

The Budget—Mr. Macdonnell

the rich to get richer but disturbing and distressing to have the desperately poor people remain desperately poor.

I want to give one further figure here. The average per capita income in Canada in 1959 was \$1,507, as compared with \$110 in the underdeveloped countries in 1950, rising to \$125 or \$130 in 1959.

The question is, can we afford to do more? What is our present contribution measured in what we might call topical terms? Mr. Keenleyside, a former United Nations official and now president of the B.C. power commission said, jocularly but accurately:

The cost of the Canadian contribution to the Colombo plan is less than half the cost of cosmetics purchased annually by Canadian women.

The easy way out of this situation, and it is being put forward by many people, is to find the money by reducing defence expenditures. This is a very attractive solution. I wish I could put that forward as my solution, but I am not prepared to base my suggestion on that. As we know from the experience of Mr. Gaitskell, the leader of the Labour party in England, the responsibility of laying ourselves open to the communists is something serious men will have to consider very seriously. I have to fall back, therefore, on familiar words.

This ought ye to have done, but not to have left the other undone.

In other words, I believe we have to do both. If this argument of mine is sound—and it is an argument that has been advanced by abler, wiser and more experienced men than myself—then we have to do both. The excuse is often advanced that we are a small country. We are not so small as all that. Moreover we are not in the habit of saying we are small. We often say that we are very big. We often say we are the third or fourth trading nation, and that is true. In addition to this, our example would be very effective in the United States. We have reason to believe the United States is going to do a great deal more about this problem. Further action by us would have a significant effect there.

No one will deny the validity of these three arguments. I am sure no one will dispute the humanitarian argument, the political argument or the economic argument. In so far as the political argument is concerned, I want to read a short sentence which I forgot. I have here an article by Malcolm Macdonald recently back from India, where he spent years as Britain's representative, speaking of India and other Asian nations whom he described as non-aligned. The article reads in part as follows:

It is vital to the interests of the free world that these nations should not slip over to the

[Mr. Macdonnell.]

communist side. The issue is in the balance; it is at present uncertain whether the non-aligned Asians will move closer to the western camp or go communist or remain strictly non-aligned. If the west does not show adequate sympathy and give sufficient help to them, they will drift into the communists' arms, which are outstretched to give them a comradely, if suffocating, hug.

In either case the balance of political power in the world may be vitally affected.

The question remains, then, not whether we accept these arguments but whether we take them seriously, whether we are prepared to do anything about them. It may be that there is a different spirit abroad. It may be that we will develop some of the boldness and imagination for which the president of the Imperial bank calls. It may be that we shall take seriously what the Prime Minister said:

Economic assistance to underdeveloped countries is a major and mandatory need if freedom is to be preserved in the world.

If my argument is right, and I am following those who have thought so much about this problem, I would go on to say, do not let us miss the bus. People say, can we afford it? I use the argument which was used when we were considering a loan of a billion dollars to Britain in 1946. The argument was made then that the question is not whether we can afford to do it. The question is whether we can afford not to do it. This argument was accepted then and was triumphantly successful.

I would close by saying that we cannot leave everything to the government. Public opinion has to support the government. The other night the Secretary of State for External Affairs at a meeting in Toronto found slight evidence of support in public opinion on this question. I venture to say to those who create public opinion, the churches, the universities, the labour unions, chambers of commerce, farmers' organizations, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association: think on these things and reach your conclusions, then act accordingly. You cannot leave everything to the government. I close with the words once used by Lord Lothian, whom Churchill called the greatest ambassador to the United States, and who once said in a speech in the United States:

Under a democracy, the responsibility comes squarely down on the shoulders of every one of us.

I say, therefore, to the Canadian people, accept that judgment and act accordingly.

Hon. Paul Martin (Essex East): In the last day of the debate on the budget, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say that much of the criticism that has been levelled against the budget by the Liberal opposition has been confirmed by the criticisms made by corporations, individuals and institutions all