

Supply—External Affairs

[Text]

Mr. Matheson: Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago the Hon. Adlai Stevenson, addressing a United Nations day rally in Dallas memorial stadium was booed, spat upon, and hit on the head with a couple of card placards saying "Down with the United Nations." At that meeting he gave a carefully prepared address, but this important figure of the United Nations and of the United States, who to some extent has represented America to the world, was harassed and attacked by people who were against the idea of international involvement. Of course, during these last few days we have had in our minds the memory of a president who epitomized to the world the good, world citizen. President Kennedy, in his inaugural address on January 21, 1961, said:

My fellow citizens of the world: Ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are the citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you.

We in Canada, responding to this challenge, should think right now of our relationship with the rest of the world. During the last six months, Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to be in 11 countries. I believe, as speakers before me have indicated, that there is perhaps no people in the world with more opportunity to participate fully and generously in world events. Of necessity, those speeches that have preceded mine have tended to be general in character, covering the wide scene. I would like to limit myself, in the time that is available, to one particular aspect of external affairs. I am referring to foreign aid. A few weeks ago I was in Skoplje. I had an opportunity to see first hand most of the devastated streets of that city. I believe I am correct in saying that over 16,000 people were then living in tents. Skoplje, an ancient Macedonian city that goes back several hundred years before Christ and represents an ancient and honourable civilization in that part of the world, would have been fractured and shattered for all time except for a process of great international assistance. The most important resolution passed by the 52nd interparliamentary conference, which took place in Belgrade, was one wherein every delegate of the 60 nations represented, both iron curtain and free countries, resolved to go back to their parliaments and recommend that substantial international aid be given for the reconstruction of Skoplje.

I do not want to dwell on this subject at any length, but I hope the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who I know has been

concerned about this matter, will regard this as a great opportunity for Canada to make a significant and permanent contribution to an ancient and proud city that has known something of the ravages of the Turks, the Byzantians, the Romans and the Huns. There is one country in the world that might exercise some sort of pressure on Yugoslavia, and that is the Soviet union. Notwithstanding their ideological sympathies, the Yugoslavs tend to look to countries outside and beyond the Soviet union for the kind of understanding they are not likely to find in their own local environment. I think this is a unique opportunity for Canada to make herself known there, and a contribution of perhaps \$2 million—if I might suggest that figure—for some kind of permanent building that would always have the name "Canada" upon it would be the sort of thing that honourably would bear our image for ever in that part of the world.

May I pass on to an aspect of foreign aid that I think is even more important in the long run. I have been interested for some time in precisely what Canada has been doing in the area of foreign aid. I have placed on the order paper a number of questions on this matter and have received from the ministry a number of answers. At page 1486 of *Hansard* for June 24 last there is an answer from the department with respect to Canada's contribution in external aid expressed as a percentage of Canada's gross national product. I might point out to the committee that in the year 1960 it was .20 per cent; in 1962 it was down to .18 per cent. Perhaps one would not be able to judge what this means unless it were compared with the contribution of other countries. On October 14, 1963, I put another question on the order paper which asked the extent of our contribution in comparison with the countries of NATO Europe, and NATO North America. I should like to put the answer on the record. This is based on the gross national product of each country during the year 1961: Belgium .86 per cent; Canada .19 per cent; Denmark .12 per cent; France 1.70 per cent; Germany .83 per cent; Italy .21 per cent; Japan .48 per cent; the Netherlands .62 per cent; Norway .21 per cent; Portugal 1.24 per cent; the United Kingdom .66 per cent; the United States .73 per cent. Then, expressing the same thing in another way, on November 13, 1963, I received an answer with respect to aid to development.

The answer of November 13, 1963 told us what in the last year of record was the per capita contribution in foreign aid to underdeveloped countries from members of the organization for economic co-operation and