

*Supply—External Affairs*

two missionaries whose fate I am not sure of at the moment. The tenth question is as follows:

Is there any truth whatsoever to this part of the *Ensign* article?

The answer, Mr. Chairman, is no.

Item agreed to.

General—

95. To provide for the Canadian government's contribution to the United Nations expanded program for technical assistance to underdeveloped countries in an amount of \$872,354 U.S., notwithstanding that payment may exceed or fall short of the equivalent in Canadian dollars, estimated as of January, 1954, which is, \$850,000.

**Mr. Knowles:** Item 95 is one of two or three items of the main estimates, together with an item or two in the supplementary estimates, that come under the general heading of economic aid. If I may say so, I feel that some of the most thrilling hours of the time we spent in the committee on external affairs were when we had Mr. Nik Cavell before us telling us the story of what is being done under the Colombo plan in the countries in southeast Asia which are participants in that plan. It does seem to me that it would be well worth while for members generally to read the evidence of the committee reporting Mr. Cavell's statement to us. As hon. members are aware, the committee not only recommended to the house the items in the estimates covering technical assistance under the Colombo plan and economic aid generally but also included in its report a paragraph on this general subject which reads as follows:

Your committee was impressed with the valuable work being done under the Colombo plan and is of the view that this aid is of considerable importance to help the growth of democracy and it also approves of the increase in the Canadian contribution to the United Nations program for technical assistance to underdeveloped countries.

It is obvious from the vein in which I have been speaking and it is well known from what all of us in this group have said on many occasions that we support wholeheartedly these programs of economic aid to underdeveloped countries. We support them because we think it is the right thing to do for the people of these countries. We also support these programs because we believe that it is a way of giving real and tangible aid to those who are trying to build democracy in other parts of the world. This is indeed a part of what my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North was speaking about earlier this evening when he urged that we be concerned as to what we are striving for in this world as well as what we are striving against.

Now, Mr. Chairman, because we are in full support of these amounts for economic aid I will not take the time of the committee to spell out that support. There is just this I should like to say. It seems to me that the impression has been created over the past year or two—and if I may say so with respect I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs has helped to create that impression—that we are doing all we can. The impression has been created that even if we were to vote more money the arrangements have not been set up to make use of that money; even if we were prepared to give more these other countries could not use it and are not ready to absorb such help as we might be prepared to give. If I have gathered the wrong impression I would be delighted to have it corrected. I think it is fair to say that impression has been created.

As a matter of fact it had been created to such an extent that some of the questions put to Mr. Cavell in the committee were based on that premise. The questions of some members of the committee started from the idea that we were doing all we could within the capacity of those countries to accept and make use of our aid. I noticed, however, that in response to some of the questions we put to Mr. Cavell he made it clear that the requests those countries make to us are made in the light of their knowledge of the amount of money we are prepared to put into these various plans. He told us also that the amount of help that could be used by way of capital aid in these countries was almost unlimited. I am sure that we in the committee all agreed with the basic principle he laid down, that was the principle that we must help them get on their own feet. We must provide training and capital assistance rather than relief and rather than relying on the notion that we, by ourselves, could rehabilitate that whole area.

Perhaps the reason I have risen to say these few words, Mr. Chairman, is in the hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs may see fit to dispel that impression which I think has been created. If the fact is that the government feels we cannot yet appropriate more money, let it be said squarely that that is the case. But believing as I do that one of the things that can contribute most to the saving of the world from communism is the effort to build it up in terms of strong and indigenous democracy, I think that every dollar we can spend in this way is very well spent. The money that we spend on economic aid is a drop in the bucket compared to what we are called upon to spend for military preparations. I know the arguments that are thrown back when we make