

CIDA

State for the Home Department in Britain, Mr. Robert Carr. In a statement made in the British House of Commons on June 29, 1973, he said:

If the government and we in this House as individual members of parliament are to have a proper relationship with the people of the country whom we represent and govern, the people must have the opportunity to be as well informed as possible, both about the policies which we are following and the reasons which have led us to pursue them.

This, he said, was central to the whole machinery of democracy. CIDA is spending substantial sums, on behalf of the Canadian people, outside the country for the purpose of building a world community and adding to the security of the world. But there should be no secrecy about its operations. I would like to emphasize that we do not believe an effective program of international aid by Canada is a matter of charity or, indeed, of mere humanitarianism. It is a contribution to world stability. It makes it possible to believe that we can build a world community. It minimizes the danger of conflicts which can lead to infinitely destructive war. However, there is no reason in the world why this effort should not be fully known to and fully discussed by the citizens generally. If there are things that go wrong, we should know about them so they can be set right.

The famous American, Ralph Nader, of Harvard, in an article in the *Civil Liberties Law Review*, volume 5, pages 1 to 15, June, 1970, said:

A well informed citizenry is the lifeblood of democracy; and in all arenas of government, information, particularly timely information, is the currency of power . . . In our policy, where the ultimate power is said to rest with the people, a free and prompt flow of information from government to people is essential to achieve the reality of citizen access to a more just governmental process. It is especially essential to provide this informational flow in the Washington regulatory agencies, which are essentially unaccountable to any electorate or constituency.

We should substitute "Ottawa" for "Washington" in that quotation. May I say, however, that in dealings with the third world and in seeking to narrow the enormous gap between the have and the have-not nations, international aid is not enough. As important, if not much more important, than international aid is a more just trade system and greater effort by the rest of the world to give access in its markets to the developing world for products produced in the third world. This is the avenue which we have to explore in the future. It is a great, unfinished item on the agenda: it will come up again and again. The third world, as it is called, is fully aware of the importance of trade to its future development. In the developed world we have hitherto turned a deaf ear to pleas for trade rather than aid.

I have had the opportunity to travel in parts of the world where I have seen CIDA projects in operation. Many of them, in my judgment, are doing excellent work. However, there is no reason why there should not be provision for adequate scrutiny by the government, by parliament and by the public. I am reminded of the fact that at the end of the last session, the standing committee on external affairs sought the production of a report, prepared at public expense by the chartered accountants firm of Price Waterhouse, which dealt with the apparent rapid turnover of personnel within CIDA. There were objections that parts of the report were irrelevant and reflected on individuals. To meet these objections the

[Mr. Brewin.]

committee asked that the report be submitted to the steering committee, in camera, so they could decide whether the report was relevant in all or in part and whether the reputation of individuals needed to be protected by not making public parts of the report or names in it.

The president of CIDA indicated that he would produce the report. However, he was instructed by the then secretary of state for external affairs, now President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), to tell the subcommittee and, through the subcommittee, a committee of this House that the document would not be produced. No reasons were given. Personally, I thought that in doing this the minister was flouting the rights of members and showing contempt for the operations of parliament and I moved a motion in the House to this effect. The Speaker of that day reserved his ruling and dissolution of the House the next day resolved the question. It may be that such a report contains inaccuracies or misjudgments, but surely if this is so it would be possible for CIDA to demonstrate that this is the case rather than to hide the report.

I make the following suggestions as to the way in which complete openness with regard to the operations of CIDA can be obtained. I do not think it is adequate, although it may be important, that the report and study of CIDA and its estimates be examined by the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. This committee has to range all the way across the globe, consider many important questions of policy and all the estimates of the Department of External Affairs as well as the estimates of the Department of National Defence and defence policy. There is no way, in the time available—however keen and informed the members of the committee may be—that there could be an adequate examination. The material made available is the annual review of CIDA which for the years 1973-74 has just been published. This is an interesting and informative review but, as might be expected, it is entirely uncritical.

● (1610)

The only means for greater governmental scrutiny of CIDA might be the appointment of a minister as assistant to the Secretary of State for External Affairs who would be in charge of CIDA and international aid generally. In Britain, as most hon. members know, there is such a member, known as the minister of overseas development, who at the present time is Mrs. Judith Hart. I have discussed the matter with her and she believes that to have a minister in charge other than the foreign minister provides for much closer examination of development aid and much more response to parliament. It has sometimes been said that it is important to have a minister of high prestige concerned with CIDA. By making the minister of overseas development, or whatever the title might be, an assistant minister to the Secretary of State for External Affairs would provide some measure of responsibility of a senior official in the cabinet which is, I think, highly desirable.

However, it seems we must go much further than this. There should, in my judgment, be some effective form of evaluation of projects by an independent source. This evaluation should not take place within CIDA, although no doubt it must take place there. We should not await the