

Financial Institutions

and I have both seen toward self-reliance in India, for example. We have all heard specific examples of projects that are working well and transforming people's lives for the better.

When we go beyond the specific to the general situation, we must keep two factors in mind. One is that the situation is always changing and many problems increasing. If the work that has been done over the past 30 years had not been done, many of these problems would have grown indeed to catastrophic proportions that would dwarf today's present troubles. Instead of 800 million people living in absolute poverty, there might be a billion and a half. Instead of 40,000 children perishing each day, it might be 80,000.

Another factor that I should ask Hon. Members to consider is the time scale. There can be no instant solutions to problems as big as those of the Third World. Change takes time. But if we look at what has happened over a reasonable period of time—roughly a generation now—there is sufficient cause for hope and optimism.

Agricultural production in the Third World has grown twice as fast over the past three decades as in previous periods. For low-income countries, life expectancy rose from 42 years in 1960 to 57 years in 1980. It is at a level now in developing countries that we had reached in the 1930s. In the same 20 years, from 1960 to 1980, infant mortality dropped from 165 per thousand live births to 94, although, of course, that is still many, many times higher than in Canada. In the three decades from 1950 to 1980, adult literacy in the developing countries has increased from one-third to more than one-half.

The picture that we see, then, is still far from perfect. Our contribution to world development can still be improved in many ways. This is an observation that I can share with Members of the House based on my own experience in development programs around the world. I would ask Hon. Members to help make those improvements and to keep firmly in mind the justifiable conviction that our effort is worth making and, in the long run, will certainly be successful.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since this is one of the Bills that the Government House Leader was urging us to pass quickly, I wonder if it is the intention of Government Members to filibuster its own legislation and to talk it out. We are ready now for the question to be put and to give the Government its legislation, if that is what it wants. If that is not what it wants, it will be quite evident by Members over there rising to speak on the matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lapierre: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member, a number of Government Members consider this matter so important that they would like to speak to it, and I would ask the Hon. Member's cooperation in giving two other Members an opportunity to speak.

[*English*]

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. We understood that the Bill was to go to the Standing Committee to receive a good airing and so that Members would

have an opportunity to look into the matter in some detail. Like the House Leader of the Official Opposition, I expected the Bill to go there quickly. Of course, I have no objection to Members speaking; I do not think anyone has. We would like to be as co-operative as possible in order to get this Bill out of the House and to meet the Government's request that the legislation be passed as quickly as possible.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss as to whether to believe the Government House Leader when he says that the legislation is urgent and that he wants it as quickly as possible. Since both House Leaders on the Opposition side are now prepared to give the Government its legislation, it obviously does not want it, thus making the House Leader's request to have the legislation dealt with immediately because of its urgency highly questionable. If it is urgent, he can have it. Why raise more speakers?

● (1550)

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, with regard to this point of order, I fully anticipate that the matter will be going to Committee later this afternoon; but I do not think Hon. Members on our side would very strongly feel that we should be denied the opportunity to make a few brief remarks.

Some Hon. Members: Right on!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: At my request, Hon. Members on this side are deliberately staying seated. There are many over here who want to speak on the measure but, in a spirit of co-operation with the Government, they have agreed with me to give the Government the legislation which it states is urgent and which it wants. I agree with my colleague the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain when he says that the matter should go to the Standing Committee where it can be fully aired, where witnesses can be called and where Hon. Members can speak. I strongly suggest to him that if any weight is to be given to the Government House Leader's request—and I would like to give it full weight—that the legislation pass as urgent legislation, we should get on with it and send the measure to Committee forthwith.

Mr. D. M. Collenette (York East): Mr. Speaker, I did want to—

Mr. Nielsen: Filibuster your own legislation.

Mr. Collenette:—participate in the debate. I take great umbrage at the comments made by the House Leader for the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), who seems to want to deny me a mere five to ten minutes to speak on this very important piece of legislation.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Collenette: I think those people viewing the proceedings of the House at home or those Hon. Members in the Chamber