

Supply

election campaign. I am not at all sure that if the Tories were in power they would have done very much differently on that matter.

Mr. Wenman: And the NDP in Manitoba.

Miss Jewett: I am not at all sure either whether the Tories would have listened to Miss McDougall. If the hon. member for St. John's West had been Secretary of State for External Affairs, I am not at all sure that he would have even known that his Prime Minister had appointed a royal commissioner to look into conditions in the foreign service. There is such division and lack of communication in the Conservative Party that he may not even have known.

● (1550)

He did not mention in his motion one of the most serious criticisms made in the McDougall report concerning the conditions faced by spouses abroad and the absence of any adequate female representation and promotion in the Department of External Affairs. When the minister is considering the report, I hope he addresses himself to that matter.

What is most alarming about the motion before us today is that it does not touch upon the most important matter to all humanity today, that is, the arms race. Not a word does it say about what Canada's position might be or should be at the special session on disarmament which will begin next week. Not a word of criticism does it offer about the absence of any follow-up by the Government of Canada on its 1978 strategy of suffocation. There was not a word in this motion about a matter which is on our doorstep and will be the subject matter, as we all know, of a seven-week session of the United Nations. Do we in fact have a policy for the government to follow? There is a good deal of talk that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would be available, would return from his travels on June 14, which is the day allotted for the Canadian speech. Will he go there to speak? Is he likely to speak there when we know that apart from a small glimmer in his speech at Notre Dame University—a speech which was quite at variance with the recent addresses of both the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Lamontagne)—he has no new initiatives for Canada to take to the United Nations and therefore probably will not attend? It would hardly be satisfying to the Prime Minister to announce at the United Nations special session that we would make our major contribution the testing of airborne Cruise missiles.

The government has agreed to postpone the final decision on that testing until after UNSSOD II. However, it seems to me that the government is still very deeply committed, because it is so intimately tied up with American strategic planning, to go ahead with the testing of Cruise missiles. There was not a word of criticism of the government for its lack of ideas, hopes and even dreams in the field of international affairs which is so vital to us all. I suggest the reason for this lack is that in fact, for all the hyperbole of the hon. member on other matters about the great differences between the two parties, there are no great differences between the two parties on these matters.

When the Conservatives were in power in December, 1979 they went along with the NATO decision, without a murmur, to have ground-based Cruise and Pershing IIs in Europe. The Conservative government of the day did not raise a murmur, as did the governments of Belgium, The Netherlands and other countries. In fact, if anything, the Conservatives might even be worse in this intimate tie-in in the nuclear arms field than the Liberals.

Having no real difference, and being Tweedledum and Tweedledee on these matters, the motion before us today did not even raise the matters of arms control and disarmament. It was as if the entire area of arms control and disarmament, about which all Canadians are now talking, is something that the Conservatives have not even heard of, with the exception of two hon. members. If some of the Conservatives here had been at the walk for peace in Vancouver on April 24 and had seen the 35,000 people who were there, if some Liberal Members of Parliament had been there as well, I think they would take a very, very different view on this matter today than they do.

The fact is that the Liberal government has been extremely remiss in almost all aspects of foreign policy. It has allowed Canada's whole orientation to be changed. Ever since 1968 it has abhorred the enormous advances made by the late Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson. It has as much as said—and in fact did say on one occasion in the words of the Prime Minister—that it did not want to be a helpful fixer, a mediator or a power in the world scene which was working for peace, understanding and reconciliation. It has not taken that course but rather has allowed Canada to become absolutely and totally enmeshed in a military strategy and doctrine over which it has no influence or control. As a result of taking that course, it has put itself on the fringes as far as the world scene is concerned.

I wonder what the government knows about the newest document which was leaked in Washington concerning the Pentagon strategy for fighting a long nuclear war. I wonder whether the minister read it. It appeared in the *New York Times* the day before yesterday. I wonder whether our officials and the minister had any role to play in the development of that document. In case some hon. members have not yet seen it, the document is the new five-year over-all plan of the United States defence department for "fighting and winning" a nuclear war, even though President Reagan a few months ago said that in a nuclear exchange there are no winners. Did our Department of National Defence have any input into this? Perhaps the Secretary of State for External Affairs does not know, perhaps the Minister of National Defence does not know; in fact they probably do not know.

Since we are so intimately linked with American strategic planning, I ask whether we in fact had any input into the development of this document. I am quite sure the answer is no. Canada has given up the kind of influence it in fact exercised in the 1950s and 1960s. Also it has given up the role, to use James M. Minifie's phrase, of peacemaker and has almost become totally and solely a powder monkey. This is what Canada has done in the last decade.