown that such agreements and particularly those in which Canada has been involved have fostered a better, more predictable and more secure world. In conclusion, while it would be a mistake for the foreign affairs review to concentrate too much attention on defence related

*Government Orders*

activities, it would be an even bigger mistake to overlook their value.

(2040)

To reiterate, it is vital that there be continuing close contact between the joint standing committee on foreign affairs and the joint standing committee on defence.

**Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, this is a very important debate and the review which it launches will be among one of the most important tasks which Parliament will face in the upcoming term.

I am pleased to be able to speak in this debate and to be a part of the process of this review as vice-chairman of the foreign affairs and international trade committee under the direction of the chairman, the member for Ottawa—Vanier.

The minister and others who have spoken before me have set out the broad policy issues which we must examine in this review. Having listened to them I will not repeat their points. My contribution to this debate will be more modest. I hope to add some personal reflections which will highlight the considerations which I believe will be relevant to this review.

When my former colleague on the faculty of the University of Toronto, Marshall McLuhan, coined the phrase “the global village” which was used tonight in this debate, it seemed like an exaggeration but developments since that time have made that statement resonate more truthfully.

My own professional experience prior to being elected to this House led me to work and teach in many countries, the United States, Africa, the Middle East, China and Latin America. In the course of my work it became quite clear to me why it was a Canadian who came up with the phrase global village.

Unlike our neighbours to the south, Canadians have long been conscious of our place in the world. We are more dependent on other nations and peoples by virtue of our trade. Thirty per cent of our economy is dependent on our exports.

We are more aware of the outside world by virtue of the great number of new Canadians who have retained the diversities of their culture while at the same time contributing to our unique Canadian identity.

Our outside activities to which some of the other speakers in the House tonight have referred have brought consciousness to Canadians of the importance of our participation in the United Nations and other peacekeeping activities.

We are also aware, I dare suggest, of the nature of the world outside because of the federal institutions which have allowed in this country a realistic and flexible sharing of powers between various levels of government, a federal arrangement which I would suggest is compared and analysed as a model in many other places in the world, particularly the European union which

is now examining how to deal with exactly that problem and also the problem of globalization which was referred to by the Minister of Foreign Affairs earlier today.

When we look at our great cities such as Vancouver, Toronto, and Montreal, we see features which make them in and of themselves global players by virtue of their trade and communication links, the diversity of their populations and their existing and future infrastructure.

Canadians are interested in and determined to fashion a foreign policy which will determine the place which this country and they themselves will take in a rapidly evolving world.

Canadians are aware of the fact that the former distinction that prevailed between foreign and domestic policy objectives have been blurred. As the Minister for International Trade put it this morning there has been a blurring of these distinctions or as my colleague at the University of Toronto, Sylvia Ostry, puts it “there is nothing more domestic than international trade policy” a matter which we learned in this House when the matter of article XI of the GATT was discussed with great intensity early on in your term, Mr. Speaker, and in my first term in this House.

We learned it in the 1988 election when people said to me that international affairs are not of interest to the people of Canada.

(2045)

Then we were into an election on an international agreement. The 1988 election was fought on an international agreement which had incredible domestic political consequences. It was the failure of the government of the day to recognize the importance of those domestic consequences that caused them to lose the last election.

In this party we did not lose that perspective. We always argued in favour of a coherent policy, the need for domestic adjustment policies, to accompany the international economic reality that was being imposed by that agreement. I and other Canadians look forward to having the chance to focus on how our domestic and international policies will be co-ordinated. We will have many chances to do so in the House.

The first speech I had an opportunity to make in the House was on social policy review. There was some question as to what it had to do with international affairs. Even a matter seemingly as domestic as social policy review must be considered in light of the international reality in which we live. If we believe in globalization we cannot formalize social policies which do not take that reality into account.

Next month there will be a labour market summit in the United States led by the President of the United States in which we will be participating. Labour policies will shortly be on the list of issues to be co-ordinated along with many other issues, if

*Government Orders*

we are to survive in this integrated world in which we are going to live.

As Canadians we must participate in these activities and ensure that our values are reflected in the social charters which will arise in the NAFTA, GATT and World Trade Organization if we are to avoid having solutions imposed upon us from outside. We have a population uniquely qualified in the world to participate in this discussion. This has been brought home to me many times since the election, but I would like to cite a couple of examples.

Recently a constituent of Vietnamese descent from Rosedale came to my Hill office. He was a refugee to this country of only a few years who now has a successful business. He came to say that he had been to the Vietnamese embassy. He wants to get back to Vietnam. He wants to get trade going with Vietnam. He speaks the language and he knows the culture. He is eager and many of his colleagues are eager. With that eagerness comes some extraordinary opportunities. As the secretary of state for Asian affairs said today, we must take a pragmatic approach to human rights when we are looking at these issues.

My friend who came to speak to me in my office is anxious to go back and trade with Vietnam, not only for the commercial purposes that will enable him to do so but because it will enable him to bring some form of relief to the family and friends he left and to encourage an evolution of human rights in that country which he believes will benefit everyone.

We need to have mechanisms in place that will facilitate that reform. It will be our job in committee to examine and to ensure that when the day is done the Government of Canada has created the instruments necessary to enable people like the constituent of whom I spoke to participate in the world in a way that would enrich him, enrich us and enrich the world.

That example is not just one of commerce. I was at a conference at the University of Ottawa last week. I learned that traces of the pollution being produced in the Sea of China, adjacent to Vietnam, are actually being found in our Arctic waters. If we do not trade with Vietnam, if we do not send our expertise there, if we do not deal with the problems of pollution in Vietnam, it is not a Vietnamese pollution problem we will have; it is a Canadian Arctic pollution problem that we will have. We must address this issue. We have the means and we can contribute to finding a solution.

There are Chinese Canadians and Filipino Canadians. I do not mean to hyphenate the term Canadian, but there are Canadians from every walk of life who have experience outside this country that they are eager to bring to bear to enrich the country and to enrich our experience. Those people are insisting we craft or create a truly Canadian foreign policy which reflects our

values and impresses our neighbours. They also recognize that our neighbours have an interest in us.

