Supply

what she said. He was repudiated by Miss McDougall in the committee. I read to her the minister's statements in this House and Miss McDougall said it was a false impression. She stood by, she said, every recommendation and conclusion she came to in the report. On December 17 in this House the minister said:

That was the answer of the minister to a question by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) on December 17, 1981. Then the author of the report came to committee and said that was entirely false, and she stood by all her conclusions. Some of her conclusions were that the morale of this department is shot. There is a huge gap in communications between agencies in the field and the head office. There is a sorry state of communications between Ottawa and missions abroad. There is mistrust, confusion and misunderstanding about the partial consolidation of 1981. There is a crisis of identity and confidence in the foreign service which requires positive counteraction. There is a profound malaise in the foreign service.

This is the commissioner appointed by the Prime Minister, one who is experienced in the service, speaking about the implement through which our foreign policy is carried out. She says there is a failure of management in the foreign service.

The Prime Minister did not care, because the Prime Minister does not care about that department. The Prime Minister makes up his own foreign policy as he goes along, and he has nothing but contempt for the people who work in the Department of External Affairs, and nothing but contempt for the three ministers he put there to play ring-around-the-rosy when there should be one secretary of state in control of Canada's external relations. That is why there is an erosion in the quality of our foreign service and that is why it is in its present condition. So our foreign policy is transformed from an enterprise which should be dedicated to achieving our interests, securing our friendships and preserving peace and the values of the west, into a vehicle for the personal glory of the Prime Minister. Here is what he said at St. Francis Xavier:

Heads of state and of governments ought to work together to forge existing international bodies into an authentic network whose lines of communication will be kept warm by a human current—summitry.

The Prime Minister thinks the answer is for heads of state to meet at the summit. Summitry is the answer to all the world's problems. It is the personalized approach to foreign policy. Canadians wonder whether we have any role to play or if it is all to be done by this magical Prime Minister at the summit.

• (1540)

I want to spend a few moments on patronage in the foreign service, which has been exemplified by the recent appointment of Mr. Erickson to be the architect to design our embassy in Washington. After practising an elaborate deception on the whole Canadian architectural profession in a shameful manner, Mr. Erickson, not recommended as one of the four best by the committee, was appointed by the Prime Minister because he was a pal, a friend of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Smith: That is nonsense.

Mr. Crosbie: Let me say this. If that gentleman had any courage or was the architect he is supposed to be, he would revoke that commission and send it back so that the people who were recommended, the Zeidler firm in Toronto, who were found to be the best by the committee, would get it. What happened is absolutely shameful.

At the very font of our system is the Prime Minister who is supposed to be the leader of this country. But what do we see? We see the kind of action that Louis XIV might have taken as the "Sun King" at Versailles, and that is where the Prime Minister is going on Friday. The procedure followed is what an absolute monarch would do but not a parliamentary government.

The questions posed by the *Edmonton Journal* on May 12 are the questions we have to ask now. How ethical is it to establish a selection committee which has no real role? How ethical is it to ask for costly submissions by architects for a project they cannot win? How ethical is it for Mr. Erickson to accept the project when a panel has decided that he is not the best qualified to design the embassy?

Mr. Speaker, I believe you are indicating that my time is running out. That is the difficulty when we are on such a vast subject. I speak now of Argentina. There is an old proverb; "He that sups with the devil must have a long spoon." We are supping with the devil by sending nuclear fuel bundles to Argentina. I have another proverb written by Erasmus in 1508: "It is easier to raise the devil than to lay him." The devil that we are raising in Argentina today and with whom we are supping is one with which we will have the greatest difficulty ever laying.

In conclusion, I have to say that we have the weakest foreign policy we have ever had, administered by a Prime Minister and a Secretary of State for External Affairs who are letting this country down badly, who can do nothing of substance, who posture plaintively and humiliate us on the world scene by letting down our friends, comforting our enemies and by inflicting shame on the Canadian people who feel we can do very much better by assisting where we are needed in international affairs.

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I thought possibly the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) would like to respond to some of the hyperbole we have just heard. If he would like to respond now, I would be willing that he do so.

Mr. MacGuigan: The hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) may have the floor.

Miss Jewett: Mr. Speaker, it strikes me passing strange that the party to my right should be talking about international morality and the absence of it on the part of the government. Mind you, they are quite right. There is no great spirit on the