

a passing reference in what purports to be the government's vision of Canada's role in the world?

● (1520)

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has put well the challenge facing anyone in charge of foreign relations. On the one hand, he said in Israel in April of this year:

—the elements of peace must be found and agreed to. Countries outside the region, like Canada, can help create conditions and provide encouragement to move the process forward.

Certainly, I would generally support that comment. The same view has been taken by our Foreign Affairs Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator van Roggen. However, more recently, in the context of Central America, Mr. Clark said that we must resist

—the temptation to reduce our influence in the United States and elsewhere, by offering gratuitous advice which we can neither defend nor enforce.

I think those two statements amount to what appears to be a dilemma, but it is only a dilemma for a government without a vision of the role of Canada in the world. If the government has a vision, it pursues that vision and accepts the costs, thereby removing the dilemma which Mr. Clark stated so clearly.

I would suggest that the challenge of Canadian foreign policy is to be there in the forefront, at the right time, with a clear understanding of the Canadian interests to be served, and with the right solutions and with the influence to move them along. This can only be done with a profound vision of the world and with willingness to take the bold initiatives which have, from time to time, been the hallmark of Canadian policy. In the field of foreign policy, the Speech from the Throne offers vacuous comments and generalities. The Canadian people and the Canadian tradition deserve better.

Honourable senators, in the Speech from the Throne, the trips abroad of the Prime Minister were highlighted as an important element of constructive internationalism. Yesterday in the House of Commons, Mr. Clark stated, "We are also breaking new ground in the use we make of official trips." I would certainly agree that new ground has been broken, especially in the excessive spending and extravagant lifestyle projected by the Prime Minister abroad. I have no intention of rehearsing in full detail the painful list of these extravagances—the airborne, tea-pouring butler, who is now disguised as a security agent; the \$300,000 spent to ferry a video crew to Asia aboard a Canadian Forces Hercules aircraft; the \$800-a-night rooms in Paris and New York for members of the Prime Minister's staff. The list goes on. It is a painful list and I shall drop it there. This costly evidence of Canada abroad is scandalous in itself. However, there is a deeper point that has to be made. The point is that when the Prime Minister travels abroad—and he must travel abroad, and I have absolutely no complaint about that, because the Prime Minister can do a great deal for the country—the Prime Minister, any prime

minister, is the country's best ambassador. So, he must travel, and I have no complaint with that at all.

However, I must say that the Prime Minister should understand that he is travelling as a representative of Canada, and that he must project in those travels the reality of life in Canada, in our own country. He must not project a false image of Canada. If restraint and cuts are the watchword of all Canadians, then that image should be projected when the Prime Minister travels abroad. We do not want two faces on this country.

I have in mind a publication which was produced, I am told, at a cost of \$42,000 by the Canadian Embassy in Washington, entitled *Canada Today*. It perpetuates in colour photography the ill-starred Washington summit of last March. The publication and its cost are in themselves offensive to me. But the events as described surrounding that summit and disseminated at Canadian taxpayers' expense are reminiscent of a royal court at a moment of wild extravagance and imminent extinction. I would like to read a couple of things from this booklet published by the Canadian Embassy at the expense of Canadian taxpayers, particularly its description of dinner:

It was a beautiful night. Harp and string music floated out of the open doors.

This section is entitled "Bach, Tulips and Angel Hair Pasta." In it we are told, at the expense of Canadian taxpayers, the menu. It reads:

They sat at small tables adorned with pink tulips,

Senator Perrault: How about that!

Senator MacEachen:

—ate Angel hair Pasta with Seafood and Romano Cheese Sauce,

Senator Perrault: Send the bill to the taxpayer.

Senator MacEachen:

—Supreme of Chicken Vol-au-Vent and Pistachio Marquise—

Senator Haidasz: No perrogies?

Senator MacEachen:

—and drank Sonoma Couter Chardonnay, Leardini Pinot Noir, and Schramsberg Crémant Demi-Sec.

Senator Haidasz: What about Canadian wine?

Senator Perrault: Did the butler get the same thing?

Senator MacEachen: What does that have to do with foreign policy? Further on, the description ends with:

—pianist, Rosalind Tureck played, "On the departure of a Beloved Brother" in B Major . . . by Bach.

I am told that that particular selection, "On the departure of a beloved brother", was selected by the President himself as he anticipated the tariff actions which he intended to take on shakes and shingles and softwood lumber.

Those honourable senators who have a strong stomach should read this booklet and the other nonsense that is disseminated for what purpose I do not know.