

North-South Relations

Another matter, which will require a considerable shift in attitude of this government toward the whole nature of government, has to do with the manner in which treaties are negotiated, ratified and implemented. Negotiations, I think, are pretty well standard around the world. Ratification differs, however, from parliament to congress, parliament to assembly, and parliament to parliament. The ratification of the east coast fisheries agreement, let us say, ought to have been approved by debate in this House and there should be provision for this within the Standing Orders of this House. The government has not called on the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to examine such matters. There could have been a Standing Order which permitted the discussion and regulated its length depending on the seriousness of the matter. The east coast fisheries agreement ought to be debatable and discussible in this House, not just ratifiable by executive edict.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Ratification is an executive act under the parliamentary system of government, no question about that. Implementation, if any, of treaties will be done by government legislation, and that is fine. However, there is that ratification procedure which is lacking in our general bilateral relations with the United States and, I might add, with other countries. Multilateral agreements might, as well, be debatable before ratification. There should be a vote if it is important enough, and if the government does not secure a majority, then I think it might very well have to decide what it is going to do. Is it going to renege on its commitment or is it going to resign? These matters, I think, deserve careful study in the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization with respect to our international relations, which my friend sniggering on the other side obviously does not consider to be within the ambit of this particular debate.

The next matter that I wanted to talk about, Mr. Speaker, had to do with—I just heard some sort of muttering over there about having something new. This new notion probably hit him so hard between the eyes that he is still reeling. It never occurred to someone who follows so slavishly the pronouncements of his government that there might be another view.

Mr. Caccia: Take a drink of water.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): The other area of foreign policy noted in the wording of the motion but not commented on is that of the refusal to come clean and reassure the Canadian people that everything that needs to be done has been done to ensure that the threat represented by Soviet communism and its attempts to infiltrate our system of government have been met adequately. Combined with this, of course, is the threat from the same source to the nations of the Third World, a threat we have recognized only partially if at all.

You are becoming uneasy in your chair, Mr. Speaker. Does this suggest my time is about to expire or has expired?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has one minute left.

• (2150)

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): In this connection I commend to all those present or listening two books which outline the matters in clear detail, a matter which causes me some concern, namely, the disappearance of certain documentation from the files of the government. The first book is by V. Sakharov and Tosi entitled "High Treason"; the other book is entitled "The Terror Network" by Claire Sterling. Those two books reveal, in the most lucid and frightening terms, the possibilities of infiltration that we in the country somehow or other choose to neglect.

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro). He should have known that, according to the *Votes and Proceedings* of December 6, 1968:

A total of 25 allotted days spaced throughout the session would be placed at the disposal of the opposition . . . On these allotted days the opposition would be free to select for debate any matter coming within the jurisdiction of Parliament—

If the hon. member had been serious, he would have convinced his party or Parliament to choose one of these 25 days. If the opposition really wanted to discuss external affairs matters, it had the last 13 years at its disposal.

I am the chairman of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. If we have not discussed some of the subjects the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) would have liked to discuss, it is up to him to have told us so. He is a member of the steering committee. I have never turned down any of his requests. All he had to do was to ask for the witnesses he wanted, and I would have been only too happy to accommodate him. Perhaps he now finds a lot of virtues in the Senate; perhaps he aspires to some nomination to that place. I would recommend him with great pleasure.

I am surprised the hon. member took all of 30 minutes and only touched upon the subjects which should have been debated today, such as the Law of the Sea. He only referred to it. I would have liked to hear about it because it is very important from the Canadian point of view and for the security of the West, but what is more, it would have provided a more equitable sharing of the world's wealth and resources with the Third World. It is too bad that the United States withdrew at the last moment. But we are hopeful, as is the hon. member, that after reassessing its views about the Law of the Sea, the U.S. will participate.

The hon. member could have spoken about Canada-U.S. relations because it is also a very important matter. We know that there is an exchange of 60 million persons per year between our two countries; he did not touch upon that subject. He could have talked about Canada.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Why don't you?