(2050)

Recently I had the privilege of going to Vancouver with a parliamentary delegation. Some members of the House were also on that trip. As I sat in a helicopter flying over Clayoquot Sound looking at clear-cuts with a communist deputy from Sardinia on my left and an English MEP on my right, I said to myself: "What am I doing looking at clear cutting in Clayoquot Sound with these gentlemen?" One might ask: "What business is it of theirs?" The fact of the matter is that they were saying they were not going to buy our tree products if they did not come over to Canada and become satisfied as to how we were doing business.

We can say we do not like it, but it is a fact of the new life. We can call it a loss of sovereignty if we like, but the lesson we learned from that trip was the following. We agreed with those people in the end that we should create an international agreement which would set up objective rules, which would lay out an objective and a scientific way in which we could determine whether or not clear cutting was being properly conducted, whether or not we were being environmentally safe.

That is the way we will have to go in the future. We will have to craft rules and we will have to craft institutions. Nowhere will it be more important in the matter of institutions than in dealing with our neighbours to the south, the United States of America. I will leave you, Mr. Speaker, with this last thought: Nowhere would I suggest we must be more vigilant in ensuring that we have proper institutions than when dealing with our neighbours to the south.

In that respect we had an interesting witness before the parliamentary committee last night who told us a very important truth. He said the United States was a great nation and it did not respect servile allies. It respects those who stand up for their rights.

The Prime Minister has made it clear that we will craft an independent foreign policy. That independence is not just because we want it as Canadians. It is also the best strategy to pursue in dealing with an ally like the United States which is powerful and strong but willing to respect the strong opinions of others.

In conclusion, we live in an interdependent world. We have in our own ridings, each one of us here, the expertise and knowledge of Canadians. John Polanyi was speaking on peacekeeping just two nights ago in my riding. All of us in the House have a great wealth of expertise in our ridings.

As a member of the committee I look forward to an opportunity of hearing from Canadians. In so doing we will learn about ourselves and how we can best contribute to a peaceful, sus-

*Government Orders*

tainable, prosperous world which we now share with those who were once foreigners but today are our neighbours.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I was tempted to ask my venerable colleague why he stopped when he did. I realize he had about 25 pages of material, as is his wont as a university professor and an expert on international affairs. However I realized that with the time constraints imposed upon him by the hierarchy in this place he had to cut short his deliberations.

I will try to take up where he left off. I hope I will be forgiven if I am a bit more humble in my approach to this topic, not having the erudition and background demonstrated by my esteemed colleague or his outstanding eloquence on the topic.

I do not want to make light of it because my colleague from Rosedale said something that is extremely important for each and every one of us to consider. In the context of an evolving Canada we now have the kinds of expertise for which most countries lust and literally spend hundreds of millions of dollars to develop. I am referring to the human resources afforded us by people from all over the world. They come here with a cultural background that gives them an opportunity to understand the societies, the political systems and the economic systems throughout the world. They also have the networks and the dispositions to take advantage of those opportunities for the greater good of Canada.

One might deduce that perhaps my particular disposition is one that would accord more attention to the international trade side of a foreign affairs and international trade review.

(2055)

I do not want you to fall into a trap, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is absolutely crucial for the well-being of our country to exercise its dynamics on the world stage, to ferret out if need be all the opportunities that will allow for the flourishing of Canadian economic potential and for the capitalization of all the resources we have in great quantity and quality. However, I am first and foremost concerned that Canada takes its rightful place on the world stage as a country or as an entity that will play its role as a leader in social development and will understand the values of social and cultural organizations permeate virtually everything we do and that all our neighbours, all our allies and all our trading partners should emulate.

Therefore I take my lead from my colleague who just finished a most studied presentation before the House and from my other colleagues both on the committee and in the departments as secretaries of state and ministers. These people have served with other members of the House in other capacities. They have learned from those experiences and through that learning have developed an appreciation of what the country ought to do.

Each and every one of them has pointed out a specific, it is almost de rigeur to say, niche in foreign policy and international trade of particular interest. They wanted to give an indication to the House and to all citizens watching the debate that the country never needed as much as it does now a new examination of and definition for its role on the world stage.

That means we have to take to heart, with the kind of energy that only the House can provide, the initiative of our ministers to undertake a studied, thorough, analytical review. It must be as critical as it can to derive all elements which will formulate a policy that is truly reflective of the Canadian entity not only in the latter part of the 20th century but one that will lead us, I dare say, into the 21st century.

The challenges are many. Many of the debates we have in the House on occasion seem to be separated and distinct one from the other, but they are all interrelated. On many occasions, and even today during the course of debate, we talked about the importance of Canada's new policies on the environment, a new definition of international human rights, and the impact of expanded trade agreements on goods, services and the exchange. Even some of our colleagues on the opposite side of the House have pointed out that there are enormous changes in the concepts and definitions of peacekeeping and peacemaking and the consequences that come to bear on domestic policy as a result of those emerging definitions.

They have also acknowledged that there are many consequences and implications for military and civil considerations, police selections, environment and surveillance. These obligations the Canadian people through their representatives, through their government and through the House, accept as part of a leading western society, a leading progressive society and as the leader in social integration and social harmony.

That is no longer a question of domestic policy. It is no longer merely a question of determining priorities in a budget environment. It is no longer merely a question of determining how much money we shall accord here and how many such resources we shall accord there. Rather it is a question of how in their comprehensive total they will contribute to stamping a character which can be defined and sum totalled with one word, and that is Canada.

(2100)

We need public consultation. We need public input. Colleagues from both sides of the House agree that if we are to develop a proprietorship in a policy each and every one of us on both sides of the House and through us the people who elected us have an opportunity to shape the views of the government of the day and governments to come.

Foreign policy is not merely the reflection of the individual on the moment for the moment. It is the vision of a people who decide in total what avenues will be pursued, what goals will be developed and what objectives will be realized in the medium

*Government Orders*

and long term. They can only do that if all the Canadian public has had an opportunity to wax their views in an environment where those who will put those views into effect listen, shape and then implement those views.

In the course of this debate some members have reflected on the problems associated with mixing what seemed to be different objectives, commercial and humanitarian. I said earlier in the debate with colleagues from the Reform Party that I was not sure that the two had to be mutually exclusive.

