

*Official Developmental Aid*

of Prime Minister Pearson, for whom we all share an admiration. I recall the war on poverty that he began. He initiated a spending program that people throughout the country supported because of our desire to follow the Government in ending poverty within this land. So year after year the spending continued and mounted and so did the poverty statistics. The intention was worthy, the objective was noble, the effort was admirable, but the results are still there. We now have more people below the poverty level than we had when the war on poverty began. This is true not only in Canada.

Only the other night I read about how this is the sad experience of the people of Sweden. Sweden, of all places, the darling of all the social democrats, that gem of a country, the model that we should all follow. Sweden has now discovered that they have more people below the poverty line than they had 20 years ago. They now have to reassess their approach, not because they have less concern for the poor than they had, but because they are recognizing, as we are recognizing, that you simply do not spend your way into human betterment. We have to recognize that the answer to the needs of the people in the underdeveloped parts of the world lies not simply in our increasing the amount of money we spend there, but lies more in our joining with them in those programs, in those methods by which they will achieve the good life to which they aspire.

For example, in a recent editorial in the London *Times*, and it is certainly in the parliamentary tradition to quote the *Times*, and I do so with reference to an editorial called "Africa Help for Self-Help", the *Times* argues quite rightly that if the level of life in Africa is to be raised it will be raised, solely when the countries of Africa attract, once again, investment capital, in contrast to their failure of recent years. Only 3 per cent of the overseas investment capital of the world has gone into African countries in recent times. So the *Times*, understandably, urges the Governments of Africa to adopt those policies that once again could attract private investment and join with private investment within the borders of their own countries.

I speak of that because I believe that we have to address ourselves as a Parliament and as a Government to linking our overseas aid with certain developments within the receiving countries, that joined with our aid it will add to the betterment of life within those borders. One of them has been suggested in previous speeches in criticism of military spending. I hope that all Members of Parliament will be conscious of the waste of resources on military spending within so many underdeveloped countries and that we might join together in improving those programs that will lift the level of life. Surely that is the goal of us all.

● (1850)

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill):** Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I believe this is a somewhat historic moment in the history of Private Members' Business in the House of Commons of Canada. Unless I misunderstand, this is

the first day we have had a debate on one of the votable items of the 20 Bills on the order of precedence. The Bill of the Hon. Member for Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands (Mr. Manly) is one of the three Bills selected so far by the Standing Committee on Private Members' Business that will come to a vote should time permit. There is a possibility that if prorogation occurs, these Bills will die on the Order Paper and not actually come to a vote, but it is worthy to note that this is the first occasion that we are debating a votable Private Members' motion.

It is unfortunate that more Members are not present because the intention of the reform was that there might be more interest, given that a particular subject might actually come to a vote. I must say that there are more Members in the House than is normally the case during Private Members' Hour and perhaps we are on the road to improvement in that respect.

I want to comment on the speech given by the Hon. Member for Scarborough West (Mr. Stackhouse). I am sorry that he cannot hear me say this—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. The Hon. Member has been here quite a while. He should not reflect on who is in the House and who is not in the House. There are monitors outside and I am sure Members are watching the Hon. Member right now and enjoying his speech. There are many Members behind the curtain who are watching the Hon. Member. Therefore, I hope he will stick to debate.

I appreciate him saying that this is the first of the five hours on this votable Private Members' motion.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to reflect any motives about the absence of Members. It was simply my way of expressing my regret. I appreciate the fact that you believe so many people are listening to me.

If memory serves me correctly, it was not Lester Pearson who initiated the war on poverty, but Lyndon Johnson. It was an American phenomenon. I know that the Hon. Member for Scarborough West is not a professor of history. He is a professor of Christian ethics, which is even more amazing. However, it was the Americans who launched the war on poverty.

I must say that with respect to what is happening in the modern welfare state, democratic socialists have not been proven wrong by the welfare state, democratic socialists have been proven right by the fact that the welfare state has not closed the gap between the rich and the poor. We have said all along that the redistribution of wealth without the redistribution of power would not bring about the kind of equality that we in the New Democratic Party want.

I want to address the arguments put forward by the Hon. Member for Scarborough West because I found them quite provoking. Part of the Hon. Member's argument was the old "charity begins at home" routine. I want to say for the interest