

*Supply*

and one begins first of all to see what is the economic downside and no longer what are the matters of principle.

It has already been said in this debate that it was in 1971, when there was last undertaken a major survey or review of foreign policy in which the Canadian public, interest groups, universities and those with knowledge could begin to be heard so that there could be a statement before the public. As one who has had the opportunity with other members of the House to be part of the subcommittee studying Canada's relations with Latin America and the Caribbean, I have been increasingly aware of the importance of this study, even if it is now being done sectorally rather than globally, as was the intention of the Clark government. In paragraph 6 of the interim report which was tabled in this House we addressed the whole matter of failure in this regard. The report says:

More to the point, our study reflects growing Canadian interest in Latin America and the Caribbean. The only previous Parliamentary investigation directly related to our work was the Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs on Canada-Caribbean Relations. That report, completed over ten years ago, formed part of a general foreign policy review conducted in the early 1970s. Our work entails a broad examination of Canada's relations with both the Caribbean and Latin America, regions that have changed profoundly over the past decade. Those changes have, in turn, important implications for Canadian foreign policy in the 1980s.

Later on in paragraph 17 of that report we again address the failure in our foreign policy and the need for the government to address it. We said:

There may be a danger of an exaggerated and naive view of Canadian influence, but there is an even greater danger of downgrading and neglecting our opportunities for influence. The evidence received by the subcommittee suggests that Canada enters the 1980s with a valuable asset in its relations with Latin America and the Caribbean: a generally good reputation for sensitivity and concern. The Government must beware of the risk of eroding this reputation with hasty or ill-advised policies.

I suggest that in relation to foreign policy the calls of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in his recent speech for a new code of international ethics is not matched by the mechanism and the tools to present that to the House. The statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) this afternoon that Canadians demand that Canada make a contribution to world order is reflected in the polls, and part of the reason the polls show this concern is that there is a failure of leadership in that area. For the minister to suggest to this House that the government speaks for the main stream of Canadian life is to be well away from the concerns of Canadians day by day.

Let me turn for a moment to our Canadian foreign service and the instrument by which we are represented. We have already heard two of our colleagues on both sides of the House speak from their experience in Canada's foreign service. The whole McDougall report deals with a broad area, as was outlined in the opening comments of the hon. member for St. John's West, of failure on the part of the government. The hon. member for St. John's West reminded us that Ms. McDougall outlined in her report the decline in morale, communication problems, mistrust between departments, the identity crisis, the malaise in the service, failure at the management level and the fact that she had not even been consulted on the recent rearrangements.

There are four main areas outlined in that report, and first among those was the area of the family and environment. Family concerns, the report says, were top priorities of employees of Canada abroad. Spouses are tired of being treated as mere appendages of employees. They need more support because of problems in relation to many moves and their support capacity respecting the careers of foreign service employees.

In that report there is a scathing indictment of the failure to come into modern days in terms of the role of women. In the last throne speech the government made an unprecedented five references to women and the enlightened legislative initiatives in relation to women which would be brought before this House. We have yet to hear a comment on this report by the Prime Minister, who commissioned it, the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the minister responsible for the status of women. The report uses terms similar to those used in the recently-tabled report on wife battering. It discusses the tensions and stresses of living abroad representing our nation and the resentment and dissatisfaction of many wives of foreign service personnel due to the pressures on them which are different from the ones which bring about violence in large measure in Canada. However, those pressures are real in relation to family life.

● (2120)

It goes on to speak about the opportunity for leadership in recognizing the spousal contribution—in most cases the spouse being a woman—as official residence administrator and the responsibility that is taken on in that case. It proposes incentive premiums for spouses of foreign service employees and suggests a mechanism for personalizing the whole career pattern through basic personnel, family support services and family counselling services. These are all a part of the business of humanizing and morale building for the representatives of Canada abroad. They are also part of a pattern for a government that has a purpose and a plan in relation to women. Surely the neglect of this report and the mass of information it contains is an indictment in itself and is an example of the failure of leadership.

Let me say a word about the implications of what is happening today in the south Atlantic. We have heard some comments about the implications of Canada's policy of continuing to supply nuclear bundles to a government which has openly said that it intends to use its capacity in a destructive way and which has not satisfied the agreements. We have already begun to look at the implications of that. Why are Canadians so deeply concerned about this failure? Surely it is because they begin to see that the mechanisms for heading off confrontations are not in place.

We have a picture of the build-up and the confrontation going on in Port Stanley today as a result of the British armada setting sail for three or four weeks. We have the scenario of the world media following it. We have the scenario of diplomatic nations at work, but we have no mechanism that can stop the bloodshed at this moment. There were three or