If Canada is to play a leadership role it is going to exercise influence. Some of that influence will be translated as internal meddling because influence means we will have others accept our values in life, our political values, our cultural and social values as they pertain to organization, development and integration. If we are going to truly exercise that kind of influence then we must be prepared to engage in productive relationships with other countries.

In the past we have focused on Europe and the United States. We have omitted ourselves from other areas such as South America. We have omitted ourselves from the tiger economies of Asia. We have essentially taken a one dimensional approach to our relationships with developing and underdeveloped nations.

Now is the time to approach this in a more comprehensive fashion and through it to have an influence on domestic policy. It is becoming more clear that the primary focus of our government should be one that gives its attention to a policy that expands beyond our borders. Then we can see ourselves not only as we would like to see ourselves but as others would recognize us to be.

I urge all members to support this initiative and then to engage themselves in the review that will follow.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member referred to the input by the people of Canada into this process of developing international affairs policy. The member also referred to Canadians influencing people from other countries through this policy.

Our country has a tremendous debt. Do we have the money to try to influence others outside this country? In my constituency and across the country Canadians have been saying we should spend less on external affairs and on foreign aid in particular. Over the last couple of years polls have shown people across the country believe this.

(2105)

If we are going to ask Canadians for their opinions in terms of foreign aid, is the hon. member willing to vote the way his constituents tell him to vote and reduce the amount of money Canada spends on foreign aid?

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Volpe:** Madam Speaker, I do not see why you have a problem recognizing me; after all, we have known each other for five years now.

*[English]*

In response to my hon. colleague opposite when constituents vested their confidence in me and other members on this side of the House and I dare say even on that side of the House, they thought: "I look at the candidate and the party. I want that individual to stay abreast of all the issues on which he or she will have an impact. I expect that individual to stay informed. I expect that member of Parliament will exercise decisions in the best interests of the country first and foremost, and second in the best interests of all citizens". Sometimes they are exactly the same thing.

The question of whether Canada at this moment in its history has the resources to engage in foreign aid ought to be addressed in the specifics of the analysis. To suggest that is the foremost question today is to negate that we are talking about a comprehensive review of foreign affairs and international trade. Foreign aid is but a portion. Whether it is large or small is immaterial; it is but a portion of that review. It is but an aspect of the obligation we impose upon ourselves under the two headings of international trade and foreign affairs.

It also negates the importance of the commercial aspect when we consider that international trade. Foreign relations and foreign affairs are part and parcel of an economic strategy that will also bring wealth to the individual Canadian citizen, to the individual Canadian entrepreneur, or to groups thereof.

To say that perhaps we should not be focusing on this at this time or to suggest or even to allow others to infer it from what we say damages the comprehensive economic policy that could emerge from a proper analysis and review of international trade and foreign affairs.

I know my colleague opposite would not want us to do any of that. In fact, I am sure he would encourage us to promote any kind of activity that would encourage the development of economic benefits for Canadians.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert):** Madam Speaker, the end of the cold war represents an incredible change in the international order. It is the last episode of an era which will disappear forever. However, the new emerging order is characterized by a

*Government Orders*

great instability, and is jeopardized by new threats such as environmental disasters, the demographic explosion, the wasting of resources, financial crisis, and particularly the impoverishment of people living south of the tropic of Cancer, which is three quarters of the world population.

From a safety standpoint, the increase in the number of problem areas throughout the world compels the international community to search for regulating mechanisms which fit current political and economic realities. We must no longer merely avoid war: We must also seek peace.

With the 21st century looming ahead, peace is a big challenge for the international community, because everywhere there are conflicts which seem more and more difficult to solve.

(2110)

It is in this context that the Canadian government is undertaking a review of its foreign policy. In the coming weeks and months, parliamentarians will have to decide what the new policy should be. We will have to ask ourselves what Canada's role in the new world order should be.

I want to mention a few ideas to think about in the course of the debate on the foreign policy review.

Apart from the violence which, too often, characterizes relations on the international scene, economic activity also influences those relations. In that regard, the globalization of economic activity is one of the outstanding features of the last few decades.

The growing internationalization of goods and services production, distribution and marketing that characterizes this tendency was influenced by the following factors: the lowering of tariff or other trade barriers, the gradual elimination of controls over capital flows, progressive deregulation in many countries, the reduction in transportation and communications costs.

The powerful forces of market globalization strongly influenced by the actions of multinational corporations give us the impression that we are ushering in an era where the worst kind of economic selfishness takes precedence over solidarity and sharing.

In recent years, the gap in the standard of living between the rich countries and the poor countries has become wider. According to the United Nations, this gap has doubled in the last 30 years. As victims of war and the international financial crisis, the people of the third world have become increasingly marginalized.

Malnutrition, the lack of democratic rights, the denial of basic human needs and the 17 million refugees in 1991, in addition to the 30 million displaced people, prevent us from turning a blind eye to the inappropriate development of the southern hemisphere countries, as our reality will be affected if only with respect to immigration and the environment.

Most developing countries were hurt by the economic crisis in the current global climate. In the 1980s, the reduced terms of trade were accompanied by the debt crisis and the overexploitation of natural resources to resolve this crisis. Caught in a vicious circle, the countries of the south cannot find a solution to this situation that has become intolerable for their population.

Partly responsible for this drama since they created the global economic configuration inherited from colonialism, the industrialized countries are also its victims as they will have to pay for environmental disasters, which do not recognize political borders.

We can no longer try to solve these problems without thinking that sustainable development is the cornerstone of the global socio-environmental chessboard. What does the Liberal government think of this?

Since a lot of people still believe in the old saying charity begins at home, the Canadian government has shown a tendency in recent years to reduce its development assistance budget. Unfortunately, this tendency is shortsighted and based on an erroneous assessment of the global situation as the millennium comes to an end.

It would be appropriate to briefly examine the evolution of aid to developing countries to show Quebecers' and Canadians' solidarity with their disadvantaged brothers and sisters throughout the world in the last 40 years.

In 1950, the external aid office, the ancestor of CIDA, had a development assistance budget of \$11 million. By 1967, its budget had grown to \$279 million. In 1968, the Canadian International Development Agency was created. CIDA never became a separate department. It was created without an incorporating act and comes under a statutory authority that gives it the power to spend money.

In his last report, the Auditor General of Canada points out CIDA's uncomfortable position under the sometimes undue pressures exerted by several departments such as foreign affairs, international trade, and national defence, not to mention Canadian businesses involved in international activities.

