

Supply

that we have just passed the \$2 billion mark. If growth continues in Canada with GNP at a level of 4 per cent in the next years, we should reach the \$5 billion mark by 1990. Too few people realize that.

The second point he made about the return of these expenditures to the Canadian economy is a good one indeed. Unfortunately, I have found that a number of people seem to feel that it is regrettable that so much of it comes back to Canada. Regrettably, there is an ambivalence in the minds of people on that subject. When people like ourselves travel abroad, we find that the receiving countries accept this as a normal and desirable fact, that we will do more when there is something in it for us too. However, again some Canadians do not accept that.

I also want to emphasize what the Hon. Member said about the balance between different types of aid. He was most constructive about this. There are unnecessary debates about it, such as bilateral as opposed to multilateral or different forms of aid, and the Member refused to engage in that theological debate. I compliment him on that.

I wish to give him an opportunity to elaborate on another point. He said that he believed there was still not enough done by CIDA for non governmental organizations of all types. Of course, I am on the other side of this question since what I see being done I find quite considerable. We should all realize that there will be much more available for NGOs if we reach the \$5 billion mark. Obviously, to put it quite bluntly, CIDA does not have the personnel to spend all that money, so the agency will have to use more voluntary organizations. Can the Hon. Member expand on this? Does he know of so many non governmental agencies that are waiting to receive money to do some good work? If that is his opinion, would he please illustrate it?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): The Chair would like to point out that there is one minute left in this question period.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, how can I do justice to such a question in one minute? I will try, and if you have a blind eye for an extra minute, it might help. With regard to the \$5 billion that the official government assistance will reach by 1990 there is a point that is extremely important today. I quite agree with the Minister that it has not yet sunk in with the Canadian public in the same way it might have sunk in with the Government. Much more money will become available.

With respect to some Canadians believing that they do not want to emphasize this return to Canada, I would say that it is perhaps the purest position which I can understand. However, experience has taught me, at least, that we are human beings here and it is public money that we are talking about. Therefore, we must understand that in a time of constraint in our own country, it is not wrong for us to show that by participating in development projects around the world there is a legitimate return to Canada. I think that is a legitimate point to make.

However, I would not want that to be the sole basis of public policy in Canada. The first motivation must be the humanitarian approach. Why are we in this? We are in it because we are part of the world and we cannot sit idly by as Canadians, in our country of tremendous resources, space and technology, if we are not prepared to do something to help our world become a better place. I am not only talking about a better place in terms of spirituality and humanity, but a better place in terms of political safety and security, because many of the local wars being fought around the world, and I am afraid some wars still to come, are caused by the sense of deprivation that is endemic in the Third World countries. The Secretary General of the Commonwealth spoke in Ottawa two days ago and he reminded his audience that by 1990, 80 per cent of humanity will live in the developing countries. That is where the need is and that is where our future markets are. Surely the Government of Canada should be responding in positive terms. In my view, going to .7 per cent of ODA should not cause that much concern.

The Minister asked me specifically to name some voluntary organizations. I do not think there are some who are just waiting for more money, and I would not want my remarks to be interpreted by the Minister as asking him to simply throw the money at the NGOs, not at all. I believe there must be a rational process established whereby organizations such as CUSO are able to grow and can do so in a systematic way.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[English]

RAILWAYS**SEVEN LIVES LOST AT MILTON RAILWAY CROSSING—IMPROVED SAFEGUARDS DEMANDED**

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton): Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1978, a train-car accident on Derry Road in Milton, Ontario, took the life of a young woman. At that time the Town of Milton and the Region of Halton requested the Canadian Transport Commission, by way of a resolution, to improve safeguards at the CNR railway crossing. The CTC did not act, and as a result last weekend six teenagers lost their lives at this same railway crossing due to what appears to be a lack of substantial safeguards.

Last night Milton Council unanimously adopted a resolution urging the CTC to reconsider its 1978 rejection. I now call