

and Cuban influence in El Salvador and the Caribbean, without our Secretary of State for External Affairs even knowing that there was an alliance.

We have shown quite properly the government's approach to El Salvador. I believe "quiet acquiescence" was the minister's description of his attitude toward U.S. arms shipments there. That once again belies the words of the government on other occasions when it was concerned, as the Prime Minister was again today, with human rights and political freedoms everywhere.

● (1640)

We have seen the government again talk a good talk about North-South. It may well be that the Prime Minister will take some initiatives at the summit on this matter. However, in his speech today he did not address any of the tough questions that Canada will have to face if we are going to do more than pay lip service in helping to resolve some of the problems of the developing world.

The Prime Minister did not suggest that if Third, Fourth and Fifth World nations are going to participate more in the new international economic order, this will involve a fundamental restructuring of the Canadian economy. Maybe he is waiting for some other country to suggest that there will have to be some restructuring. I am sure he knows that if we are actually going to have a new world economic order this will require substantial change in our own industrial structure. Very important measures will have to be taken and thought through now to offset the disruptions that they involve. He never mentioned them at all. If you do not realize what the implications are, talk about them and plan for them, you are giving lip service and nothing more to the restructuring of the world economy, to providing greater benefits and opportunities to the have-nots.

Nor did he say anything about the role of the multinationals in the Third World, a role even worse in many respects than their role here, which is bad enough. Multinationals operate in their own self-interest, moving capital from country to country where they think it would be most advantageous to do so, leaving communities and labour forces abandoned. An unfettered right to operate is what they ask for and what they get. They export what they think the western economies need from the Third World, not focusing on the food and agricultural needs of the Third World countries but on what they think the export markets need and want in the industrialized world.

The great power of the multinationals in the Third World, which I am sure some hon. members have read about, particularly in the book "Global Reach", was never addressed. I doubt very much if it will be at the summit either, unless François Mitterrand has something to say about it. However, our Prime Minister has not. In my view, it is a key to our making something more than rhetoric out of the North-South dialogue, to start thinking now of home-based and international controls on the operations of the multinationals in the Third World.

North-South Relations

Did the Prime Minister say anything about another incredibly important and urgent matter in the Third World, the position of women? Perhaps I should not be surprised. He has not said very much about the position of women in Canada.

Mr. Dupras: Oh, come on!

Miss Jewett: Well, he is getting better.

An hon. Member: He has been overgenerous.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Rae: You have just said that he has been overgenerous. That will be on the record.

Miss Jewett: He has not said a word about the role of women in the rural economy of developing countries. When the Prime Minister was talking about human rights, he mentioned in addition to political freedom the freedom of the market. If he has the view that the North-South relationship can be developed, improved, and made meaningful by relying on the freedom of the market, it just will not happen. It will not happen for the rural woman, it will not happen for any of the Third World, particularly the poor in the Third World.

I believe it is important not only for Canadians but our government officials, particularly those in external affairs, to know what direction the government is going in foreign policy, and above all in matters of war and peace, poverty or well-being, human freedom or despotism.

Canada must have a consistent policy and it must apply it consistently. That means it does not fool around trading with Chile, providing export development credits there. It does not fool around by saying that the Nicaraguan government may not be quite as good as the Somoza government. It does not fool around by wondering if there is going to be a better buck or deal in one part of the Third World than another. If Canada is going to have a clear, coherent and consistent policy, it must stop just talking peace and war, human liberty, the developing world, and start putting its policies and approaches in those directions. As my colleague says, it should put its actions where its mouth is.

I want to emphasize, although it has been mentioned once this afternoon, an initiative that the Government of Canada might take. There are many I have suggested it could do on its own to become a more independent, respected, powerful and influential nation, but the initiative that was proposed by George Kennan in his acceptance speech on receiving the Albert Einstein peace prize in Washington on May 19 bears repeating. I read of this in the *Manchester Guardian Weekly* of May 31. The article was entitled "The only way out of the nuclear nightmare".

I would like to quote from this article at some length because it might not otherwise appear on the record and because it comes from a most distinguished American and may have an influence with the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who has been influenced out of all proportion by another American, General Haig.