

referred to the cadastral survey in Morocco and said it would be interesting to know about it. Apparently he had questions about it. But that project was approved and the announcement was made in 1968. Surely in that period the hon. member could have gone to the committee and asked some questions. But really he was not interested in asking questions.

Mr. Wagner: I was not here in 1968.

Mr. MacEachen: He was inspiring his colleagues from Quebec at meetings of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, not asking about the cadastral survey in Morocco.

Another project is that of the national library on the Ivory Coast that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) raised. That was approved in 1969—but the hon. member says he has not received any information on it. The committees have been meeting—the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and the committees on estimates. Surely a hard-driving member of parliament could have gone to the committee meetings in those five years and found out what was going on.

The same is true of all these projects that have popped up in print recently. The motorization program on river boats in Senegal was approved in 1971, and the building of the boarding school was approved in 1969. The provision of fertilizer unloading equipment for the ports of India was undertaken in February of 1971. All during these years controversial projects about which the hon. member says it would be interesting to know something about have been there; but few, if any, questions have been asked.

I am glad there is a conversion. They want scrutiny and I want scrutiny. I think this is great. There has been such massive misinformation. The hon. member spoke about the loan to Cuba and suggested that there was a rift between myself and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner). In fact, there was a story in the press on this subject relating to a letter which I was alleged to have sent to the Minister of Finance protesting the views of the Minister of Finance on this subject. The fact is that no such sentiments were ever expressed either by voice, by word, by pen or by typewriter. Never did I differ with the Minister of Finance on the financing of the loan to Cuba. When CIDA, just seven days ago, announced a detailed accounting of the Cuban loan, most of those who attempted to exploit the imaginary rift between myself and my colleague did not see fit to report the facts about the alleged controversy which made the headlines just a short time ago.

● (1650)

Then there was another story about Iran, with its oil riches, to which CIDA was alleged to have loaned \$100 million on soft terms. Well, the loan to Iran never took place—not for a dime, let alone \$100 million. Iran has never been in the development assistance program of Canada. Then, of course, there were the lie detectors. An important journalist, a former member of this House who has sat on both sides, said that CIDA was providing lie detectors to Cuba. One can imagine the fear which struck the hearts of the timid in Canada when they learned we were providing lie detectors to the Cuban authorities. It

CIDA

turned out that these machines, called polygraphs, were in fact needed for public health and animal husbandry programs in Cuba.

We were accused of subsidizing a private airline in Indonesia. That did not happen. We are accused of subsidizing the oil-rich countries. Are hon. members going to be drawn in by these spurious allegations that we are subsidizing oil-rich countries through CIDA? For example, Indonesia was mentioned as having a per capita income of \$80, based on the gross national product, or a personal income of \$100. Nigeria, which has improved its per capita income, is today standing at about \$230. The hon. member asked me to tell him our criterion for providing aid. The criterion is poverty based on per capita income. If we give aid to Indonesia, Nigeria and Algeria despite the welcome improvements in their economies, it is because their standards of living and their per capita incomes are still unspeakably low in Canadian terms. The hon. member asked about Brazil. He asked an important question. Why do we give aid to Brazil? Does the hon. member know Brazil well? Has he talked to Bishop Camara of Recife, who is a worldwide authority on development and who knows Brazil well? If the hon. member had spoken to him, he would have been more moderate in his charges in regard to extending aid to Brazil.

Probably the most damaging criticism of all those made in this House was that in the dying months of 1974 CIDA rushed around trying to get rid of \$117 million or so before the axe went down at the end of the fiscal year. I find that pretty hard to take, because of the \$117 million, \$70 million was reallocated in accordance with pledges made at the World Food Conference to feed the hungry of the world: \$70 million was food aid. This reallocation was absolutely necessary because of the world food crisis and the plight of many countries. We provided \$50 million plus \$20 million of food aid commitment—\$71.4 million—to countries like Bangladesh, Sahel, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. I think it was good that we rushed around to provide help in that amount to the starving people in these countries. Part of the reallocation was in the acceleration of ongoing projects in the amount of \$20 million for a railroad in Malawi, Kenya and Botswana.

Then we accelerated and approved new projects in the amount of \$25 million, reacting to the inflationary problems, the balance of payments problems and the financial problems of the underdeveloped world. These reallocations were not made by this so-called fiefdom. They were approved, signed and authorized last November and December by myself as Secretary of State for External Affairs, and when I go before the committee I will be happy to explain each and every item in that \$117 million. If any hon. member of this House argues that that money has been wrongly spent, I will ask to be convinced that it was and I will apologize if he can show me and the members of the committee that what he says is right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: I hear that criticism while we try to get more rice seedlings to Bangladesh or more fertilizer to Pakistan and Sri Lanka. This was all part of the reallocation of the \$117 million. I would like to close on a more conciliatory note than that which I have been following