

concessional financial terms and using aid as a way of moving our products in the Third World. We do not believe that this is appropriate. Canadians do not want their aid program to be used as an adjunct to the program of international trade. We recognize the importance of international trade but we believe that the aid program has to stand on its own two feet. It should have its own validity and criteria and should not be subjected to the criteria of international trade.

• (1600)

In providing aid to other countries, there always has to be a certain policy dialogue with those countries. We believe that there has to be more emphasis on long-term economic and environmental sustainability of capital projects. Programs for structural adjustment should be consistent with our development assistance goals.

Too often we have pushed upon Third World countries a form of structural adjustment in accordance with the IMF that results in cuts in wages and social services and a reduction in the standard of living of the very poorest of people. Again, we recommend that Canadian representatives on international financial institutions ensure that structural adjustment policies take into account their effect on the poorest people. The burden must not fall on the poorest people.

The report commends the Government for the five-year moratorium on ODA debt for sub-Saharan countries in Africa. We recommended that 2 per cent of our aid should continue to be set aside for international emergencies but that an additional 1 per cent of our aid budget, approximately \$25 million, should be available to match voluntary relief contributions of Canadian agencies. This is what happened in 1984 with Ethiopian relief.

Except in emergencies, food aid should not exceed 10 per cent of our ODA budget. In recent years, it has gone beyond 15 per cent. Food aid is superficially attractive to countries like Canada. Our farmers and fishermen produce good food, sometimes more than we are able to sell on world markets. We do not like to see good food go to waste and Canadians do not like to see people in other parts of the world go hungry so they ask what would be more natural than to use CIDA funding to buy Canadian surplus food and send it to countries with hungry people.

The other side of the coin is that for the receiving country, food aid creates a dependency on imported food. It depresses the prices paid to local farmers, driving them out of business and leaving the country more dependent than ever on imported food.

I see you are giving me the signal that my time is up, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, I would like to say that we disagree strongly with the refusal of the committee to go back to the Government's original commitment to move toward devoting .7 per cent of Gross National Product to development assistance by 1990. Africa, Asia and Central America are all crying out for help. The Government made a commitment three years

ago at the United Nations that it would move toward that .7 per cent. It has not done so. Instead, it has moved the goal-posts. We are now talking about reaching .6 per cent by 1995. Instead of the Government accepting even the modest suggestion of the committee that it move more quickly to reach that .6 per cent, it rejected it.

The Government has accepted some of the recommendations of the committee but it has not accepted the very important recommendation for decentralization. I wish I had more time to talk about that. The committee talked about decentralizing to the specific countries involved rather than decentralizing to regions, leaving a great deal of authority in Hull.

The Government has not really accepted our recommendation that human rights should be put front and centre in the whole development assistance question. In other areas where it has accepted our recommendations, it has done so with so many qualifications that we have to wonder what will really happen.

I see you are giving me the signal to conclude. I hope that the Government will continue to examine closely the report's recommendations, and we look forward to hearing the step-by-step announcement the Government has said it will be making to implement those recommendations which it has said it will accept.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his comments and I know that he speaks from a great background of experience, not only from his study and work in the committee and his attendance at committee meetings to listen to the witnesses who spoke to the committee on this matter in its tour across Canada, but also from his visits to the countries of the Americas and Africa to learn at first hand about the work of the committee, the ODA.

I was concerned with the Hon. Member's closing comments in which he said that he regretted that the Government had paid little attention to or given little support to the recommendations the committee made for linking the giving of aid to the finding of human rights conditions. I recognize that it is a very difficult subject, one on which we might make some progress, and I would like to ask the Hon. Member if he could comment further on why, in his understanding, the Government has not yet taken up those recommendations positively and whether he thinks there are certain respects in which the Government may be moving in the direction of the recommendations.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, we had recommended, for example, the establishment of a grid, but in the response, the Minister said that the Government believes that the establishment of a grid and especially the classification of countries according to such a grid would not serve the over-all interests of Canadian development assistance or of Canadian foreign policy and made similar comments about the suggestion that there be a report tabled in the House of Commons that looks at the human rights situations in recipient countries.