(2115)

Legally, CIDA reports to the Department of Foreign Affairs, but its mandate has never really been specified. In principle, it should advise the government on co-operation issues; in practice, we have the impression that it responds to influence more than it really influences others.

Since it is not a department and since there is no minister with a mandate only for development assistance, Canadian ODA has never reached the internationally recognized standard of 0.7 per cent of GDP. In 1993, Canada spent only 0.4 per cent of its GDP, which is much less than what many industrialized countries spent on development assistance, as the following figures show: Norway, 1.16 per cent; Denmark and Sweden, 1 per cent; the

Netherlands, 0.86 per cent; France, 0.63 per cent; Finland, 0.62 per cent; Canada, 0.40 per cent.

While the federal government spent hundreds of millions of dollars on advertising Canada's 125th anniversary and sending its propaganda to all Canadian households, at the same time, it lowered the aid budget for developing countries.

The early 1990s marked the end of any measure to achieve the goal of 0.7 per cent. The 1991 budget not only further restricted development assistance but it extended aid to include the countries of eastern Europe and of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

In his 1992 economic statement, the then Minister of Finance cut international aid by \$50 million. The last budget reduced the international aid envelope by 2 per cent and it will be cut by the same amount again in 1995.

Canada's aid strategy will soon be at a crossroads.

To this decrease in aid for developing countries must be added something else that reduces the impact of Canadian ODA: the scattergun approach. This approach no doubt confirms the many influences that turn CIDA away from its objectives. The charter of official development assistance from *Sharing Our Future* bases Canadian aid on the following four principles:

First, the fight against poverty; the main objective of development assistance is to help the poorest countries in this world; second, aid must seek to strengthen the human and institutional resources of developing countries so that they can solve their problems themselves; third, development needs must take priority in setting goals for official development assistance; fourth, development assistance must help to strengthen ties between Canadian institutions and citizens and those of third world countries.

Despite such clear objectives, the Auditor General, no offence to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, points out major shortcomings in what CIDA is doing: lack of clear, precise objectives and lack of coherence; dispersion and chronic lack of focus in CIDA's objectives; red tape favoured to the detriment of development content. On this point, I add that it is embarrassing to recall that for bilateral aid or the geographic program, CIDA uses 600 people to supervise the work of 125 people in the field. At the same time, a small organization like CECI sends 250 co-operants to carry out specific small projects.

The final shortcoming mentioned by the Auditor General is the limited knowledge of and minimal learning ability for accountability with respect to results.

On the other hand, the Auditor says he is sympathetic to CIDA, since it is subject to many constraints and influences. So,

### *Government Orders*

what is at issue is not so much how CIDA is managed as the lack of legal framework which makes it vulnerable.

In fact, Canadian development assistance increasingly finds itself torn between assistance and foreign trade. Which is to be favoured? This question sums up pretty well the whole problem. Again, the old saying "grasp all, lose all" is rather appropriate with regard to CIDA.

Let us not forget that Canada's ODA encompasses several programs which further dilutes goal attainment by involving more and more people. Although the figures do not apply specifically to Canada, the 1992 report on the United Nations development program is particularly bleak and calls into question ODA practices in developed countries.

(2120)

In spite of these flaws revealed by the UNDP, definite progress have been made over the past 40 years in developing countries: life expectancy went from 40 to 63 years; the infant mortality rate dropped from 190 per 1,000 to 80 per 1,000 and the ratio of deaths of children under five years of age from 300 to 120 while, between 1970 and 1990, literacy grew from 23.8 to 48 per cent in Africa, from 44 to 64 per cent in Asia and from 73 to 84 per cent in Latin American and the Caribbean.

Yet, absolutely scandalous gaps continue to exist in terms of the per capita GNP for instance. Here are a few examples: in sub-Saharan Africa, the GNP was \$120 in 1968 and reached only \$330 in 1988; in South Asia, it was \$100 in 1968 and \$320 in 1988; in East Asia and Asia-Pacific, it was \$100 in 1968 and had grown to \$550 in 1988. Meanwhile, in Latin America and the Caribbean, it varied from \$490 and \$1,850 and in the Middle East and North Africa, it went from \$220 in 1968 to \$1,210 in 1988.

During that time, in OECD countries, the per capita GNP jumped from \$2,750 in 1968 to as much as \$17,468 in 1988. In 1993, OECD nations allocated about \$71 billion to official development assistance, while a 2 per cent annual growth in the economy of poor countries would cost industrialized countries \$200 billion a year. When faced with needs of this magnitude, we all too often give up. I remind members that these same OECD countries spent in excess of \$370 billion on national defence in 1992.

Therefore, the problem is not one of resources, but rather of resource allocation. Canada's defence budget for 1994 is \$11.5 billion, while \$2.8 billion has been budgeted for assistance to developing countries. One can assume that the powerful defence industry lobby has a great interest in seeing this budgetary structure remain in place.

The Canadian government, cannot, however, continue indefinitely to support these questionable choices. By maintaining the gap between defence spending and development assistance spending, we perpetuate the belief that if poor countries cannot climb out of their state of poverty, the only solution left is for us

*Government Orders*

to arm ourselves to ensure our security in the face of a future revolt. Are we being foolish or reckless?

Any future foreign policy should settle this debate and come down on the side of government funding for development assistance. Canada could take on a leading role in this area and map out a new course to follow in the field of co-operation and development in the 21st century.

Moreover, Quebecers and Canadians are keenly aware of this new world vision which is tied not to the arms race, but to solidarity and sharing. It is no coincidence that roughly 250 aid agencies are members of the Canada Council for International Co-operation, the CCIC, and the Association québécoise des organismes de coopération internationale, l'AQOCI. These NGOs are driven by the generosity and dedication of thousands of volunteers who donate their time and money to help and ease the suffering of the poorest and most destitute men, women and children in the world.

In its foreign policy review, the Government of Canada must consider the objectives pursued by NGOs. It is generally recognized that these agencies are the most efficient channels for development assistance.

In the years to come, the Canadian government, as stated by the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the House on February 9, will be expected to increase its support for NGOs. At the present time, NGOs receive only 10 per cent of the ODA budget. This percentage must increase, especially since amounts allocated by the Canadian government are matched by the substantial amounts invested by development co-operation agencies in their development projects.

