

ple, what are we told will be the government policy for energy? While in opposition, those hon. members who now form the government had endless months, nay years, to formulate such a policy. But they frittered that time away, those years and years and years, tearing down the policy of the last government, criticizing, nagging, carping and complaining. Their energy went into tearing down the energy policy. No wonder all they now have in their hands are reams of notes on how to tear down and destroy. Destroy PetroCan. Destroy our arrangements with Mexico and Venezuela. Destroy our federal international responsibility and involvement in offshore rights.

Since the election they have had months to do their work, and what do we learn from the throne speech? There is not a word in the speech about PetroCan, the single most important agent the Government of Canada possesses to protect us with regard to the most critical issue we face. This would be a forgivable oversight if the government had not broken our energy mast in the conflicting orders that have been shouted from its crew members as to whether to raise or drop the sails—sale of PetroCan, no sales, half sales, have a sale, but only where crew members can buy—and as the sails go up and down they are being torn to shreds. They will not catch the wind and take us anywhere but down into the deep. It is a profligate destruction of our heritage. Our country is up and down for sale.

Yes, it is a policy of evasion. They evade the issue with smiles and chuckles while we flounder and our energy mast is splintered and broken. We are a country divided and confused about PetroCan, about energy prices which are not resolved. For this reason prices have already been set and have soared for our winter fuel for homes, transportation and industry, because the middlemen could not wait. It is too late now. The government has failed to chart its course and everyone else has had to make up their own minds. They have taken to the lifeboats to save their medium and small-sized fuel companies. They had no choice, with no guidelines, but to jack up the prices.

Evasion leads to licence. The rich get richer, the powerful more powerful. No wonder we have monopolies like the policy of evasion, of “no decide”, of laissez-faire. They can rip us off unfettered, because the government has no policy or, rather, has a policy to evade, to pass, to make no bid. But how can you win the game if you keep giving away your cards and keep on passing? Evasion.

And what does the Speech from the Throne have to say about our foreign policy? It is amazingly evasive through its silence. Just as in the case of silence in the throne speech on Petro-Canada, so there is silence on foreign policy. There is total silence by the government on the handling of the issue of the Middle East. All we know is that a special study is under way, a study triggered by the most blatant and destructive fumbles in Canada's foreign policy for as long as my mind can recall.

The present Prime Minister, seizing upon what appeared to be a popular and meritorious yearning on the part of many, if not most, Canadians to move the Canadian embassy from Tel

The Address—Mr. de Corneille

Aviv to Jerusalem, which is the capital of Israel, during the election took this ultimately desirable and even sacred issue and dragged it down into the realm of partisan election politics.

What all those who love Israel want, whether we are Jews or non Jews, is that the issue of the moving of the embassy be based on the merits of the case, and be timed and effected in a way that contributes to the peace process. Jerusalem is a holy city and it should not have been a brick-bat for partisan argumentation. The ultimate objective of moving our embassy is too important to have hastily thrown it into an election contest which gave Canadians the impression it was done for votes instead of on merit. And worse yet, after we warned over and over again of the delicate nature of this matter and of the need for education, information, preparation and understanding, our advice was spurned, and in cavalier fashion the issue was pressed, without the needed resolve to see it through, which resulted inexorably in total débâcle.

It was no favour which the captain of the election strategists did for Israel by making such a self-serving promise and dragging the sacred name of Yerushalayim—the city of peace—to the level of vitriolic argument. That damage can never be fully undone, because try as one might to rectify it, the discussion of the embassy has been totally removed now from the merits of the case itself. And the irony of it all is that the good reason and the only reason that the embassy should ultimately be moved is based entirely on the merits of the case. The timing and the setting and the motives were all-important. And it all was trampled upon for the sake of pledges made for opportunistic reasons and timing seemingly unrelated to the justice of the cause at stake.

The result of this lack of policy, and then of vacillation instead of swift, decisive action one way or another, has been to compound our troubles. It has thrust us into a situation where Canada now appears to be susceptible to blackmail, bullying and belittling. We have desecrated the name of Jerusalem, lost our honour, and now we decide that it is time to find out, not only what to do, but also how much damage we did; how much tribute we will have to pay or how many compromises we will have to make to regain lost friends or contracts. What ignominy! Is this how we protect human rights in the world? What was the message in the Speech from the Throne on the Middle East? Was it that we were not going to be susceptible to blackmail, that we have our own policy? Or was it silence or evasion, as with PetroCan?

What do we hear about human rights in the world in this speech? Is there anything at all about genocide or about the hungry in the Fourth World crushed to death by OPEC oil costs and inflation? There is nothing in the speech except that we will be getting a committee on foreign policy. But we do get ministers telling us from the flora side that human rights will come up like flowers, while the fauna side forages upon the money pastures which alone could make our promises to the Third and Fourth Worlds a reality. How sad to see our reputation in the field of foreign affairs, built up so assiduously and patiently by past hon. members like Pearson, Sharp,