

given us a chance to help frame a decent Canadian policy which would respond to international conditions. That would have given us an opportunity—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Why not the estimates?

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to talk about the estimates. I have just read again the evidence presented last spring at the meetings of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence which examined CIDA when considering the estimates. A very strong representation was made that the Price, Waterhouse study of CIDA should come before the committee to be examined. Even if there were some chance of confidentiality being breached it could have still been presented to the steering committee for examination.

● (2040)

The president of CIDA—I use the term advisedly because that is how he likes to be known—did a wonderful skating exhibition in by-passing a definitive response to the committee, even though he had assured the committee that he would make the report available to us, and went and hid behind the coat tails of the then external affairs minister.

If the minister were really serious he would say: “Yes, let us look at this Price, Waterhouse study” because, I suggest, it shows the management of CIDA has been lacking the best kind of operation that the minister has been saying he wants to have. If he refuses to let us have the Price, Waterhouse study, refuses to refer the CIDA report to the committee, if he comes to the House, as he did this afternoon, and gives us a political response when what we are looking for is leadership, then I say he only invites the kind of speech that we have unfortunately just heard from the hon. member for Saint-Michel (Miss Bégin). She took her lead from the minister and produced, I say very regretfully to her, a slurring speech not only on the opposition but on the whole idea of an examination.

We must get rid of the idea that when we call for an examination of something in this place we are attacking it. I say very clearly that I am not attacking CIDA; I am a defender of CIDA, and that is precisely why I want all the facts. I get mail, as do a lot of my colleagues, from people around the country who look at newspaper stories and hear what is going on in CIDA—staff turnover, things happening and so on. They ask me why we are contributing more money to CIDA: They do not even know yet that the amount is up to \$933 million; it will take them a week or two to find that out. That is almost \$1 billion, more than all but two departments of government. As soon as they discover this, I figure the mail will increase all the more.

I am trying to respond to these people as a member of parliament by saying that the money is being well spent, that it is going to places where we are achieving humanitarian benefit, that it is responding to the injustices that have so dominated international relationships for so long. But when I try to tell my constituents that the money is being well spent, the minister does not even allow me to have any decent factual material. All he wants to give me is high class, high gloss, very expensive public relations material that his department so assiduously turns out.

CIDA

I say that is not good enough when you are talking about an agency with a budget of almost \$1 billion. I only hope that during this debate we might be able to throw a little public light on the need for an examination of CIDA, even though it is apparent that when this debate ends tonight we will not be much further ahead than we were when it started, precisely because the minister chose to give us a political speech rather than the statesmanlike speech that we had every right to deserve from the external affairs minister of this country.

Mr. MacEachen: Why not show a little leadership yourself instead of that carping approach?

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, my approach is not carping at all. I want to get behind the management of CIDA with all the support I can muster. I ask in return only for a share of some of the facts concerning how CIDA is presently being operated. I ask him to share with us the opportunity of planning the kind of response that is needed to meet the new conditions facing this world.

Those new conditions are graphically illustrated by the escalation of oil prices which have quadrupled during the year 1974, and which have more than wiped out all the foreign aid that the developing countries had been receiving. That simple fact alone illustrates why it is so necessary to move away from reliance on foreign aid as an expression of international assistance and toward what the United Nations has been proclaiming in its New International Economic Order, in the COCOYOC declaration, in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. Those are three documents which came into being in the year 1974.

I look to the minister to come into this House and to explain to hon. members and to the Canadian people what this New International Economic Order is all about. It is not just a piece of paper, a mirage, a dream; it is a formal document passed by the sixth special session of the United Nations general assembly, backed up by the regular assembly last year with the passage of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

I ask the minister to explain to us what needs to be done in order to implement that charter on the part of the developed countries. For surely it is the developed countries that must respond to the pressure being put upon international bodies today by the group of 77, now expanded to larger numbers but consisting mainly of countries of the developing world which have been most seriously and adversely hit by the kind of explosion that has taken place in international finance.

Time is running out on a speech in which I have so many more things I wanted to say in order to try to open up this debate and to open up parliament toward a new direction for Canada in international assistance, one where we can probably do more by spending less money. We do not need to spend \$933 million by way of direct assistance, which will itself be wiped out by the kind of international trade and monetary arrangements which have such a deleterious effect upon developing countries. That is the principal point that needs to be expanded upon both in parliament and in this country.

The United Nations is engaged in a long process of solidifying a new international partnership for develop-