(2125)

Because NGOs have no political ties with the often illegitimate governments of poor countries, they are unlikely to be obliged to abandon their activities in countries with a record of gross human rights violations, since their assistance is always directed to people, which unfortunately is not always the case with bilateral aid.

If we consider the fourth main principle of the ODA charter, which is that development assistance must help strengthen ties between Canadian citizens and institutions and those in the Third World, I think it is clear that the best vehicle for achieving this objective is the NGOs, whose workers merge with the social and cultural fabric of the people they help.

At the other end of the spectrum, we find large Canadian companies carrying out turn-key projects in developing countries which preclude this merging with the population, create even greater dependency and, in the final analysis, guarantee maintenance contracts for these companies. Our foreign policy review should stress these major issues: Does Canadian ODA serve the interests of a few Canadians rather than those of the poorest countries? These are a few of the aspects of develop-

ment assistance which the Bloc québécois would like to see considered in the context of a foreign policy review.

In concluding, I want to express my disapproval of the fact that the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade is being merged with that of the Senate. I object on several grounds. In the light of budgetary cutbacks, I think such concerns should be reflected in all decisions made by the government. In this case, having senators on the joint committee will add to operating expenses if the committee plans sittings away from Parliament Hill.

Furthermore, I also see this as a sign of panic on the part of the Liberal Party, which is afraid to see the party it resembles most, the Conservative Party, disappear altogether. To ensure the Conservatives are represented, the Liberals are prepared to appoint committee members from their supply of federalists. This means putting elected and non-elected members of Parliament on the same footing. This is unacceptable in a society that is proud of its democratic roots.

A survey conducted across Canada last summer indicated that more than 60 per cent of Canadians were in favour of abolishing the Senate outright. It is certainly not appropriate at this time to give the senators a legitimacy they have already lost as far as public opinion is concerned.

[English]

**Mr. Jake E. Hooppner (Lisgar—Marquette):** Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member's comments and I am impressed with his generosity.

I would like him to answer a question. I produced grain and livestock on my farm for years and years and I am producing more every year and it does not seem to keep up with the bills.

I am now at the stage at which I am old enough and fortunate enough to have some grandchildren. Every time I welcome one of them into this world I have to tell them they have \$24,000 of debt. The next one has more debt.

How am I going to convince my grandchildren that I have spent their fortune already by being so generous. Can the member answer that for me? I have a great problem with spending somebody else's inheritance before I look after my own.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paré:** Madam Speaker, I, too, have grandchildren. I do not want to leave them a country such as Canada the way it is now. However, I do not think that it is Canadian assistance to developing countries that put Canada in this situation. I simply want to point out the incredible gap between the nearly \$12

*Government Orders*

billion we invest in national defence and the \$2.5 billion to \$2.8 billion we spend on aid to developing countries.

We must realize that what we do not do for developing countries in the coming years is precisely what our children and grandchildren will criticize us for in 20 years, as the world order will be completely destroyed and the developing countries, the third world countries, will end up by imposing the law of the majority.

(2130)

I think we must clearly agree that it is necessary to increase our aid to developing countries and that the arms race taking place around the world is just about the most stupid thing we have seen in the 20th century.

[*English*]

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Madam Speaker, it is a great privilege today to speak on a subject that is close to my heart and the most valuable thing we possess beyond our good health. That is human rights, the right to live in peace, say, do and go where we want within the confines of a fair, compassionate legal system, free of harassment and secure in due process. As the name implies, they are not a privilege but an undeniable right as a member of the human race.

We in this beautiful country are very fortunate to be in one of the few countries where its people can express their human rights to their fullest potential. Tragically the same cannot be said for most countries in the rest of the world.

The end of the cold war with its two warring superpowers has given rise I think to an environment of greater political instability and has unleashed decades of seething ethnic and tribal tensions; for example, Yugoslavia, Somalia and, right around the corner, South Africa.

This will give rise to more bloody regional or civil conflicts and the rise of smaller, non-functional or poorly functional nation states with their nationalism, tribalism and, at times, intolerant attitudes and behaviours.

Added to this melting pot of troubles are a number of other factors. Developing nations economies are either stagnant or have regressed dramatically over the past 20 years. Corrupt leaders have throttled and pillaged their economies for their own ends, pocketing foreign aid for themselves. Foreign governments in many cases have given aid for prestigious megaprojects that have often wound up being megaflops instead of concentrating on small scale rural projects.

I will give an example. Sub-Saharan Africa, exclusive of South Africa, will take 40 years to get to the same level of economy that it had in 1970. If we take Nigeria out of that equation, it is going to take 100 years for that part of the world,

that represents a population twice the size of America, to get back to where it was in 1970.

Another factor is a world population that is spiralling out of control. In fact by the year 2050 we will have a population that will exceed 10 billion or more than twice what it was in 1990. These numbers will outstrip, I feel, the ability of this planet to adequately provide for its inhabitants and leave the majority of people with an appalling quality of life on a planet that is suffering from a significant amount of environmental degradation. Examples of this we can currently see.

I would suggest that we would in part concentrate our efforts on providing aid in conjunction with population control in many of these third world countries.

When we put all these factors together we have a climate that is ripe for conflict, struggle and human rights abuses. Although we may say we live in a beautiful and big country with a small population and that many times the situations seem far distant from us, make no mistake about it, what happens half a world away will sooner or later wind up on our doorstep.

As has been mentioned here before by some hon. members, I like to think of ourselves not necessarily as Canadians first but as citizens of this planet. If we all practised that perhaps we would be able to engage in a little bit more tolerance between each other.

Abuses of human rights such as detention without trial, torture, rape, extrajudicial executions are commonplace and occur in such diverse countries as Iraq, China, Liberia, Brazil, Egypt, El Salvador, Angola and Burundi, just to name a few.

My first personal experiences with gross human rights violations came when I was working in Africa in the 1980s. Here I saw people who had had chunks of their flesh torn out, whose human rights were trampled, who were tortured with hot irons, who were gang raped, who were brutally beaten and who were murdered. Once you see this first-hand you cannot turn your back on it. You feel compelled by every part of your soul to do something about it.

