

end of a project, but there should be examination and evaluation in mid-term as well as at the end of the project. In this way it would be possible to ascertain which projects had been failures and which were likely to fail and should therefore be discontinued. If it were possible to ascertain the reasons for failure, efforts could be made to ensure that future projects did not fail for the same reasons.

We are conscious, of course, of the fact that conditions in each country are different. I cannot at this stage say exactly what the composition of this evaluating organization would be. It might well be that we should seek experienced people who have been with the United Nations development program or with the development assistance committee of the OECD. Some such external evaluation is essential, in my judgment. We should review very carefully the list of recipient countries. I believe we should confine our assistance, both on a multilateral and bilateral basis, to the nations in most urgent need as established by the United Nations itself in August of 1974. They issued a list of 32 or 34 nations which are in most urgent need. It seems to make sense that these are the countries which need our assistance. If we adopt the philosophy that the purpose of international aid is to aid ourselves, a different judgment might be arrived at. But if the object is to aid people who are in greatest need, then we should restrict our aid to these countries.

Second, we must concentrate much more on agriculture, particularly on food production in the developing nations. At the World Food Conference we learned that there are chronically up to half a billion people who are undernourished, including at least 200 million children who are stunted both physically and mentally as a result. Certainly the answer is increased food production in the developing countries. Developed countries such as Canada have a part to play by providing research assistance appropriate to the areas in question. Of course, we cannot forgo direct food aid where there are threats of starvation. Nevertheless, the basic objective of development should be to enable people to help themselves produce the basic food essential to decent living.

We must also ensure that our aid goes to the people: in other words, it should go to labour-intensive projects and not to the enrichment of those who are already relatively prosperous. It should not be a program for aiding business in Canada or outside, but for aiding people in need. We should have less tied aid and more multilateral aid. We should increase our program of assistance to non-governmental agencies such as the World Council of Churches, OXFAM and UNICEF, all of which have practical, ongoing programs operated by experienced people, with greater flexibility than is possible for governments or government agencies to achieve.

I wish I had time to discuss the question of training people from developing countries. I believe much more attention should be paid to training people in their own countries, if possible with Canadian funds. If they came to Canada they should be fitted into courses where they could learn skills that would be valuable to their own country, and they should be given assistance on return to their own country. We could ensure that students and trainees in Canada returned home for summer holidays so

they did not get out of touch with their own countries and found it difficult to adjust when they had completed their training.

There are many other things which would make CIDA's and Canada's contribution to international development and aid even more effective—something of which Canadians could be truly proud. An essential element in this is that the operation should be adequately understood and full information about it made available. I have in my hand CIDA's annual review which was published a day or so ago. This is a useful document but it is certainly not enough. One could read it from cover to cover and not find the slightest suggestion that anything done under these programs was, for one reason or another not working well. I believe the people of Canada are proud of and willing to support a contribution to international development. We in this parliament must be sure that this contribution is as efficient, as innovative, as flexible and as well understood by the public as possible.

• (1620)

[Translation]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity of participating in the debate on a motion introduced on one of the allotted days provided for consideration of the business of supply, and which will allow us to study and scrutinize the performance of the Canadian International Development Agency.

The motion states rather accurately that the members of this House and the public in general lack information on this government agency. In my opinion, what the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) has said is true. All we can work on is an extremely vague annual report, cleverly printed in vivid colours, if you please, and this costs a lot of money, but which says just about nothing. Moreover, when one writes to CIDA, one gets no reply nor acknowledgment. As a rule, Mr. Speaker, CIDA is as busy as a hive, but that has nothing to do with the parliament of Canada. Still, over \$770 million, more than the budget of the Department of Agriculture, are handed over to CIDA to provide assistance to developing countries.

Several developing countries experience shortages in areas as essential as food, energy or housing. In view of those disastrous situations, the president of CIDA has said in presenting his annual report, and I quote:

... only a coordinated international response could effectively meet and minimize suffering.

Mr. Speaker, from that statement of the president of CIDA, we assume that he should give us evidence that CIDA assistance has really met and minimized suffering. In a few moments, I shall give extremely specific examples that will prove the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, CIDA operates in very strange ways. This government agency's annual report is the only document available to the House. Now, on page 25, there is a chapter on the Ivory Coast. I shall read from it briefly.

Ivory Coast's National Library, constructed at a cost of \$4 million, half of which was provided by Ivory Coast, was inaugurated in January 1974.