

Export Development Act

policies which have an impact on the developing countries and to use a variety of policy instruments in the trade, international monetary and other fields in order to achieve its international development objectives.

What does this mean? The point, it seems to me, is summarized in the following sentence, also from the publication mentioned:

While continuing to value a higher volume and an improved quality of development assistance, developing countries are particularly concerned with other factors influencing their economic prospects, such as trade, monetary reform, investment, shipping and transfer of technology.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how have we been doing? How well have we been harmonizing the various instruments available to the government? The new North-South Institute, a private organization founded about a year ago, an organization well respected in development circles in Canada, made an evaluation of the government's development policies in a report issued a couple of months ago. Time does not permit me to go into this in this debate, but with respect to point one, about which I have just read, on the question of harmonizing, the North-South Institute has given a rating to the government's performance in that policy, and the rating is minus D. When my children come home with minus D on their report cards, I do not think very much of it.

● (1652)

What does minus D mean? It means that the government has failed to implement that key plank in the five-year strategy which is supposed to be harmonizing our industries to promote development in the world. The government, and I quote:

... is failing badly on this point. There is not sufficiently strong or consistent leadership being exerted to force all departments to give adequate weight to developing countries' concerns in their areas of policy. Without this supervision, departments tend not to do homework and to lose sight of the development dimension. The result is that the main effort now must be to prevent backsliding in several important policy areas.

Then the North-South Institute goes on to make the following point:

—Negative steps (non-tariff barriers) and contradictions (promotion of uncompetitive industries by DREE and the adjustment programmes of Industry, Trade and Commerce).

All of those programs have had a negative rating so far. When we talk about failure to implement policies, we have to put the discussion into the wider context of what is going on in the world, because I think it is unfair to single out the Canadian government as the only culprit in not taking long-range constructive policies to promote development. The problem is deeper than merely the colouration of the government. The problem has to do with the structures in the international community today as well as with what we might call the climate of world opinion.

There is another important passage from the most recent address by Mr. Ramphal to a number of British parliamentarians on January 23 of this year, in which Mr. Ramphal puts his finger on the dilemma we and the Export Development Corporation face as the EDC attempts to decide where it can most successfully invest its money commercially. It is a dilemma which hon. members of this House ought to be considering as we contemplate the future of the EDC. Mr. Ramphal evaluat-

[Mr. Roche.]

ed what has been going on over the past couple of years since the new international economic order was formulated and espoused by the United Nations at the Sixth and Seventh Special Sessions of the General Assembly which took place in 1975 and 1976.

Mr. Ramphal gave this evaluation:

The frustrations of UNCTAD IV, the failure of CIEC ...

The North-South Conference which took place, at which the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) was co-chairman.

... to produce meaningful results on structural change in the world's trading and financial arrangements, or, even to agree on the character of its disagreements; the negligible progress being made in eliminating the barriers to trade at the Multilateral Trade Negotiations in Geneva after four years of intensive dialogue; the bogging down of the negotiations on individual commodity agreements and on the Common Fund in spite of verbal agreement on the Integrated Programme for Commodities; the perpetuation of disorderly conditions in the international financial system with the attendant displacement of an international financial system by one substantially under national control; and the inability of the international community to agree even on a forum for coming to grips with the debt problem of the developing countries despite the staggering balance of payments deficits which have been projected for them—these events (or non-events) are not only disappointing in themselves, they are positively dangerous. To put it at its most charitable, this record of continuous dialogue and consistent inaction suggests that the realism which induced the promises of the Sixth and Seventh Special Sessions has passed and that the rich are returning to accustomed complacency with an unequal world—with all that that implies for a world at war with itself, even though all the evidence demonstrates that—as the young Canadian poet Margaret Atwood so poignantly warned us: "surviving is the only war we can afford."

I have used that quotation to indicate that the harmonizing of our domestic and international policies, with a new understanding that such a move is essential to create those long-range markets for Canada, is most urgently needed at this moment. I said that we should clarify the roles of both EDC and CIDA so that we can stop being confused about them. In order to do that I would like to draw attention to Mr. Robert McNamara, the president of the World Bank, who is among the leaders in the world now making the point that if developed nations in their assistance programs would change their programs to provide basic human development in developing countries—and by that he means food, water, shelter, hygiene, and education—that would provide a spirit of self-reliance in the developing nations and would help them to grow so that they can become those legitimate consumers who are waiting in the expectation that some day they will be able to have some of the basics of life. I want to use a little incident to illustrate the magnitude of what we are talking about here.

I was in China recently. I was going through a commune. I know the Export Development Corporation does not deal with China, but its officials should listen anyway because the moral applies to the countries with which it does deal. When I was in China I went through a commune, and I noticed a television set in the home of one of the leaders of that commune. That leader was a woman, and I asked her why she had a television set. She said it was true that there were television sets in public halls and so forth, but that more and more people now wanted to have television sets. I asked why, and she said, "Well, because it is so nice to lie in bed and watch television". I said to myself that that woman was ringing a bell. She was speaking for millions upon millions of people in third world