

North-South Relations

government demolish that opportunity, it destroyed by fire thousands of documents and studies from the Privy Council office that were destined to be distributed across the country and for study by the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Caccia: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member has just made a very serious allegation. I challenge him to prove it.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): That is not a point of order, but it is true. Where are the documents now, I might ask that interloper who has just stepped into the debate? He has just had his time, said he concluded his remarks, but he is back on his feet. What has this government done now? Instead of permitting a thorough review of Canada's foreign policy, it has condescended to allow us one day's debate. We have had two days' debate in eight and a half years. This is the second day of debate during that time.

There was a foreign policy study in which I participated in 1969-70. The foreign policy review which was to have been undertaken by the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, or possibly a special subcommittee of that standing committee, was to have examined foreign policy and updated it in light of all the developments in foreign policy thrusts since the 1970s, for the 1980s, and on into the 1990s.

As I say, I find it difficult to accept this hypocritical washing and wringing of hands about the plight of the Third World by members on the other side, and I will come to that in a moment.

In view of the decision to give us one day's debate, the fact that the Prime Minister has taken part in it, and the fact that members of this government have demolished and destroyed those documents intended for a serious review in depth, I cannot help but ask myself, and I have been asking myself this question for about 48 hours, why the government has chosen this particular time for this particular debate. I ask myself this, particularly in view of other matters which are before us at this time such as legislation at the second reading stage, policy matters affecting Canadians, including interest rates, energy and inflation policy. They have all been put aside for this one day's debate. Why did the Prime Minister get involved in this debate? Is he setting himself up as the great manitou for the summit meetings which are to take place in July and, I think, in September in Ottawa and Mexico? Is he setting himself up as the great spokesman? If this is the way his spokesman's qualities are to be displayed, I cannot believe that those who will participate next month will be thrilled.

Having regard to energy policies which we might have been discussing, there is one incidental comment I should like to make at this time. When the Secretary of State for External Affairs was on his feet this afternoon he was chiding the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett). He said he hoped "the hon. member would carry the same kind of message to Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan, that good New Democrat who is sending Saskatchewan uranium all over the world for purposes which she says she so frankly detests". I would think a comment of that sort would be beneath the

dignity of a minister. He knows perfectly well, and if he does not I will tell him now, not one milligram of uranium in any form leaves this country without federal permission. He knows that, or I am ashamed for him that he does not.

An hon. Member: Hypocrisy again.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Hypocrisy, yes, that is what it is. I say this not to defend Mr. Blakeney. It is directed particularly toward the Secretary of State for External Affairs, just in case he did not know there is no export of uranium from this country without federal permission.

● (2130)

I feel called upon at this stage to make another comment about energy. Further along in his remarks the minister spoke about the incredible impact of two global oil shocks on the Third World. No one argues that the Third World has suffered more than any part of this globe. It has suffered more than any population as a result of the sudden increase in the price of crude. We all regret that, but here is where the hypocrisy of this government comes in. This government could easily alter that situation by making Canada self-sufficient so that we would not have to draw down offshore resources, so that we could increase the global supply of offshore resources and thereby cause prices to go down and reduce the impact of high prices on the countries of the Third World. If what the government is doing is not hypocrisy, I do not know what is. I have a funny notion in the back of my head that this government had not even thought of that. However, instead of doing that, what does the government do? It indulges in demeaning internecine strife in this country. It exacerbated federal-provincial relations as never before, and I hope as never again.

I find these two comments of the Secretary of State for External Affairs this afternoon unworthy of him because I know his record. He has a good academic record, but somehow that integrity which typifies the academic seems to have been tarnished somewhat in recent days. With all these thoughts in mind I wonder, whether this particular debate we are having today is not something of a smokescreen or a treading of water while the government waits for something. What could this government be waiting for? I do not know, but I suspect it might be the Supreme Court ruling on the Constitution.

In this connection I am constrained to think about Canada's relations with Britain. This government has set itself up as the great defender of Canadian independence as a sovereign country, and yet it is asking Britain to do a demeaning job which this government does not want to do and which, within constitutional convention, Britain should not be asked to do.

There are parts of the constitutional package on which, of course, Britain is required to act. In 1931 Britain was requested by Canada to do certain things. However, Britain was not requested at that time or at any time, until now, to establish in Canada—by a British statute—a Canadian charter of rights, which will be a British statute. I do not know whether members of this government thought of that either.