(2135)

The response of the international community has in many cases been abysmal, particularly with smaller countries where people tend not to care too much about what happens. The world and the international community seem to deal with human rights violations in other countries only when it is politically expedient or when the media has thrust it on to the front stage so that it cannot be ignored.

Self interest has directed many governments' response to human rights and violations of friends of a country are often met with silence while those that are enemies of a country are publicly and vigorously castigated. This shows a terrible lack of

*Government Orders*

political integrity, foresight and compassion with respect to foreign policy.

What can we do about this? I should say that I am proud that we are one of very few countries in the world, one of only a handful I think, which can actually speak credibly on the matter of human rights which makes it more imperative that we do so.

First, I suggest that we publicly castigate countries that commit gross human rights abuses. We must take a lead role in mobilizing other nations to force the country in question to mend its ways. International co-operation is the most expeditious way of dealing with this.

There are certain techniques we can use and some that have been underutilized in the past. Most of them involve economic levers against the guilty party, for example, via the World Bank, the IMF. I think country to country loans are a powerful and often underutilized technique and can be very effective.

We also need to tie economic aid and trade packages to human rights. Sports sanctions and the freezing of state assets are two other options that can be utilized under certain circumstances.

A second thing that we as a country can do is to start looking at the United Nations and help to mobilize the countries in the UN to utilize it as the primary force to act as the advocate for human rights in the world.

The following are some of my recommendations. First we have to define the various courses of action that we can take against states which commit gross human rights violations and get the acceptance of the UN body at large to follow suit when this occurs.

Second, we must put forth an early, firm and decisive action on the part of the UN against brutal regimes and anticipate problems before they occur. We must anticipate these trouble spots and act early. A couple of examples might be Mr. Zhirinovsky and his so-called democratic group in Russia. Another one that is happening very close is South Africa. I just would make an aside and say that we as a country have to support democratic reform in that country. If South Africa falls and falls into the same morass and quagmire as has occurred in most sub-Saharan African countries after their independence, then we will lose the whole southern half of the continent for the next 50 to 100 years. I think it is very important that if we invest now it will pay off amply in the future. An ounce of prevention, as they say, is worth a pound of cure. Yugoslavia is an excellent example where we did not take the initiative early enough and now we are paying for it in spades.

Another thing we need to push for on the world stage is to support the international tribunal against war crimes. We must make it known on the public stage that individuals who commit gross human rights violations are going to be met with the full and effective force of the international community.

As an aside I would also push for this country to press for the banning, as I have said before in this House, of anti-personnel devices world-wide. These devices have no role to play in war. They are meant purely to maim innocent civilians and destabilize a country for decades to come, even after peace has occurred.

For us to do these things and to forge a consensus among other countries and to stop flagrant abuses of human rights will require clarity of vision, unshakeable determination and backbone. When you look, as I have said, into the terror-filled eyes of innocent civilians who have had their basic human rights trampled and see the despair and suffering they are enduring, you cannot turn your back on it. In fact, with every fibre of your heart and soul you are compelled to help them.

It is our moral obligation to this beautiful, cruel, frustrating world that we live in to provide the international leadership to fight for one of mankind's most basic needs.

(2140)

**Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound):** Madam Speaker, since 1982 the Department of Foreign Affairs has administered the federal government's program for the promotion of Canadian exports.

In recent years this program has been criticized by academics, the private sector, provincial governments, government employees and others for the following reasons.

First, employees and the workings of the TCS have been integrated only imperfectly into the culture and operations of the Department of Foreign Affairs. The pursuit of mundane commercial interests is not a natural activity of individuals who joined foreign affairs and were trained to become diplomats dealing with international politics, war and peace and the nation's external security. While there are many career officers who work hard on their assignments in the commercial field, such assignments continue to bring little prestige and opportunities for advancement in the institutions hierarchy.

Second, the private sector has expressed discontent with the lack of input into the work of the federal trade promotion work. The Department of Foreign Affairs is heavily bureaucratized and never has had a tradition of working with the private sector in the pursuit of its traditional mandate.

Efforts to rectify this situation through the creation of consultative committees have not been a great success. One aspect of the criticism by the private sector is that the operational objectives of the trade commissioner services are often linked with political goals.

The promotion of political and military alliances, of human rights and democratization and of international development efforts can and often do interfere with the promotion of international trade.

*Government Orders*

Third, the work of foreign affairs duplicates and overlaps with that undertaken by provincial governments. In major countries abroad, trade representatives from the two levels of government compete with each other. Further duplication occurs as federal trade offices throughout Canada deal with the private sector and promote exports in competition with provincial officers.

Fourth, even within the federal government there are at least 15 other departments that undertake trade promotion activities of their own. CIDA-INC as it is known is one of them. In some instances its activities are better financed than those of the Department of Foreign Affairs.

Efforts to co-ordinate the different federal departments' offices through foreign affairs have not been totally successful. Time does not permit me to dwell further on the negative assessments of the Department of Foreign Affairs trade promotion efforts.

Instead, I must now turn to some positive suggestions for reform of Canada's program. Suggestions for change involve different models of organization based mostly on real world experiences. There is a proposal to create a crown corporation independent of direct political influence.

The Government of British Columbia recently created such a crown corporation. Another model envisages the complete privatization of the service. This best describes the system used by Britain where executive agencies with independent management have been established on a contractual basis.

The removal of the bureaucratic culture from these agencies has resulted in substantial performance increases. This precedent can be applied to the trade commissioner service offered by our federal government. However there is also great merit in an approach I am investigating now in the context of preparing a private member's bill. The approach involves the use of a commercialized service to deal with the problems of the present system.

The following represents my preliminary thinking on the subject and I welcome suggestions for improvement from anyone interested in the subject.

I propose to call the new organization the Canadian Trade Organization. Let me call it CTO for short. Its headquarters in Canada will be located in one of the large commercial centres like Toronto, Montreal or Vancouver with branches in other cities. The CTO will have offices in foreign countries with headquarters in the capital like Rome and subsidiary offices in major cities like Milan.

(2145)

The responsibility for the Canadian operations will be in the hands of a board of directors consisting one-quarter each of representatives nominated by the federal government, the provincial governments, private sector organizations like the

Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Exporters' Association, and general membership consisting of Canadian, foreign and multinational firms.

