

*Speech from the Throne*

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the committee accepts the restatement of the national objectives, for the time being. It considers that the white paper has given too much importance to the integration of the objectives and priorities of our foreign and domestic policies. When one considers foreign policy, one should not only wonder in what kind of Canada we are going to live, but also, as one witness put it, in what type of world we want to live.

As for the report on the assistance to international development, which was also tabled in the House in June 1971, the committee has held 25 meetings, beside the in camera sittings for the drafting of the report, and it has heard several witnesses. Furthermore, this report is based on a statement by Mr. Maurice Strong, former chairman of the Canadian International Development Agency, referring to the emergence of what he describes as "a much more human attitude toward development".

This report on the aid to international development especially deals with five main objects: the equity for social development and a fairer distribution of the advantages of economic growth; in underdeveloped countries; sharing to awake, maintain and channel the interest of Canadians; the creation of jobs entailing some assistance to obtain the best conditions of employment in less fortunate countries; a receptive and more coherent policy towards co-operation as a true association of equals; the adoption of a new policy in a field such as trade and commerce, so as to enable developing countries to help themselves, also retained the attention of committee members, and so did a new definition of technology as the adjustment of progress to the needs of various societies.

Also, we considered a quotation from Pope Paul VI, to the effect that "development is the new name for peace".

I wish to commend those who participated actively in the study of this report, and say that this experience was very enriching to me, because I had an opportunity of participating actively in the preparation of these reports. I think the government is doing well by introducing white papers and giving committee members an opportunity of discussing them in consultation with the public.

During the last session, I had the opportunity of membership on the Joint Senate and House Committee on the Constitution of Canada. I attended some 200 public and in camera meetings and I hope the committee will produce a report in the near future.

That experience was also a highly interesting one as for the first time a committee travelled all over Canada, inviting the general public's participation in the study of the problems of Canada's constitution.

During the summer of 1971 I also had the pleasure of going on a mission of inquiry in India and Pakistan together with the hon. members for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) and Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie.) Upon our return we submitted a report to the federal government wherein we stated that the major reason for the journey

[Mr. Lachance.]

was to have a direct view of the plight of the refugees from East Pakistan, as it was then called, and which is now called Bengla Desh and was recognized by Canada just a few days ago.

We believed then that the heavy burden of having to face such an influx was not to be assumed by India alone; we are more than ever convinced now that that humanitarian problem concerned all countries and that the world community owed it to itself to provide immediately an efficient and generous aid to help these millions of unfortunate people.

The Bangla Desh state is now born and those problems still exist. I hope the Canadian government will take the necessary steps to promote the rehabilitation of those 10 million refugees and that it will help Bangla Desh to gain a strong economic foothold so as to cope with the numerous problems of the present.

Last November, Mr. Speaker, I also had the opportunity of accompanying another parliamentary group in South Africa where I went along with the hon. member for Malpègue (Mr. MacLean) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) on a study mission which enabled us to gain first-hand knowledge of the problem that exists in South Africa.

That country is multiracial and multinational. About a month ago, I had a chance, in a speech I was making in Montreal, to say a few words about it. I shall take a few minutes from the House to make a few comments.

For instance, today's policy in South Africa is not the result of a mere abstraction. Five centuries are there to provide an explanation and, one might even say, command it. Even if this solution is imperfect, as compared to others, at least it has the merit of being realistic for today and imaginative for tomorrow.

Still, it remains a makeshift solution. In other words it may be acceptable, but only temporarily and for the time being. For the Republic of South Africa is racing against the clock. If it is to win the hardy game it has entered into, it should be aware of the need for quick transformation. However, such an evolution will require some sacrifices.

We will have to make financial sacrifices: the development of the future African states will necessitate huge expenses. We will also have to make moral sacrifices: in order to preserve the most essential things, the whites will have to forgo some of their privileges.

There should be no more question of petty apartheid or of what could be called pin-pricking. It is of course a considerable challenge, but it is well worth it. If historians are not allowed to prophesy, they can at least express wishes.

My wish is for the western world to finally understand the solidarity which unites it to South Africa, and without withholding criticism, to be able to temper it with objectivity. Above all, it will have to show understanding and to make allowances for a country which is faced with a problem such as exists nowhere else in the world.