

Supply—External Affairs

cold war, the United Nations cannot function effectively as an instrument for peace and security. There is in my view a very close connection between what has happened in the Far East and what has happened in the Near East. I do not think it is too much to deduce if the United States had not been heavily involved and preoccupied in the Far East there would have been no encouragement to create a crisis in the Middle East. I doubt if that would have happened.

I do not propose to repeat the views of this party on Viet Nam as they are well known, but in any debate or discussion of external affairs I think we have to make, and I do so now, reference to what I believe is a vital problem, to the primary responsibility which rests on one of the great powers to seek to bring the war in Viet Nam to a close through an unconditional cessation of bombing of North Viet Nam. There has been talk of a lull in fighting but it has been denied that it has any connection whatever with the Near East crisis. Perhaps it has no connection, but if we are to move ahead so we will not have a recurring crisis then what is happening in Viet Nam must end. It is certainly impossible to anticipate that there will not be further crises throughout the world if the war in the Far East continues as it is today.

Let me emphasize what I think is very closely connected to the crisis in the Near East. That is the tragic failure of the well-to-do nations of the world, including Canada, to deal adequately with the problems of world poverty. Some people have said that the Near East crisis is an aspect of the east-west conflict and the cold war. I think it would be more to the point to say that the Near East crisis is a tragic reminder of the unsolved north-south problem and the growing gap between the rich and the poor nations.

Mr. Escott Reid, the principal of Glendon College, formerly our ambassador to India and formerly an official of the World Bank, has recently contributed an article to the *International Journal* which is published by the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. He speaks of two fields in which Canada could make a creative contribution to world affairs, and this is something I believe all members of this house and all Canadians wish to do.

In this article Mr. Reid says that the most serious gap in the defences of civilization is the gap between what the rich nations of the world should be doing to help the poor countries speed up their economic development and what they are in fact doing. He points

[Mr. Brewin.]

out that Canada, for example, has during the last three or four years raised the level of foreign aid by \$50 million yearly. This is less than 2 per cent of the annual increase in our national income. So we are applying to this crucial problem of world poverty less than one-fiftieth of our annual increase in wealth.

● (5:10 p.m.)

In this regard we are not doing any worse than most of the other rich countries of the world. In the past six years the rich countries of the non-communist world have got a great deal richer. They have reached a level of income about \$300 billion higher than the level six years ago. They have not shared any of this vast new wealth with the poor countries. The level of their contribution to dealing with the problem of world poverty, which I suggest constitutes a continuing threat to the peace and stability of the world, has remained constant as far as the world as a whole is concerned, although the wealth of the western world has increased by \$300 billion a year. As I say, they have not shared any of this vast new wealth with the poor countries.

I want to adopt this comment by Mr. Reid:

If we of the western world persist in our present policy of aid to poor countries, we will have earned the contempt of our children and of our grandchildren.

He points out that if Canada alone were to give another \$700 million of aid to the underdeveloped countries to help them speed up their economic development, this would increase the net flow of long term economic aid of NATO countries to poor countries by about 12 per cent. Some people say this might be throwing money away, that there is no assurance that an increase in economic aid will in fact make any substantial difference or will enable the underdeveloped countries to break through to a position of self-generating growth. But we were told in the committee on external affairs this morning by Mr. Maurice Strong—incidentally, we warmly welcome him to his position as director general of our external aid office—that a conservative estimate of practical and immediately available projects which could be approved by the World Bank would cost between \$3 billion and \$4 billion a year, but this \$3 billion or \$4 billion a year is not made available and the projects are not proceeded with for lack of available funds.

This would represent a contribution by Canada of an additional \$200 million a year approximately. It would only bring Canada's contribution up to approximately \$500 million