

*United Nations*

Here in North America we were enabled to build up our substantial capital because of the sacrifices and the miseries of the people who had gone before us. We in North America owe a debt to those people in Great Britain who underwent the horrors of the early industrial revolution, and to those who accumulated the first stocks of capital there. We owe a further debt. We owe a debt to those people in the Asiatic countries, with whom we have been dealing here this afternoon, who in the beginning made their heavy contribution to the capital accumulations of Great Britain and western Europe. From each in turn the economies of North America were able to benefit without our people having to go through the grim and bitter period that the peoples in Asiatic countries and Great Britain had to undergo during their periods of capital accumulation.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that we have a very heavy moral responsibility to explore every possible avenue of technical aid and assistance to these people. The nature and magnitude of the problem are of course displayed in figures which are released from time to time by the various subsidiary organizations of the United Nations. I believe one of my colleagues here this afternoon pointed out that people in a very large part of the world have incomes of less than \$100 per year. That compares with the average per capita income in Canada of \$900 per year, and in the United States of \$1,450 per year. Fifty-four per cent of the world's population have incomes of less than \$100 per year, and the people in Indonesia have an average income of less than \$25 per year.

If we look at other figures which have been released by the food and agriculture organization we can perhaps understand why these people have incomes which, expressed in monetary terms, are as meagre as those I have quoted. The food and agriculture organization informs us that in comparison with Canada, where we have a ratio of 800 acres of improved agricultural land per 100 of our population, Indonesia has a ratio of only 35 acres of improved agricultural land per 100 head of population, and in Burma the figure is only 104 acres. That I believe demonstrates as well as is possible the urgency of our problem. It indicates the work that has to be done.

The next question is what is the most effective way of tackling this problem? I was very interested in the suggestion made this afternoon by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) to the effect that there is a limit to the absorptive capacity of these countries as regards capital or

technical aid. He is perfectly correct; but on the other hand I should like to quote to the house the remarks of a very distinguished Canadian, Dr. Hugh Keenleyside, director of the United Nations technical assistance program. Dr. Keenleyside, almost precisely a year ago, had this to say in the city of Victoria:

It is at this point that I believe our present Canadian policy to be gravely inadequate. It seems to me to be unreasonable to devote \$100 to direct military defence for every \$1 we give to the saving of the underdeveloped areas of the world. Although Canada does more than most countries, her annual contribution to the T.A. programs of the United Nations is about equal to the cost of one bomber. Even adding the amount we are providing under the Colombo plan the total is still just about what we spend on a single destroyer.

That, Mr. Speaker, appears to me to reveal a most shocking lack of sense of proportion. While it is perfectly true, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs suggested, that we cannot hope to solve this problem merely by pouring money in by the bucketful, on the other hand I think we should not put too narrow an interpretation, as the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Philpott) suggested, upon technical assistance. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to send someone to these areas to teach an illiterate Indonesian peasant how to read and write, then we should also be prepared to put a pen in his hand and a book on the bench beside him. Otherwise what we have done for him is useless. If we are prepared to teach a primitive agriculturist in India modern methods of agriculture, then we should also be prepared to make that teaching of some value by providing him with modern agricultural machinery.

If we adopt that interpretation of technical assistance, then I believe we will find the absorptive capacity of these people very much greater than some people imagine. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed although not surprised when I found that the Secretary of State for External Affairs considered that an important yardstick for our contribution to this scheme should be the relationship of Canada's contribution to that of other nations. For the life of me I cannot see any reason why that should be the yardstick. The yardstick surely can only be the need and our capacity to fill that need.

This attitude on the part of the government—because I presume the minister's colleagues agree with that attitude—seems to me to savour of an all too common Canadian approach to world affairs, an approach which might be boiled down to this, that under no circumstances whatever should Canada take the risk of leading in an approach to world