

*Government Orders*

criteria are there and you cannot get on the list if you violate any of those four.

I have to say that the criteria are there. They are clear, public and known. Every year—

**Mr. Brewin:** They are changeable.

**Mr. Reimer:** The opposition likes to say “and they are changeable”. These criteria are the new regime of stringent controls, which are being introduced in this bill and—

**Mr. Brewin:** No, they are not in the bill.

**Mr. Reimer:** If I may continue without the interruptions of the hon. member, they are the criteria by which the Government of Canada would add or consider adding a country to that list.

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that I am the next speaker. It comes as a great surprise to me that the great Liberal opposition has disappeared today on this particular debate. We know that the government has abandoned its principles, but now we find that the opposition is sitting on the fence. Where does the Liberal Party stand on this issue? We know the hypocrisy of this government and I will deal with that chapter and verse in a moment. You must help me in my shock and disappointment, Sir, to find that the Official Opposition refuses to take its place in this debate.

**Mr. Bélair:** Stop talking about others and talk about yourself.

**Mr. Barrett:** Talk about others. This is politics, my friend, and the political matter is clear on this issue. The government has taken one position, the New Democratic Party has taken another position, and the Liberals are hiding again. I have to say that because it is political. I do not like being political in this place because on occasion it has been noted that people have been partisan in this Chamber but the government has set a new arena for being partisan. You have to go to Japan to do that. Far be it from me to be partisan here at home. I am not in Japan, but I have to take my place in this debate.

The member who just spoke misspoke accidentally, but he left himself with the impression that the criteria he was talking about were in the bill. Nothing could be more incorrect. The member who spoke did an eloquent job speaking about something that was not in the bill and

that confuses me. I know it is not out of order, but it confuses me. So how can he say the policy was in the bill when it is not in the bill? I did not get a chance to ask him what section of the bill he was referring to, but that is the way it is.

I have decided that what I would do is speak through the government's own words. I find it preferable, rather than giving an unrestricted point of view of my own, that I show some respect and dignity to the government of the day. This is not a change of temper in my approach to politics. It is just that once in a while I read things that the government says, and once in a while I would like to believe it. I have been shocked again even though I am young and *ingénue* in this whole process. I am shocked that the government is also playing a game of politics, saying one thing in one location and something else in another location.

The example I am going to give is appropriate because it took place in western Canada, a region largely unknown to members of this House and albeit it is a superior region of this country, we are modest about that superiority. This is what the former minister of external affairs made in his very pious mode.

• (1210)

I love to see him in his pious mode, when the fount of all wisdom comes down and says: “This government is going to take its place internationally and present this point of view”.

Here he is with his best pious views out on his home turf, none other than Calgary. The Right Hon. Joe Clark at a luncheon hosted by the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, a hotbed of radical politics. What did he say on page 3?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring this to your attention because you are listening more than anyone else. This is what his rationalization was about the current follow-through on the war we voted against in the Middle East. I quote page 3 with some pontification.

“Canada did not put the lives of its men and women at risk for the sake of a few cents a litre on oil. No, no, no”. He goes on to say: “Nor was this war about democracy”—that is interesting. “Kuwait is not a democracy of the Canadian sort, although there were signs before August 2 that it was moving in that direction”.