

Some countries thought that that figure was a little too high. It would certainly increase our contribution considerably. In fact, it would increase every country's contribution considerably. The only country that comes close to giving one per cent of its gross national product—and I am sure it will surprise you when I name it—is France. I do not quote these figures to belittle my own country, but in comparison they are worth considering. On a per capita basis France contributes \$110; the United States \$80; the Netherlands \$75; and Canada \$27, which is one-sixth of one per cent of our gross national product. That is not a large sum of money to spend on so worthy a cause.

The *Toronto Globe and Mail* was angry when it found out that our Colombo Plan aid was reduced by \$8,500,000, and it had this to say:

Many Canadians hearing that Ottawa has cut Colombo Plan aid by \$8.5 million as part of the nation's austerity measures will hang their heads in shame. The Government decided to reduce its surplus wheat shipments to India, Pakistan and other Asian countries, and in this way chopped the aid figure to Southeast Asia from \$50 million to \$41.5 million.

In a land where most of us have more than enough to eat, surely the last place where Government spending should have been trimmed is surplus food gifts to the world's hungry nations.

That reminds us of something that is very pertinent to Canada.

Canada was one of the initiators of the World Food Bank, where the 27 member countries have pledged \$86 million in surplus grain and other foods, shipping and a variety of commodities and services. Presumably the \$8.5 million cut will make it that much easier for Ottawa to fulfill its commitments to this new experimental food-sharing project.

I must admit that this is an angry editorial. Nevertheless, it is something that makes us think when we realize that we take this thing rather lightly. There are people in this country who are deeply concerned, and the *Globe and Mail* speaks for many.

Honourable senators, we have the resources in our country that can help the less fortunate to create a new world of opportunity, but somehow or other we have lacked the vision and the will to do that which is so necessary. I take this occasion to say what is in my mind. I regret very much that we took a backward step with respect to one of the great undertakings with which we associated

ourselves in the days when we were dreaming of a better world for other people who were less fortunate than ourselves.

Hon. Gordon B. Isnor: Honourable senators, I think the practice in past years has been for the Leader of the Government in the Senate to answer questions that honourable senators may have with respect to any particular item in the appropriation bill before them, and I think the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Brooks) said in his remarks tonight that he would be pleased to do so. I do not propose to make any extended remarks in regard to the general terms of the bill or the amounts involved, but I would like to inquire concerning one or two items.

In Schedule A on page 3 under the heading "Finance" may I inquire as to the meaning of the word "repaid" as contained in the following paragraph:

Miscellaneous minor or unforeseen expenses, subject to the approval of the Treasury Board, including authority to re-use any sums repaid ...

Just what does that word "repaid" mean? Does this item include amounts paid by other nations with respect to loans? Will those amounts be now used for expenditures by the Government during the past year or in future years? I would like a definition of the word "repaid".

Hon. Mr. Brooks: The explanation I have for this item is that it is one of the two contingency funds which are intended to meet otherwise unprovided-for expenditures of a department. Generally, the limits of interim supply can be expected to give rise to more unforeseen requirements, many of them temporary, than would develop under full supply conditions. This vote is to take care of contingencies and unexpected expenditures. I believe this type of vote has been in estimates from time immemorial. It is a vote that is in every year.

Hon. Mr. Isnor: I am not questioning the fact that this vote is in the present estimates, or in bills of a similar nature to this one. I am questioning that one word "repaid", and I am asking for its exact meaning. My question is: does it include repayments of loans, and are those sums to be used to defray expenses for the current year? That is a very simple question.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: It is to cover contingencies that have been paid for out of some other fund.

Hon. Mr. Isnor: Does the vote include loans recently repaid by certain nations?