

I feel that industrialized countries, and Canada is one of them, do not always put themselves in the place of the underdeveloped countries. When we say that underdeveloped countries have not responded to industrialized countries' proposals, I wonder, reading from this statement, whether the industrialized countries let the underdeveloped ones express themselves in the first place. It can happen that the stronger of the two might want to impose its own program, that is called the law of the fittest. The same thing happens even here on the federal level in respect of provinces. The federal sets its own program and then offers it to the other saying: Whether you like it or not. This is not dialogue but a laying down of conditions.

I believe the underdeveloped countries should have had the opportunity of an open door to make their propositions on an equal basis before another country took decisions. Indeed I feel that, although they are underdeveloped, these nations have their pride too. In this area of international trade, I believe that, because they are weak, these countries should not be expected to sell their resources at prices which are ridiculously low, while industrialized countries take advantage of the situation to sell them goods at prices which are often three times too high, if we compare the prices paid in underdeveloped countries with those paid in industrialized countries.

● (1540)

I suggest it would be interesting for the House to obtain more information. It is unfortunate that when we ask for information on these operations, we never can get them. When, for instance, CIDA spends something like \$1 billion of Canadian taxpayers' money, I think hon. members of the House are entitled to get explanations, to know how the money is being spent, and also to be advised of the reactions of the beneficiaries. When we ask questions, the government often replies: "It is impossible, it would take 10 years".

However, as reported in *La Presse* of June 1, which I think most hon. members have read, this leaves us wondering, particularly after a conference like this which did not generate all the success the minister was rightfully expecting.

The people of Haiti, for example, a country we have been helping for years, write things like this; I quote:

MILLIONS IN CANADIAN ASSISTANCE  
ENTIRELY WASTED

"Canada is wasting its time and money in Haiti. The dozens of millions of dollars it is spending there under aid agreements are entirely wasted. It is like subsidizing a government made up of profiteers and incompetents who stay in power through lies and violence."

It is on this aspect of dialogue, Mr. Speaker, that I want to draw the attention of the minister to know how every individual country is using this Canadian aid. Is it used against Canada or against the population of those countries, as it happens to be the case now in Haiti as well as in other countries I could name? I am not surprised at all to see representatives of these countries coming to the conference and saying to industrialized countries: "Listen now, we are not

*International Economic Conference*

going to go along with this anymore." This is why the conference, although it was quite a painful experience for the minister and for many others, will perhaps open new perspectives, encourage some hon. members to try to be better informed and above all induce this government to give us more concrete answers about what is happening to the \$1 billion we put in CIDA, since it has been said that some Canadian citizens were paid to give out our money in Cadillacs in countries where people are starving.

Mr. Speaker, all these statements lead us to wonder whether this government has really paid all the necessary attention to this agency, which in fact is said to be another department. I think the minister did not keep a close check on the exorbitant and often unexplainable expenses of that agency. I have no intention to put the blame on CIDA but merely to draw those matters to the attention of the House and of the minister. It is not enough to say that we give \$1 billion in assistance to underdeveloped countries. If we are to be blamed by the people who receive such assistance, we should keep our money and leave them alone. What do these countries want? They want technical and monetary assistance of course but they want to be free to decide on the kind of life which suits them, they want to have it their own ways in adapting the development of their industries to their way of life.

I do not believe that a Canadian could ever become a true African. He can only show them new methods, train them in electronics so they can improve their standard of living, produce more and achieve self-financing. The minister has good reasons to be disappointed but he should make the best of it for the coming conferences and try to establish a genuine dialogue. It takes two to have a dialogue and as long as both groups do not discuss frankly on an equal basis, we are bound to have this kind of disappointment.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Introduction of bills.

**Mr. Breau:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like some clarification from the Chair. I thought the new procedure provided for a short question and answer period after a statement by a minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** The new procedure does in fact provide for such a question and answer period at the discretion of the Chair as to whether it should take place and, if so, what duration it should be. The motivation for that adjustment to our procedures was to provide in certain circumstances a bit of a counterbalance by way of dialogue.

One of the disadvantages of the statement procedure was that the minister making a statement was met with three times the commentary from the opposition that he himself made. Therefore it was thought that by way of questions from the opposition afterward there would be some counterbalance by giving the minister an opportunity to answer such questions.

In a situation where I see no indication of a desire on the part of the opposition to put any questions, it seems to be a proper exercise of discretion by the Chair that no questions