

*International Relations*

When we have taken sides like this, the only certain thing is that there is one loser—the ordinary, common people of El Salvador. They are the losers. The left wants to paint the revolution there as a peasants' revolt, as a mass popular uprising against the rightist regime of Duarte. The right wants to paint that situation as a democratic agrarian reform movement, ready to restore all rights to the peasants. The peasants are squeezed in the middle between those two extreme protagonists. In terms of foreign aid, this unavoidably determines the level, the kind and the destination of foreign aid. Depending upon whose side one is on, those who favour Duarte will ensure that he gets military equipment, those who favour the revolutionaries will ensure they get the equipment they need, but the peasants will not get the equipment they need.

It comes to the bottom line. In all too many of these cases, government to government aid simply does not work. There are at least two reasons for this. One is that it is determined by people who have axes to grind. They have a motive, they have a reason tied to the aid program. As the Prime Minister said yesterday, it is in our self interest to give aid. The reason then is not that the people need it; it is that we will suffer if we do not give it. This is not the best of all motives in the world. We have an axe to grind. The simple truth is that donors in the northern hemisphere really cannot know or understand the needs of those people.

The hon. leader of the NDP went on a two-week tour of Latin American countries. I give him full points for that, but there is no way that someone from Canada can spend two weeks down there and expect to meet the people at their level. By the time the lists of whom he wants to see have been laundered—they have gone through so many checks to ensure that only the right people meet him—the people who are suffering the most are never heard from. It is not the fault of the leader of the NDP; it would have happened to anyone. Those of us who are designing aid programs in this country simply cannot know or understand how to meet the needs of the people in receiving countries.

● (2140)

The other half of the equation is that the receivers have their own bureaucratic programs to fulfil if it is a government to government operation. Every country has its own bureaucracy. I am sure that if we looked just a little more closely at the bureaucracy in El Salvador we would find that that government has vested interests in the kinds of aid programs which are given to it, which do not necessarily meet the needs of the people. Have we not learned that fact within Canada? Do you not think that what goes on in El Salvador also goes on in Canada? All countries have their bureaucratic games. Therefore, for aid to be effective, it must be people to people. As other speakers have said, that means the governments on both ends are avoided and the work is done through non-governmental organizations, such as private agencies, voluntary agencies and charitable organizations in Canada which have gone to the receiver country ahead of time and have become one with the people. The people from these agencies know what the needs are. They show compassion at the grass roots

level and not at a distance of 2,000 or 3,000 miles. They are people who are willing to drink the contaminated water along with the people they are there to serve.

When non-governmental organizations get into the act, we can rest assured that aid will go to the people who need it most. There will be no filtering off to meet the backsheesh desires of government officials. It will not be filtered through graft, but it will be from the people in the homeland who care to the people in the receiver land who care.

The second reason why government to government aid does not work is shown in the 1980 report of "World Military and Social Expenditures, 1980," by Ruth Leger Sivard. I would like to read to you, Mr. Speaker, some of the statistics which come from that 1980 report. Using Canada as a base for comparison, I wish to point out that in 1977, which I believe was the year used for this report, Canada spent 2 per cent of its gross national product on military expenditures and at the same time spent 5.5 per cent on health care.

I would now like to give some figures for the government of Peru, which is a rightist regime. In 1977 the government of Peru spent 3 per cent of its gross national product on military expenditures and 1.1 per cent on health programs. In Cuba, in 1977, 6 per cent of that country's gross national product was expended on the military while 4.3 per cent was spent on health programs.

The next figures I would like to cite are for Tanzania, where the life expectancy is 51 years. In 1977 Tanzania, whose president is a great buddy of our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), spent 4 per cent of its gross national product on military expenditures and 2 per cent on health care.

Using Canada as a base, do you not think that there is a violent wrenching of priorities in these countries, to which we must address ourselves? We ought to take a look at what is happening with regard to the radical priority differences which exist in the countries to which we give aid and make loans. It is hypocritical for us to spend nearly three times as much on health as on the military and not expect Third World countries to do the same. That does not make any sense. Maybe that radical problem ought to be addressed. It seems to me that we are relieving those governments of the responsibility of spending money on health care so that they can spend it on the military. That also makes no sense. This matter must be addressed.

Perhaps there should be a second recommendation. On the one hand we ought to cut off government to government aid and work only through non-governmental organizations. On the other hand maybe we ought to have the UN establish a benchmark of a "reasonable limit" which Third World countries can adopt. Every country will have some kind of military spending. A reasonable limit which that country is entitled to spend on military expenditures ought to be established. But if the country spends beyond that limit, it should no longer receive foreign aid from our government, especially if health services are denied to its people while military spending escalates.