

Adjournment Debate

which, as I say at first blush, must be done by amendments to the Standing Orders.

The purpose of what I have said is simply to describe the structure of the amendment. Again I say that the intent of the amendment, which was defended by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), is to attempt to extend the statute by describing how the House will deal—or to set up some manner of dealing—with these reports. This may—and I say may—have been achieved, but that is entirely different from what is proposed here. That is the intention and the motivation of this amendment, but to go on to describe in detail the membership of the committee, its structure and its powers, which are different from those of any other committee now sitting, seems to me to go far beyond what was ever anticipated as a part of the principle of this bill—and certainly far beyond the scope of any one clause—which provides simply that the Auditor General may report to parliament through Mr. Speaker, and that that report will be tabled in the usual way.

After very careful consideration I must find that in some very fundamental ways this motion does more than go beyond the scope of any clause which it seeks to amend, and in fact goes beyond the principle of the bill and introduces entirely new concepts into the practices of the House which I think would have to be done in a different way.

There may be some disposition in the House to call it six o'clock and to proceed to deal with the items which have been called for at that time. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY—
REQUEST FOR NAMES OF COUNTRIES WHICH ALLEGEDLY DO
NOT HONOUR THEIR COMMITMENTS—ATTITUDE TOWARD AID
TO INDONESIA

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, since last February when I raised the question on CIDA that is at the core of the present debate, two significant things have happened. First, Michel Dupuy has taken over as president of CIDA, launched a drive to tighten up and improve the management of that agency, and appeared before three House committees. At his last appearance Thursday before the public accounts committee he reported that he had implemented more than half of the Auditor General's 92 recommendations for improving the management operation.

[*Mr. Speaker.*]

Second, the North-South Conference has come to its conclusion. The final communiqué listed 21 points of disagreement and only 20 points of agreement. It was not a happy conclusion. Thus, we have not made much substantial progress in putting into place the structural changes in trade and monetary systems needed to build up self-reliance in the least developed countries.

Where does this leave us? The work of CIDA continues to be of the utmost importance since aid programs, despite their limitations, are still very necessary. Therefore Canada ought to be progressing toward the .7 per cent of the gross national product figure that is the United Nations goal. As it is, we are going in a reverse direction since Canadian aid has slipped from .58 to .51 per cent of GNP in the last two years. But who can argue for a higher volume of Canadian aid until parliament and the public are assured that aid is being directed and administered in the best possible way? The Auditor General last year found a "very unsatisfactory state of financial control" in CIDA and set up a major audit which led to 92 recommendations. As a result of last week's meeting with the Public Accounts Committee we learned from the deputy Auditor General that there is in place "a well-balanced plan" to implement the recommendations which have been made.

Progress is being made. But of course we are not yet satisfied that CIDA is being run in the most efficient manner. Another auditor's report will be needed. Not even that, however, will be sufficient, for the Auditor General concentrates on control systems. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of Canadian aid programs we must go beyond control systems and have access to CIDA's country reports which describe the intentions of aid programs in the economic, social, and political context of the recipient country.

CIDA has for a long time needlessly employed the confidential stamp on much of its most relevant material. Even as late as last week CIDA was denying me access to the Auditor General's list of 92 recommendations. It took the pressure of the Public Accounts Committee meeting to make that list available to me. On reading it, I cannot see any possible reason for the previous confidentiality, except to avoid embarrassment to CIDA's former president, who left his successor with a leaky ship. If CIDA is to complete the process of regaining the confidence of parliament, the country reports must be made available. It is neither fair nor reasonable to ask members of parliament to vote CIDA's \$1.1 billion budget without at the same time making available to us relevant information, as distinct from CIDA's public relations material.

We want to know some basic facts. What is CIDA doing to ensure that more aid goes for community development in rural areas of developing countries? What pressure is being put on the administrations of developing countries to enforce internal reforms so that the fruits of development get to the massive rural populations and not just the elite? What is CIDA doing about ensuring a strong Canadian input into development strategies for the third development decade? What is the amount of the Canadian contribution to the special action program set up by the North-South Conference?