

*Company of Young Canadians Act*

letter is by Escott Reid, former principal of Glendon College, and in it he says:

Canada can do relatively little to assist in preventing war by maintaining armed forces. That game has become too expensive. If Canada were to double its present defence expenditures of 1.8 billion Canadian dollars a year, this would increase the total expenditures of the NATO countries by one and a half per cent. But if Canada were to increase its net expenditures on foreign aid to poor countries by 1.8 billion Canadian dollars a year, this would increase the total net expenditures of the wealthy white countries on foreign aid to poor countries by 33 per cent.

Such an increase could not, of course, take place in one move. It might be reasonable to assume that if Canada were to decide to increase its foreign aid by this order of magnitude, say to 2 per cent of its GNP, the increase would be spread over six years.

My hope is that Canada will decide so to increase its foreign aid. The annual rate of increase might be such that if our GNP should go up by an average of 7 per cent a year... we would be in the fiscal year 1975-76 be spending about \$2.4 billion (up from the present \$300 million) on foreign aid. If our expenditures on defence were held at \$1.8 billion a year the total expenditures of Canada on defence and foreign aid in the year 1975-76 would be \$4.2 billion—about 3½ per cent of the GNP.

Three and one half per cent of the GNP for defence and foreign aid is less than what Australia, Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands, or Norway spent on defence and foreign aid in 1967 and all these countries have lower per capita GNPs than Canada.

This puts some perspective into our position, and shows how we in Canada, through perhaps the CYC volunteers and other techniques, could increase our aid, our responsibility to these developing countries. I would hope the minister would see fit to continue the work-abroad principle that exists within the original CYC bill. I believe he can do so without being any more disloyal to the broadcasting committee report than he was when calling for an appointed council, despite the fact that this was not part of the committees recommendations.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State):** One word only, Mr. Speaker, to say that we cannot accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member. I could give several reasons to justify this refusal, but one will be more than enough.

We have overseas an organization of young people precisely to try and meet these very real needs of which the hon. member has spoken movingly and which provides young Canadians with the opportunity to work in under-developed countries.

This is a well known agency called Canadian University Service Overseas and it per-

forms excellent work. We do not see why we should have overlapping by steering in that direction the activities of the Company of Young Canadians. Work sharing is an excellent principle for social action as well as for industry.

• (5:40 p.m.)

This is why we object to the amendment. I could put forward other objections, but this one seems quite sufficient to me. I like the hon. member's aims, but it seems to me that it is possible to attain them more effectively through an institution which has already an experience of several years abroad, which has done Canada proud and whose effectiveness is acknowledged. Therefore it would not be well advised to have in the same field two separate and overlapping institutions.

[*English*]

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I too will be very brief, even more brief than the minister. I am happy to find myself on this occasion agreeing completely with what the minister said.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Nowlan:** I know the minister has many other reasons he could enunciate and define, and there are many other reasons I could give why we could not support this amendment. Many of the objectives of the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) are idealistic, and he hopes to resolve the problems of the developing countries by some agency, any agency, and in this case the Company of Young Canadians. But it comes down to this, Mr. Speaker, if I may be short and to the point. In view of the experience we have had with the Company of Young Canadians, and in view of Mr. Pearson's original concept of the Company of Young Canadians, although even in the gestation period he decided that we should try the Company at home first before we exported it, I do not think it should engage in activities abroad.

I appreciate that this legislation is only a chapter in the history of the Company of Young Canadians, and that the question of the company will back before this Parliament or certainly it will appear before another Parliament. There have been problems with the Company of Young Canadians, and I believe we should make sure that it works at home before we start to export it abroad. In view of the experience with the Company's handling of some of our problems at home, I believe that the hon. member's objectives of