The day to day operations of the CTO are undertaken by a private staff, the executive director of which is also on the board of directors. Governments can have liaison officers on the operational staff.

Financing of the CTO will come one-quarter each from the four groups represented on the board of directors. In addition the organization is required to sell its services to private firms and administer Canadian involvement in trade fairs throughout the world. This is important.

Profit sharing or bonus payments to employees successful in such private sector sales will assure that the CTO is responsive to market needs. Such needs often involve Canadian governments in their roles as diplomats and makers of industrial policies. The proposed links of these government offices with the CTO through the board of directors and liaison officers assures that the public interest will adequately be reflected in the employees' work.

Periodic meetings, the publication of a newsletter and social affairs arranged in different cities will provide a constant link among directors, staff and the private sector in Canada. Contacts through such arrangements will provide the proper environment for the flourishing of commercial activities of CTO.

I now turn to the business offices of the CTO abroad. They will have advisory councils consisting of representatives from the local Canadian embassy or high commission and from local industry. The latter will most likely consist of multinational corporations, Canadian firms with representatives abroad and local firms interested in trade with Canada.

The operations of the foreign business offices will be in the hands of Canadian managers who work with staff consisting predominantly of persons who speak the local language, have local contacts and are familiar with the country's business practices.

Financing for these offices will come from the same sources as that for the operations located in Canada, that is federal and provincial governments as well as interested parties in the private sector.

In addition special efforts will be made to obtain financing through contracts with private sectors abroad and in Canada. These contracts will involve market research, establishing commercial contacts, assuring representation at fairs and exhibits, keeping an eye on technological and product developments and many other activities that would help promote international trade and Canadian competitiveness.

*Government Orders*

In many smaller countries CTO offices will be attached to local embassies or consular offices. In larger countries they will be housed in separate quarters though a close link with the diplomatic representative is essential.

The preceding is only a rough and preliminary sketch of the institutional, financial and operational characteristics of the proposed replacement of the international trade promotion system which is presently operated by the Department of Foreign Affairs.

My sketch should suffice to show how the commercialization of these trade promotion services will first, eliminate the currently existing duplication of government services. Second, it will permit its governors and operators to concentrate on commercial issues while it retains the benefit of access to and advice from Canada's professional diplomats in foreign affairs. Third, it creates private sector incentives for professional staff to serve the needs of Canadian business. Finally, it removes domestic and international political agendas from the trade promotion program.

In conclusion, I note that it should be possible to structure the CTO so that the government cost of providing trade promotion services will be lowered considerably. Such savings should be welcomed by the federal and provincial treasuries and departments like foreign affairs during this period of extreme financial restraint.

The commercialization of the service would permit governments to focus better on the delivery of services in which they have a competitive advantage. The financial and operational involvement of the private sector would increase operational efficiency of the service. It would also raise general interest in international trade.

I believe that out of the shortcomings of the current trade commissioner service in foreign affairs arises an opportunity for change that will produce nothing but winners.

(2150)

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member welcomed suggestions on his concept of a Canadian trading organization. I am wondering whether he is familiar with a parliamentary task force that submitted a report over 12 years ago now. It was not called a Canadian trading organization. It was called a national trading corporation.

This all-party task force which travelled across Canada and actually through Europe, looked at trading houses, looked at bartering, et cetera. The whole idea was that if we could help small and medium sized businesses increase their exports by 10 per cent and if we could get some firms that were not exporting into the export business, we could generate \$10 billion worth of additional trade. That was back then; it would be more like \$100 billion now.

The concept was that this national trading corporation would be funded 50 per cent by government and 50 per cent by the private sector. As we know, many countries today will not trade with another unless there is some government involvement and that was the idea of the 50-50 per cent.

Unfortunately on the day when the special parliamentary task force tabled its report the Conservatives at the time submitted a minority report and shot down the main report. They agreed with the recommendations. Actually, many of the recommendations came from the Conservatives. Unfortunately on the day that the report was tabled it was not supported.

I recommend it to the hon. member. I believe there will be a copy of the report in the parliamentary library. I know it would be of great interest to him because I think that is the kind of foreign affairs, independent Canadian foreign policy, that we should be looking at.

I really appreciated his creative suggestions. It is too bad that he was not here 12 years ago.

**Mr. Grubel:** Madam Speaker, I thank very much the hon. member for pointing out the existence of this report and my executive assistant will go after it tomorrow morning. Perhaps we can speak a little bit more about my ideas.

I have already been invited to send my concept to a number of private sector groups and government people for comment. Then perhaps something can develop out of it with the hon. member's support, maybe a private member's bill. If he wishes I will happily give all of these ideas to the government to do something good for Canada.

I am most pleased with the hon. member's comments and thank him very much.

**Mr. Flis:** If we have some time, Madam Speaker, I do want to caution the hon. member that in our findings the trade commissioners were the most efficient and the most effective in promoting export trade.

That could have changed over the 10 years, but we complimented the trade commissioners in our report because we got very positive feedback on their service and their effectiveness.

**Mr. Grubel:** Madam Speaker, I thank again the hon. member for his comment.

I want to make sure that I am not ever wanting to depreciate the efforts that people make. I believe, however, that the effectiveness of efforts made by individuals is determined by the institutions and the incentive structures in which they work.

It has been suggested to me by people who are intimately in contact with this that we can bring the system we now have into the next century by looking at what other countries have done. They have removed it from their foreign affairs departments where the culture simply does not seem to be functioning as well as it does when the institution is separate, profit motivated and the private sector has a direct stake in it. That is my basic concept.

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The question is on the amendment.

Pursuant to order made earlier this day, the recorded division is deemed requested and is deferred until the end of the time period for government business on Wednesday, March 16, 1994.

Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.)

