

Supply

what they have asked for. And if I cannot pronounce that gentleman's name properly, he knows that my heart and support is with him!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: On May 17, Mr. Speaker, I presented those Solidarity resolutions to Parliament exactly as they had been given to me by way of a motion under Standing Order 43. The members on the Liberal side of this House said no and did not permit that resolution to be passed by this House.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Crosbie: The party that sits with and supports—

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand, and you can correct me if I am wrong, that it is inappropriate and improper to comment on the result of a vote because the hon. member does not know from which side the "no" on those motions comes from. In any event, he is not supposed to comment on them and that is a rule of this House.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I am—

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. gentleman wants the record set straight in *Hansard*. When martial law broke out on Sunday, December 13—

Mr. Crosbie: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Flis: Yes, it is. On Monday there was an all-party agreement to a motion which was to be presented in the House on that day. When the motion was brought into the House the Conservatives refused to give it unanimous consent—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member will have an opportunity to be recognized in the course of debate. The hon. member for St. John's West has the floor.

Mr. Crosbie: the Polish Scarlet Pimpernel has spoken. Mr. Speaker, I have limited time or I would deal with that Polish Pimpernel pretty quickly. However, I want to move on and my next—

Mr. Flis: I have a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale-High Park is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could check whether that was parliamentary language or not. As a Canadian, I resent being called names like this.

Mr. Crosbie: I retract, Mr. Speaker. Let me leave Poland for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker. By the way, the Prime Minister has never retracted his initial statement of December 18 when he said:

Hopefully the military régime will be able to keep Solidarity from excessive demands.

He was very hopeful about that. What were the excessive demands of Solidarity? Free speech; freedom of movement; freedom to have a free-trade union. Those were the "excessive demands", and our Prime Minister hoped that the military régime would be able to keep Solidarity from those excessive

demands. What do they say in Poland? *The Globe and Mail* reported that one Pole said:

Your Trudeau, he really did us in.

This illustrates the false hypocrisy of our position in the world, the pirouetting and posturing which goes on under this government.

The Prime Minister made a speech on May 2 at the convocation of St. Francis Xavier University where he warned of a moral void. He spoke of the—

—need for a new code of international morality, a new global ethic to guide the conduct of peoples and of nations, in this new age in which we live.

The person who spoke those noble words is the same person who is selling nuclear fuel bundles to Argentina, no matter what happens in the realm of armed aggression. That is the "new global ethic" of this Prime Minister who speaks in these terms to university graduates and then proceeds to sell nuclear fuel bundles to the military régime of Argentina which is guilty of the most heinous human rights violations, apart from anything else. Do his actions in support of martial law in Poland reflect his new code of "international morality?" If that is the new code, then we have no difficulty in finding out who the architect of that new code is.

There has been an erosion in the moral vigour and direction of our foreign policy which is paralleled by a decline in the status and efficacy of its chief instrument, our foreign service. The Prime Minister cares not a whit about the condition of the Canadian foreign service. The Secretary of State for External Affairs cares not a whit. A royal commission was appointed by the Prime Minister in the person of Pamela McDougall when he himself said that dissatisfaction was prevalent in the foreign service. She reported to the government on October 18, 1981, and what action did the government take? It has taken no action. There was a major reorganization of the department on January 12 about which she was not consulted by the Prime Minister who appointed her. She was not consulted by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. She was not consulted by the deputy minister of that department until some time in February or March, I have forgotten the exact date. The minister was satisfied to tell us here in this House that he had nothing to do with the commission, that it was reporting to the Prime Minister. Well, God help Canada if we have ministers in charge of departments who are proud to proclaim that they are doorsteps and footmats for the Prime Minister, and that they do not control or administer their own departments. If that was my department I would have had Miss McDougall in within a week after she gave me that report, and would read it and discuss it with her. Maybe I will never be in that department, but I would not want to be if I had to function as the Secretary of State for External Affairs now functions, like an India-rubber man.

This royal commission report was ignored, Mr. Speaker. What are some of its findings? Tremendously alarming findings were made, and then the minister came into the House and tried to pretend that Miss McDougall did not mean