

*Supply—External Affairs*

is still understood, that only in exceptional circumstances will other forms of assistance be given under that plan.

It is true that we have made grants of wheat under the Colombo plan in India and, I think, possibly in one or two other countries—at the moment I am not quite sure which ones—but those were special circumstances. The wheat was requested by the governments concerned, and it was given under conditions which required the setting up of counterpart funds, so that the money which would be realized from the sale of the wheat—because it was sold to the countries in question—would be used for the purchase of materials and commodities which, in their turn, could be used in the capital assistance program.

So, in principle and in general, I think it would be well to confine our assistance under the Colombo plan to capital and technical assistance. That, indeed, is what the countries on the receiving end have asked.

Then, so far as the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre are concerned, of course we can always do more in any good cause. And that applies to the Colombo plan as it does to United Nations technical assistance and other forms of contributions to what I might call the international community chest.

But the Colombo plan is a continuing plan. At the present time it is a five-year plan to which we have pledged ourselves a contribution of \$125 million, and some few millions for technical assistance. And I think that having regard to all the circumstances that was a reasonable amount for Canada to contribute for those five years. And I still think that if we had pledged five years ago a greater amount we would have had some difficulty in expending it efficiently, economically and productively. But the Colombo plan is a continuing program, as I say, and I hope that Canada will continue to play a very important part in the years ahead in carrying out that project.

**Mr. Macdonnell:** Is there any problem as to the method of rendering technical assistance? It has been suggested to me that sometimes the sending in of people from the outside does not work entirely smoothly. Would the minister say a word as to whether the trend now is to educate the people of the beneficiary country, or whether we send in technical people, or both.

**Mr. Pearson:** The answer is both. As my hon. friend has pointed out, the sending of technicians from western countries to Asian countries has not in all cases worked out

successfully. Not only do the technicians have to be good ones, but they have to know how to get along with the people in the countries concerned. And occasionally in the early stages of these co-operative international assistance programs people were sent, not only from this country but from other countries, who might have been good technicians but perhaps were not always best qualified to co-operate with those at the other end.

But those difficulties were bound to occur, and most of them have been surmounted. The greater difficulty in that regard is the finding of technicians in countries like Canada and the United States—qualified technicians and scientists—who are available for assistance in those countries. Because they are the people who are most in demand in North America. Another important part of the technical assistance program has been to bring students from those countries to Canada and the United States to teach them the skills and techniques so that they can go back and do this work for themselves. One of the great difficulties in carrying out these co-operative programs is the absence of qualified nationals on the spot. And it will take some time to overcome that difficulty.

**Mr. Macdonnell:** From the huge sums that we know the United States is contributing in various ways, can the minister tell us roughly how much of those contributions go into similar work, and to what extent the problem in a country like India—where it must be huge—is being grappled with. Or is it just a small beginning in a problem which continues to be overwhelming?

**Mr. Pearson:** I am not quite sure if I understood my hon. friend's question.

**Mr. Macdonnell:** My question is as to what relative amounts are being used by the United States for similar purposes under the Colombo plan.

**Mr. Pearson:** I have not the figures available. But perhaps my hon. friend from Ottawa West, who has been directly connected with some of these programs, might be able to give information as to the relative amounts expended under the Colombo plan in a country like India. It will probably be found that the United States has spent more in the last four or five years in countries like India or Pakistan. But I believe it has already been indicated that the great proportion of the money spent by the United States was under their Point Four program, and not under schemes of United Nations technical assistance or co-operative schemes. I would guess that the amount of United States money spent