

Supply

were being established so painfully in Poland last year under Solidarity.

As a result of the Prime Minister's deficiencies in this respect the government has failed either to lead or to educate Canadians on foreign policy matters. Foreign policy is any little matter the Prime Minister is interested in at the moment. For example, the Prime Minister whined to the United States of America and to the other six powers that comprised the economic summit some years ago because Canada was not to be included. Because Canada pleaded to be included and because the United States took pity on us and our Prime Minister, we were included in the economic summits. We are attending the one which starts this week because the United States of America listened to the pleas of the Prime Minister, who wanted to be included and who will go there this week not to put forward some far-reaching design of Canada's but to whine about United States interest rates and to try to pretend that it is the American economy and American policy which have Canada where it is today economically and which have devastated Canada from one end to the other. He will go there and use that opportunity to try to find a scapegoat in the United States, the very country which made it possible for Canada to attend. That is what foreign policy is in the Trudeau era.

The Prime Minister also does not think much, apparently, of his Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan). He does not appear to think he is up to being the spokesman for our foreign policy or external affairs generally. When that minister has taken that occasional stand, he has inevitably been contradicted by the Prime Minister, with the result that our foreign policy is and appears to be contradictory and confused.

What are some examples? One was the response to the Polish imposition of martial law in Poland in December when the Prime Minister took a very easy going approach to that, almost approving—really approving—while the Secretary of State for External Affairs seemed to take his line from Mr. Haig in the United States to take a tougher line. Further confirmation was the supposed reorganization of the Department of External Affairs on January 12 of this year when this minister was cluttered up with two other ministers hung around his neck like albatrosses. One was the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Lumley). Some people believe that there is an argument to be made for putting those people into the Department of External Affairs. But a third minister, one designated the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. De Bané), the former minister for DREE, has been added. This only causes confusion in the Department of External Affairs. It shows how little the Prime Minister trusts the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Why was it necessary to appoint a Minister of State for External Relations? It must be because he has relatives living overseas! One cannot see any other purpose for the appointment.

• (1520)

To top off the insult to the Secretary of State for External Affairs from the Prime Minister, who should be supporting him at all times, in announcing the role of the Minister of State for External Relations the Prime Minister said that the purpose of the appointment was to develop a strategy of our relations with foreign countries and the role of Canada in francophonie, Africa in particular, and so on. Surely to heavens the role of Canada in francophonie and our relations with foreign countries must be decided and defined by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, not by some third minister hung around his neck.

Where is the Minister of State for External Relations? When it was necessary to send someone to Cameroon it was not the minister of state in charge of francophonie who was sent but the Minister of State (Mr. Joyal). The Minister of State in charge of nothing from Quebec represented Canada for a week in the Cameroons. We are to have a fourth minister to assist in foreign affairs. The matter would be laughable if it were not so serious. What is left for the Secretary of State for External Affairs to do once our relations with foreign countries and the role of Canada in francophonie and international, social, cultural and humanitarian affairs are removed? What kind of trash is this, Mr. Speaker? The Secretary of State for External Affairs has been cut off from the neck down, if not from the knees up.

The Prime Minister's foreign policy is plagued by contradictions between what he says and what he actually does. In a press conference on May 14 he said that we are 100 per cent behind the British in the Falkland Islands crisis. If Britain had to depend on friends like that, God help the United Kingdom! If we are 100 per cent behind the United Kingdom while we are shipping 3,000 nuclear fuel bundles to Argentina this month—if we are carrying on business as usual, as the cabinet paper stated—is that 100 per cent support for the United Kingdom or is that hypocrisy pure and simple on a gigantic scale?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: The government claims that it is bound by a contract with Argentina. I have requested that the contract be tabled but the government refuses. We are told that it is such a strong contract that it cannot be breached. We may forget about war, forget about civil commotion, forget about riots, acts of the Queen's enemies and all the other exceptions that are put in every contract. This is apparently the strongest contract ever entered into on this earth between two sovereign nations. Apparently we cannot break it by stopping the supply of nuclear fuel bundles for a nation that is already proven to be an aggressor and which has used armed force to invade the Falkland Islands. We are to supply that nation with nuclear fuel bundles while at the same time supporting the United Kingdom 100 per cent. If that is 100 per cent support, it is the same kind of support we see the Prime Minister giving the Secretary of State for External Affairs—100 per cent in the back!