

*Supply*

as much as in any other department—because it operates to a large extent outside of Canada where people cannot see what it is doing. There is a lot of fat in some of the expenditures which do not provide any great benefit to Canada, even in a diplomatic way. When I recall my visit to the United Nations some eight or 10 years ago and saw the offices and the staff which operated there in support of our delegations and groups at the United Nations, and then recall my return visit there recently I was amazed to see the tremendous growth which had taken place in that operation. It seemed to me that the people who were there were more interested in providing good conditions for themselves in respect of office space, conference rooms and so on than they were in respect of what they were trying to do in terms of representing Canada.

Too often we find government departments operating in this manner. In this respect I think probably the Department of External Affairs is the worst offender, probably as a result of being run by people who have no relationship whatever to everyday life in Canada. They do not concern themselves about the workers, the farmers and the majority of the people but are merely intent on living the easiest possible life they can and doing the least amount of work. This expenditure has been explained briefly, but I think that if the people who are acquiring these buildings, equipment and staff wanted to do so they could save money for the Canadian taxpayer. I am sure they could save half the expenditure in this item. Many people in this nation are getting fed up with the growth of the bureaucracy in the federal government and the squandering and waste of money without any real benefit accruing to the people of Canada. The Department of External Affairs is the worst offender of any I know.

Probably the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce runs a pretty close second in this regard. If that is the case, it is because the industry section was set up by a Liberal government specifically for the purpose of finding a Cabinet seat for one of the ministers who is sitting in the front bench now. They set up the department of industry specifically for the gentleman who presently is the President of the Treasury Board. Later, the government put the department of industry in with the department of trade and commerce and created the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. There is a lot of duplication involved in this. However, that is a matter with which we can deal later. Knowing the way buildings are constructed, and knowing that if someone representing the taxpayers of this country said to these fat cats it was about time they started justifying their existence, I believe if they sharpened their pencils a little these buildings could be acquired for half the cost shown here.

In order to try to instill in this group some sense of responsibility to the Canadian taxpayer, I intend to move a motion which would have the effect of cutting this amount of money in half. If we must have these facilities and buildings in Budapest, Atlanta and Lusaka I would like to see this accomplished a lot more cheaply than is planned here. Accordingly, I move:

That the schedule be amended by reducing the amount set out in Vote 5a of the Department of External Affairs to \$242,250.

[Mr. Howard.]

**Mr. De Bané:** Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say that in a few moments I will have the details concerning these expenditures for which the hon. member has asked.

**Mr. Howard:** That is what you said before.

• (1420)

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Chairman, I am in agreement with the reduction in this item. When I look at the main estimates I find that we have in the capital budget in relation to Brazilia \$2,200,000 which we previously estimated to which is now added \$1,620,000. We are going to spend another \$4,230,000 for the construction of a chancellery residence and staff accommodation in Islamabad, Pakistan. We have already spent around \$8 million there, which is probably about one third of the budget of that country. In New Delhi we have spent, in the second stage of the current estimate, a total of \$1,300,000. The previous estimate was \$1,400,000. That involves the war. Everything is cheaper there now. In Dakar, Senegal we are putting in \$285,000 for a chancellery. I suppose that this goes with our religious attachment to these places. Now we have Atlanta, Budapest and Lusaka added to this list.

I believe, as does the hon. member, that we should also be giving some consideration to the expenditure on the monument which was built down the street. I suppose this monument is worth \$20 million and to staff it will probably cost another \$20 million. The hon. member for Assiniboia has been asking some questions regarding the salaries. It is my guess that the salaries of Members of Parliament will look very small in relation to the salaries of the staff of the chancelleries which we are going to build as well as the salaries of those in the other buildings which we are putting up in these countries. Almost every one of them will have four or five people to staff them.

A few years ago I had some experience in a hospital in a country in Africa. I became part of the native population there for a three week period. Of course, there was no official from the Department of External Affairs coming to visit me, but a representative of Mau Mau came to visit me, as well as some other people. I found that the sole function of our senior staff representative in that area in eastern Africa was to keep whisky, and all the delegates who were there were very unhappy because she would not allow us to buy any of the whisky at embassy prices, as is done everywhere else. She was in another country and they kept the whisky and would not give it out. Maybe that was judicious of her, maybe it would not have been wise for her to do so, but the booze was very cheap in that country. They made it for the natives and allowed us to buy it at the same price. Her main function was to be keeper of whisky. She was responsible for three embassies, and I suppose we have buildings for them.

I have looked into our main estimates to find out what our embassies are doing. They are supposed to help Canadians. Help Canadians be damned. They do not help Canadians at all, in any shape or form. In most cases they do not even help delegations which go there unless a minister is attached to them. I remember attending one particular conference where we finally told the ambassador—and he is one of the long haired ambassadors who has been there a long time—that if he did not supply us with a car, we would confiscate one. Finally, he supplied