

*Government Organization Act, 1983*

for being able to make that kind of choice. Now, if it is a joke, I have not laughed yet; and I am worried. The direction that the Progressive Conservatives have officially taken in external affairs really upsets and worries me as a Canadian, not only as a Member of the NDP.

● (1140)

With all due respect to my colleague, the Hon. Member for York-Peel and I have worked closely with him on the Latin American report and over a number of years in external affairs matters, and he has a view of the world about which I am deeply concerned. He has not spoken yet and I will be very happy to hear his views, but I believe that this set-up of External Affairs being responsible for international trade will be very much to his liking. I believe the Hon. Member sees international relations as being basically concerned with trade.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the subcommittee on Canada's Relations with Latin America and the Caribbean, of which there were 15 Members from all three Parties, 14 Members came to an agreement on the report about how Canada should deal with its neighbours in the Caribbean and Latin America. There was one dissenting voice, that of the Hon. Member for York-Peel, although in the meetings of the full Committee on External Affairs and National Defence there were Members who supported the Hon. Member for York-Peel, all from the Conservative Party. But the report, which I felt was balanced and was prepared only after extremely hard work and an awful lot of study, I feel gave Canadians and the Government a direction to follow in dealing with the people of the Caribbean and Latin America, yet it was opposed by that one Member who is now the Conservative Party critic for external affairs. I do not think that this appointment is a joke, even though Mr. Valpy of *The Globe and Mail* says it is.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if this legislation is going to please that Hon. Member, then it is the kind of legislation he probably would have planned himself. I believe the Hon. Member is going to speak later today on this particular Bill and I will be anxious to see just exactly how he will address it. I will be anxious to see whether or not the Hon. Member will see it as an intrusion into the freedom of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to make clear decisions on morality and not be pushed by the business side more than others. There are many sides the Minister has to take into consideration when he makes his judgments.

The sub-committee on Canada's relations with Latin America and the Caribbean is one of the few groups in this House of Commons which has taken seriously this part of the world and has studied how Canada should relate to its neighbours. All 14 Members of that subcommittee, excluding the Hon. Member for York-Peel, felt that in dealing with countries in Central and Latin America the primary thing to be taken into consideration by the diplomats and the Government is the question of human rights. What are we as a country doing to protect the human rights of the people who live in Uruguay, Peru, Bolivia, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Jamaica, Cuba, or wherever, so that they can live as human beings with the rights

and privileges of a human being at this particular time in the history of the world?

In our report we also make the very clear point that trade and investment is another reason Canada is interested in relations with those countries. The world runs on trade and I have no difficulty with that. But we also recommended that in development assistance Canada should be very conscious of the fact that it is to assist and develop the country, not just something to develop and make Canadian industry go. Development assistance or true aid is to aid and assist people, wherever they happen to be, who because of the current economic situation need this assistance. Aid is something that people do not ordinarily want; they would prefer to assist themselves. But at times in their lives, as in ours and everyone else's, aid is demanded.

The point I make concerning this reorganization is that development assistance can now become much more of a tool, let us say, to trade. I repeat, development assistance should be for the human needs of people wherever they happen to be, but I have a fear that what can easily happen with this reorganization is that this will be the first stepping stone to increasing trade. Canada will send off aid in the form of machines and tools or technology which will tie the receiving country into a web they cannot get out of. Everything they do will be directed to the particular Canadian industry involved.

Well, Mr. Speaker, people can ask what is wrong with that. I suspect there are good reasons for thinking a little bit in that direction but my experience, having worked in developing countries and with people in the Third World, is that many times aid programs, because of this effort to try to tie them into trade, did not or do not help those to whom they are directed. The program was imposed by those who want to trade something they have here and are trying to find a market for, but the market is not there because the people of that country have not arrived at that level as yet.

For better or worse, CIDA has been criticized many times for programs which do not work well and reflect badly on the whole idea of aid. But I think that if you looked at those programs which have received the biggest opposition and caused the most conflict, they would be programs which are very closely associated with an aid approach which was attached almost directly to Canadian trade.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this new set-up really does concern me. Is there going to be an unequal pressure now from the Minister of Trade (Mr. Lumley) in the area of external affairs so that human rights, which the subcommittee laid down as the guiding force of Canada's relationships with other countries, and development assistance will now fall out of focus and be forced away because Trade and Commerce have become too predominant in the judgments being made in External Affairs?

There is another thing that concerns me about this Bill. I do not know what the Minister of External Relations means. What is it? Who is it? Why is it? I cannot find in the Bill a definition of what that Minister is supposed to do. I may not have read the Bill correctly but I cannot find that, so I think