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 15, 1994

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Canadian Foreign Policy

Mr. Ouellet ..... 2253

### Order in Council Appointments

Mr. Milliken ..... 2253

### Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Milliken ..... 2253

### Non-Profit Organization Director Remuneration Disclosure Act

Bill C-224. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 2253

Mr. Bryden ..... 2253

### Petitions

#### Latvia

Mr. Flis ..... 2253

### Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Milliken ..... 2253

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Canadian Foreign Policy

Motion ..... 2254

Mr. Ouellet ..... 2254

Mr. Bouchard ..... 2262

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	2268
Amendment .....	2270
Mr. Plamondon .....	2271
Mr. Cannis .....	2271
Mr. Crête .....	2272
Mr. MacLaren .....	2272
Mr. Paré .....	2275
Mr. Penson .....	2276
Mr. Bergeron .....	2276
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	2279
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	2279
Mr. Penson .....	2283
Mr. Strahl .....	2283
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	2284

## **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

### **World Junior Alpine Championships**

Mrs. Bakopanos .....	2284
----------------------	------

### **Revenue Canada's 1-800 Information Number**

Mr. Sauvageau .....	2284
---------------------	------

### **Euthanasia**

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	2285
--------------------------------------	------

### **Collège Militaire Royal de Saint-Jean**

Mr. Bernier (Beauce) .....	2285
----------------------------	------

### **Human Rights**

Mr. Malhi .....	2285
-----------------	------

### **The Late Dave McComb**

Mr. Jackson .....	2285
-------------------	------

### **Linguistic Minorities**

Mr. Leroux .....	2285
------------------	------

**Breast Cancer**

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) ..... 2286

**Port of Halifax**

Mr. MacDonald ..... 2286

**World Consumer Rights Day**

Mr. O'Brien ..... 2286

**Immigration**

Mr. Ianno ..... 2286

**Forum de la solidarité sociale du Québec**

Mrs. Lalonde ..... 2287

**Canadian Curling Championship**

Mr. Forseth ..... 2287

**Canadian Medical Hall of Fame**

Mrs. Barnes ..... 2287

**Human Rights**

Mrs. Terrana ..... 2287

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Job Creation**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 2288

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 2288

Mr. Bouchard ..... 2288

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 2288

Mr. Bouchard ..... 2288

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 2288

**Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean**

Mr. Bachand ..... 2288

Mr. Massé .....	2289
Mr. Bachand .....	2289
Mr. Massé .....	2289

**Job Creation**

Mr. Manning .....	2289
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	2289
Mr. Manning .....	2289
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	2289
Mr. Manning .....	2289
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	2289

**Collège militaire royal de Saint–Jean**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	2290
Mr. Massé .....	2290
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	2290
Mr. Massé .....	2290

**Small Business**

Mr. Silye .....	2290
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	2290
Mr. Silye .....	2290
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	2291

**Indian Affairs**

Mr. Duceppe .....	2291
Mr. Irwin .....	2291
Mr. Duceppe .....	2291
Mr. Irwin .....	2291

**Interest Rates**

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	2291
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	2291
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	2291
Mr. Walker .....	2292

**Publishing Industry**

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	2292
--------------------------------------------	------

Mr. Peters .....	2292
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	2292
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	2292

### **Unemployment Insurance**

Mrs. Parrish .....	2292
Mr. Bevilacqua .....	2292

### **Ministerial Regional Offices**

Mr. White (North Vancouver) .....	2293
Mr. Eggleton .....	2293
Mr. White (North Vancouver) .....	2293
Mr. Dingwall .....	2293

### **The Environment**

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	2293
Ms. Copps .....	2293
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	2293
Ms. Copps .....	2293

### **Immigration**

Mr. Hanger .....	2293
Mr. Marchi .....	2294
Mr. Hanger .....	2294
Mr. Marchi .....	2294

### **Government Expenditures**

Mr. Dromisky .....	2294
Mr. Eggleton .....	2294

### **Overfishing on the High Seas**

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) .....	2294
Ms. Copps .....	2295
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) .....	2295
Mr. Anderson .....	2295

### **Agriculture**

Mr. Hart .....	2295
----------------	------

Mr. Goodale .....	2295
Mr. Hart .....	2295
Mr. Goodale .....	2295

**Information Highway**

Mr. de Jong .....	2295
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) .....	2296

**Guaranteed Annual Minimum Income**

Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	2296
Mr. Bevilacqua .....	2296

**Presence in Gallery**

The Speaker .....	2296
-------------------	------

**The Late Gilbert Rondeau**

Mr. Leroux (Shefford) .....	2296
Mr. Ouellet .....	2296

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Canadian Foreign Policy**

Consideration resumed of motion and amendment .....	2297
Mr. Penson .....	2297
Mr. Flis .....	2298
Mr. Chan .....	2298
Mr. Canuel .....	2301
Mr. Strahl .....	2302
Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil) .....	2302
Mrs. Debien .....	2305
Mr. O'Brien .....	2307

**Business of the House**

Mr. Milliken .....	2308
(Motions moved and agreed to). .....	2308

## **Canadian Foreign Policy**

Consideration resumed of motion and amendment . . . . .	2309
Mr. Marchi . . . . .	2309
Mr. Lebel . . . . .	2311
Mr. Canuel . . . . .	2312
Mr. Strahl . . . . .	2313

## **PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

### **Criminal Code**

Bill C-214. Motion for second reading . . . . .	2315
Mr. Boudria . . . . .	2315
Mrs. Venne . . . . .	2317
Mr. Ramsay . . . . .	2318
Mr. MacLellan . . . . .	2319

### **Suspension of Sitting**

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 6.10 p.m.) . . . . .	2321
-----------------------------------------------------------------	------

## **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

### **Supply**

#### **Allotted Day (S.O. 81)—The Budget**

Consideration resumed of motion of Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge) . . . . .	2321
(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division.) . .	2321
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 41; Nays, 193 . . . . .	2321

### **Canadian Foreign Policy**

Consideration resumed of motion and amendment . . . . .	2322
Mr. Strahl . . . . .	2322
Mr. Volpe . . . . .	2323
Mr. Flis . . . . .	2324
Mr. Benoit . . . . .	2327
Mr. Ramsay . . . . .	2328
Mr. Hoeppepner . . . . .	2328

Mr. Harb .....	2329
Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier) .....	2330
Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier) .....	2330
Mr. Harb .....	2332
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	2332
Mr. Ringma .....	2333
Mr. Harb .....	2334
Mr. Frazer .....	2334
Mr. Graham .....	2336
Mr. Volpe .....	2338
Mr. Benoit .....	2339
Mr. Paré .....	2339
Mr. Hoepfner .....	2342
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	2343
Mr. Grubel .....	2344
Mr. Flis .....	2346
Division on amendment deferred .....	2347