

Canadian Economy

● (1550)

I have never met a more dedicated group of civil servants than those in CIDA. Yet I know what they must endure to go through all these monkeyshines. When one country gives to another country, you cannot really enforce the carrying out of that program in the other country.

What is a better way of doing it? I have mentioned the International Trading Congress. I think I have said enough about it. Their programs are working at no cost to government. Both sides benefit and world trade has improved.

I think hon. members probably know that in 1961 the People's Republic of China had only \$400 million a year in trade, \$200 million going to Russia and \$200 million coming back to China. What is it today? They have \$30 billion a year in trade. That has been done by free trading institutions moving in and out, sometimes to government, but more often just private businessmen going back and forth and dealing with corporations. Handouts are just a new form of imperialism. These people out there know it, and so do we. They are ashamed. I am not going into the question of the competence of handling these programs. We should not be giving them handouts. We should give them lower interest rates, if they take aid in the form of loans. They have no more chance of paying back a loan at low interest rates than they have with a high interest rate loan if the loan is not properly utilized to produce more wealth with which to pay it back. I do not want to spend too much time on that aspect either.

The last type of rap we have had over the last ten years started with Malta. Someone came along with this great Christian concept that we should turn the wealth of the oceans over to the newly developing nations. My God, wouldn't our fellow men think we are wonderful people? The ocean wealth is the heritage of mankind. Every nitwit in every political party in Canada is in fraud and scam from the word go right up to their necks. The wealth at the bottom of the sea under international law belongs to the coastal states, as far as they can develop it. With present technology, that means everywhere. Six sevenths of the world is ocean today under sovereign control by international law of the coastal states. Canada owns the resources halfway across the Atlantic, the Arctic and the Pacific. That is the international law. Yet civil servants who come into our political parties never even mention that the international law still applies.

Mr. Blais: How much of the high seas?

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): The high seas have nothing to do with the bottom of the sea convention, if the hon. member knows anything about it.

I want to make it very clear that Canada put forward that proposal in 1958. It was unanimously approved in committee at the Law of the Sea Convention, unanimously approved at the United Nations in 1962, and enough nations ratified the proposal to make it international law, and there it remains.

Why should nitwits in our political parties here in Canada play a part in this scam of pretending that we are going to give

something from the bottom of the sea to these new nations? At present we can do it very easily by simply granting them a certain royalty, 5 per cent, 7 per cent, 8 per cent, or whatever we agree upon. If we want to give them a handout, 7 per cent of the gross might be acceptable. There is no way to ever get these nations to agree on the split. We would have to turn it over to a United Nations body, such as the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank. With their programs, it would probably be more rationally assigned.

I have mentioned three or four different types of scams: the handouts, the low interest rate scam and the scam of pretending that we are helping people when we are really trying to delude them. The newest one I have mentioned is the one where Canada will take the lead with the wealthy nations of the world toward a better North-South relationship.

We all know what that is. The Prime Minister has made up his mind what he is going to do. He wants to go out with something good. He has failed with every other thing. He has failed on his constitutional gambits. He has failed on his energy gambits. He is not able to do anything on the economic side, so he has to pretend that he is leading the world to higher and better things. Whenever you try to persuade nations such as Britain, France, Germany, Japan and the United States to join together in a helpful procedure for the newly developing nations, boy, that is real pretence. There is only one way you get things through these countries sensibly and that is to help them make more money first so they can do without the handouts.

The proposals I want to put forward all have precedents. When Malaysia wanted a handout to fight communism in 1958, what we did was to clear the land in ten acre jungle lots, plant red rubber trees and pay the people directly wages of \$70 a month. When the rubber trees came into production and they were able to pay for running their operations and looking after their families, we asked, as Canadians, for a 15 per cent return. We were paid back in three years.

If we can do this type of thing for Malaysia without getting rid of interest rates, and stop communist insurgency by letting people own their land, they will never become communist. Why can we not use the same rules for Canadians?

Canada took the lead in 1959 and then in 1961 on another project. Instead of handouts, we set up an international program through the United Nations called the world food program, under which were not authorized handouts except in cases of famine or emergency. Today we are beginning the twentieth year of that program. There is no program in the whole of the United Nations working more successfully and achieving more good than this one. Ninety per cent of the billions of dollars we have raised and given to this program has been spent in constructive enterprises, and only 10 per cent has gone to handouts for emergencies. There are precedents to do things in a constructive way so that everyone benefits.

Because my time has just about run out, I want to plead with this Parliament to start putting proposals forward in the hope that in its desperation the government will accept a few of these precedents and begin to apply this type of construc-