

Business of the House

Such a situation seems absurd to me and it shows the inconsistency of our external affairs policy.

I would not want to delay uselessly the business of the House. The previous speakers have sized up the present situation rather well. However, I want to emphasize that the minister should see to it that this Centre is independent from political parties, in order to really be the conscience of Canada in its foreign aid policy. Through the creation of this Centre, it is proposed to the government and to the Members of Parliament to make a review of our policy, namely, to continually assess our investments. Canada should not impose its aid on any country. It goes without saying that we must make this recommendation, because if Canada imposes its views, various conflicts will result. In this connection, let us remember the failure of the American policy.

The present aid of Canada is ridiculous. We shall never repeat it enough. It is high time that Canada, in addition to founding new research centres, should increase its financial, human and technical investments. When reading the reports of development agencies, it does not take long to realize that Canada is a country which cannot boast of the aid granted to developing countries.

It is already scandalous to note that two thirds of mankind are starving. Poverty, starvation, illness and ignorance prevail. It is unfortunate to note that owing to our non-participation policy regarding conflicts such as those in Nigeria, in Viet Nam, etc., we help widen the gap between the affluent countries and the poor countries that we want to assist.

Such a contradiction, I feel, should be recognized by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his officials. The establishment of this new Research Centre should have priority. The Centre will suggest a global policy to the government, enabling it to dissipate the present scandal. So, Canada might really reach a top place among countries providing foreign aid.

At the present time, we can draw great lessons from the achievements of several other countries. I have here before me the September 1968 issue of the publication entitled *International Development*. Canadians will not find in it any reason to be proud of themselves. That publication shows the shameful shallowness of the Canadian policy. Indeed, it is again the consequence of its inconsistency. I therefore want to insist strongly on that point. Besides, it is the only

one I want to rise now because I do not care to delay the debate needlessly. And once more I urge the minister to revise our external aid policy, in the light of his external affairs policy, so that we do not build on the one hand and destroy on the other but rather see to it that our country leads the way without expecting any return in order to eliminate poverty and hardships in two thirds of the world. We have in Canada, according to the minister, surpluses of wheat, of milk and of many other products still to be sold because the government is incapable of selling them. Those goods keep accumulating, while there is growing poverty in Canada, and two thirds of the world's population is starving to death.

Mr. Speaker, this should weigh heavily on the consciences of Canadians. That explains the intervention of my fellow-citizens of Victoriaville, in the riding of Lotbinière, who have asked me to urge the minister to revise that policy. Indeed, Canadians would be proud to increase their help to co-operate with the minister, and to tighten their belts, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has asked, provided it really helped to check poverty and hardship. Otherwise, this is nothing but a farce, and a lack of responsibility.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[English]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATEMENT ON PROCEDURAL AGREEMENT

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might indicate to hon. members the substance of what I believe has been agreed between representatives of the parties with regard to this debate and to the proceedings this evening. I understand that there are others who wish to speak on this bill. It has therefore been agreed that Private Members' hour should be suspended for today's sitting and that if second reading of the bill now under debate should not have been completed by then, at six o'clock the question on second reading would then be put. If, however, the debate concludes before six o'clock and the question has been put, the House would at that point rise until eight o'clock and commence with the debate under Standing Order 26.

It has also been agreed that debate under Standing Order 26 shall be concluded by 10.30 this evening; it would be terminated at that