

their aid, then it is almost certain that for the first time in this long haul of years that gap would begin to narrow.

This of course is a matter of the greatest importance to the nations of the Commonwealth, because in this respect we are about the poorest of all the international organizations. Of our 25 member nations, only four are in a position to grant aid without also being the recipients of aid. These are the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. All the authorities I have consulted are agreed that it is only with a program of aid first, and then trade, that we will be able to solve this world-wide problem which many think constitutes a greater danger to the peace of the world than Red Guards, Vietnam, the population explosion, or even the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Our world can handle these, but only if and when we are able to assure the peoples of these undeveloped countries that their standards of living are going to begin at once to rise a little bit every year.

They are not asking for the moon and sixpence; they are asking only for the sixpence. If we do not collectively find ways and means of giving it to them soon, then we may find as Rome did—and I do not think I am exaggerating—that we are not safe behind all the legions on the frontier.

I simply cannot believe, honourable senators, that we of the developed affluent nations can keep on adding to our affluence every year, and boasting about it—as of course we do—while half of the world starves. That is a fact, and it has been verified before the United Nations. Half the peoples of the world are starving, or are living at slightly below subsistence level, while ours is an affluent society.

There is a realistic target. Nobody is suggesting we just keep on pouring out money and hoping. Studies have made it clear that if all the nations in a position to give aid were to give one per cent of their gross national income, then the gap would immediately start to close; not only that, but many nations would within a year or so reach that take-off point where their economies would become self-propelled and they would need very little aid in the future.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has predicted that by 1970 the total level of Canadian aid should reach that figure of one per cent of gross national income. At the present time the average amount given by all the aid-giving nations is about half of one

per cent of their gross national incomes. Canada's giving is probably 0.6 per cent, or just over half of one per cent.

Not having all the facts, and not wishing to suggest that I know more than those who have responsibility in this matter, I wonder if it might not make a tremendous contribution to the solution of this problem if Canada were to announce now that somehow we will find the extra money to bring our contributions up to one per cent, if other aid-giving nations will do the same.

Another matter that arose out of the conference discussion—and honourable senators may have read something of it in the papers—was the suggestion that these conferences cost too much money. I think it is fair to say in respect of this conference that any such comment was almost entirely due to a lack of knowledge of the facts. It should be remembered that the C.P.A. is an association of branches attached to some 90 legislatures around the world. Of these, no fewer than 11 are Canadian. Both federal and provincial Canadian representatives have for 15 years been guests of other countries at these conferences. All 11 Canadian branches were joint hosts at this last conference, and Senator Leonard, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance, would be the first to agree, I think, that the provinces were generous in their co-operation with us.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Grosart: So, to get an estimate of the weight of expense we have to divide the total by 11, and remember that our branches were 11 members who took responsibility for this conference.

Of course, a most unique feature of the C.P.A. conferences are the tours across the country. Some have said they are unnecessary. I spoke to many delegates about this, and I would say the opinion was unanimous that these tours are just as important, if not more important, than the conference itself. As far as Canada is concerned, I am convinced that the value to us of these important leaders from all over the world getting to know Canada, and not just Ottawa, is inestimable. The same applies when our delegates go abroad. There are ties that bind us together as a Commonwealth, and they are ties that need constant renewal. I would say, of course, that it is not necessary for any tour in a smaller country to be as expansive as was necessary in Canada.