

*Financial Institutions*

exception of a portion of the payments due to the Caribbean Development Bank, all of the above appropriations I have mentioned will be made in notes.

In closing, it is important for the House to be aware that some of the appropriations that I have referred to in the course of this debate are required to meet immediate obligations to these institutions. Passage of this Bill will also facilitate Canada's international undertaking to increase its overseas development aid in order to reach a level of 0.5 per cent of the gross national product by 1985.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, there are those in this country who argue that we should be cutting back on overseas development aid, otherwise known as foreign aid. Certainly as long as I am in politics, and I am sure I speak for many of my colleagues on this side and others in the House, not only on the Liberal benches but even on the Conservative benches, we must be vigilant in this country, this country of wealth, this country of great economic opportunity, which although suffering is not suffering nearly as much as many of those poorer countries in the world that vitally depend on the financial assistance that will be accorded them by the passage of this Bill.

This is not a partisan issue; it is an issue that crosses all Party lines. I want to thank Hon. Members on the other side for their rapt attention this afternoon, despite the House Leader for the Official Opposition who did his best to inject a note of partisanship into this highly non-partisan and technical debate.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Is the House ready for the question? The Member for Manicouagan (Mr. Maltais).

[*English*]

**Mr. Nielsen:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the remarks made by the Member for York East, nothing could be lower than for him to accuse me of partisanship. They laugh over there, but the Government House Leader asked me and the Member for Hamilton Mountain, the House Leader for the New Democratic Party, for an agreement to get this legislation through.

We have both said this afternoon that we want to see it go through now, yet what is happening? We are being treated to the dubious value of departmental speeches being read by Government Members, with one Government Member after another getting up and blocking their own legislation. Surely, if we are to believe the Government House Leader that the Government wants this legislation, that it is urgent, then let us have the question put and send the legislation to Committee without any further delay on the part of Government Members.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Collenette:** With all respect, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the Hon. Member for Yukon was really rising on a point of order or just engaging in partisan rhetoric. But I have a point of order which is almost a question of privilege. The

imputation that I would come into this House and be set up with a speech is thoroughly distasteful, and I resent this kind of accusation by a gentleman who should know better from his years in this House.

I have tried to speak from my experience with the Latin American affairs subcommittee. I have tried to speak as one who is vitally concerned with overseas development aid.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into a debate on the quality or merits of the speeches, but I do want to say to the Acting House Leader for the Government that there is a small problem that begins to develop as more and more Government Members rise, one after the other, to speak. I have asked at least two of my Members if they would allow the Bill to go straight to Committee in order that the matter could be studied there. They have said to me quite bluntly that that was fine provided we had some understanding that the Bill would be completed quickly and would go to Committee. I thought we had that understanding. Perhaps I was wrong.

I was wondering if the acting Government House Leader would consider whether it is not counterproductive at this stage to put up seriatim Members of the Government Party's backbench, knowing that it may provoke Members on the other side to want to rise—let me be quite fair about this—in order that today's *Hansard* not reflect that there are no Opposition Members sufficiently concerned about the matter to rise and enter the debate.

● (1610)

If there are other Government Members who wish to speak, then I would feel compelled to suggest to my good colleague who has already agreed not to speak that perhaps he should, in order to protect us against the possible thought that maybe we did not care about the debate which was currently going on.

At this stage, I would be happy to see the matter disposed of and go to Committee. If we have yet another speaker, without trying to create a problem—I am trying to be as non-partisan as I can in this—I feel the debate might go on for some time, which I think would not be terribly productive. I want to say to the Hon. Member who rose to speak that I am not trying to prejudice his contribution. It may well be very valuable.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order, please. I see a number of Members rising. The Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Cosgrove) was the first to rise.

**Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention, either, to further engage in what has been referred to as "partisan" consideration or debate over a subject which is of serious concern to many Members on both sides of this House. I had the privilege, though, of leading off debate on the Bretton Woods Agreements Act last week which was discussing support to developing nations in a similar way. I think all Members would agree that when I, for example, restricted my remarks to a very