

Adjournment Debate

tional chart that must have been found in a Harvard business school text. The changes were of such moment as changing individuals from divisional heads to directors general. But, in addition, the conventional line arrangements were superimposed upon the geographic line arrangements.

I was thinking also of the imposition, for example, of collective bargaining and of the program "budgeting", which has since been replaced by some other kind of budgeting, and the imposition of bilingualism on a department which, I venture to guess, was more bilingual than any other department of government as far back as the 1950s and 1960s, as well as of the requirement to absorb first the foreign support staff and then the entire body of personnel serving abroad, except CIDA officers who staunchly refused, for as long as I was in the department, to report through the ambassador; and finally, only a year ago, the move to consolidate the foreign service—whatever that means—a move which was followed immediately by the establishment of a royal commission to inquire into the conditions of the foreign service. That is an admission, I suggest, of there being something wrong with the conditions in that foreign service.

Each of these remouldings or investigations of external affairs was imposed from above with the minimum of consultation with those immediately affected, and each was imposed, which was perhaps worse, before the preceding one had had a chance to be properly absorbed and put through its paces.

These successive and overlapping waves of organizational and functional change took their toll on the morale of serving officers and staff. They were traumatic years; few will forget them, and all, I suppose, because the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has never really had any use for the foreign service, as he admitted as far back as 1959.

Now we hear of even further changes. On January 12 of this year the Prime Minister announced the creation of what he called a "triumvirate" of equals as ministers for the department. I describe them as a tricephalous monster; an outrageous creature with three heads.

From his comments to the press the Prime Minister on that day provided little indication of how to determine who is to wear what hat, at least as between two of the heads, or which among the equals is to be the most equal or more equal than the others. We do not even know whether they are ministers or ministers of state. We have both versions in *Hansard*, one on January 27 and the second on February 3. Even the organizational chart accompanying the press release of January 12 now seems to have used improper designations.

Not only are designations in doubt, Mr. Speaker, so also are duties. The Secretary of State for External Affairs, the press was told, "will be . . . responsible for Canada's external relations". That appears at pages 2 and 3 of the press conference transcript. We find on page 3 that the same responsibility is laid upon the new minister or minister of state, whichever it may be, for external affairs. Furthermore, the new minister or minister of state has been assigned a task by the Prime Minister, at page 11 of the transcript, for "the development of a strategy of our relations with foreign countries and the role

of Canada in francophonie, in Africa in particular, and so on". Where does that leave the Secretary of State for External Affairs? What is he supposed to be doing? If you think you are confused, Mr. Speaker, when trying to distinguish between ministers, ministers of state and secretaries of state, I leave you to imagine the state of confusion which must affect those three hon. gentlemen themselves. What about officials in the Department of External Affairs; to whom do they report and on what?

• (2205)

In addition to all these changes, we find that the Department of External Affairs has been endowed with a second tricephalous monster, a second triumvirate of deputy ministers and assistant deputy ministers. Not one of them has had any experience whatever in the diplomatic service of Canada overseas. I suggest that in these circumstances it is small wonder the Department of External Affairs is in a state of utter confusion, not knowing where it is going, to whom it is reporting, or whether it is really wanted at all.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) has a deep and sincere interest in Canada's foreign service. Therefore, I understand his interest in the McDougall report and in the recent reorganization of the government, particularly as it affects the foreign service.

The hon. member knows that the McDougall royal commission was established by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as head of the government. As such, the eventual disposition of the report lies in his hands and to the present time he has not taken any final action in this respect, nor has he yet delegated to any minister responsibility for follow-up on Miss McDougall's report. I assure the hon. member that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) is very interested in the report and that the report is being analysed and studied with a positive spirit. The government and the Secretary of State for External Affairs is determined that the report and its recommendations will be given the earliest possible and closest attention.

I should like to remind the hon. member that Canada has a very fine foreign service where generally morale is high and efficiency is good, considering that many members of the foreign service are called upon to serve in very difficult circumstances. The hon. member may remember that Miss McDougall herself said both in the report and in her press conference that the over-all morale in the department was high and efficiency was very great.

Turning to the question of the reorganization of the government, I assure the hon. member that reorganization is intended to improve the efficiency of government in dealing with economic problems which face Canadians. It has, as one of its consequences, increased the relevance of the Department of External Affairs by making it, in its new broad sense, an economic department as well as a political one. This change